EXHIBIT J

100 East Ocean Project

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

SCH No. 2018121006

PREPARED FOR:
The City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services

PREPARED BY:
Eyestone Environmental, LLC

eyestone ENVIRONMENTAL

January 2021

Table of Contents

1.0 Summary

The City of Long Beach (City) is considering the approvals and environmental review for the construction and operation of a 537,075-square-foot hotel with 429 rooms, restaurant uses, meeting rooms, ballrooms, pre-function space, and hotel amenities, plus parking and open space improvements (Project) on a 1.36-acre site located at 100 East Ocean Boulevard (Project Site). The Project Site is currently occupied by a surface parking lot consisting of 80 vehicular parking spaces and an automated pay station. Access to the Project Site is provided via existing driveways along Seaside Way and Ocean Boulevard. The Project Site is designated as Land use District (LUD) No. 7, Mixed Use District, and LUD No. 11, Open Space and Park District, by the City's General Plan. The Project Site is also located within a coastal zone and is subject to the City's Local Coastal Program. The Project Applicant is 100 East Ocean Blvd, LP.

A Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) were prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts of the Project. The City is the lead agency for the Project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 *et seq*.).

The Final EIR identifies a significant and unavoidable impact for the Project related to cumulative construction noise. The City finds this significant and unavoidable impact to be acceptable due to overriding considerations. All other Project-specific and cumulative impacts would be less than significant or mitigated to a less than significant level.

2.0 Project Description

2.1 Project Location and Site Conditions

The Project Site is located within the southeastern portion of the City at 100 East Ocean Boulevard. The Project Site is bounded by Ocean Boulevard to the north, the Convention Center Walkway (also referred to as the Promenade South) and an office building to the east, Seaside Way to the south, and Pine Avenue to the west. Primary regional access is provided by Interstate 710 (I-710 or Long Beach Freeway), which runs north-south and terminates 0.9 mile west of the Project Site.

The Project Site is approximately 1.36 acres in size. The Project Site is designated as LUD No. 7, Mixed Use District, and LUD No. 11, Open Space and Park District, by the City's General Plan. As set forth in the General Plan, uses intended for LUD No. 7 include employment centers, such as retail uses, offices, and medical facilities; higher density residences; visitor-serving facilities; personal and professional services; and recreational facilities. LUD No. 11 includes open space and park areas which are intended to remain or

be redeveloped in the future in (essentially) an open condition. The Project Site is also located within a coastal zone and is therefore subject to the requirements of the City's Local Coastal Program. The Local Coastal Program includes policies to increase use of public transit, walking, and bicycling opportunities, and encourages recreation and visitor-serving facilities.

The Project Site is zoned per the Long Beach Municipal Code as Subarea 7 within the Planned Development District 6 (PD-6), Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District (Downtown Shoreline Plan). The Downtown Shoreline Plan specifically identifies residential, hotel, and office uses within Subarea 7 and includes specific requirements pertaining to ancillary uses such as retail uses, restaurants, and art galleries, as well as access, building design, and setbacks. In addition, as the former site of the Jergins Trust Building, the Subarea 7 requirement to provide a corner cut-off at the northeast corner of the site to create a cohesive entry feature to the Promenade South from Pine Avenue applies to the Project.[1]

The Project Site was formerly owned by the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency (Redevelopment Agency). Prior to the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, the Project Site was identified for future development within the Downtown Long Beach Project Area.[2] The Project Site is identified in the approved Successor Agency Long Range Management Plan for "high-density development to maximize overall economic benefit to downtown and in accordance with the use of eminent domain."[3]

The Project Site is located in an urbanized area surrounded by a variety of primarily commercial land uses. To the west, across Pine Avenue is the Ocean Center Building, a Long Beach Historic Landmark approved as an adaptive reuse project from commercial to residential use, with commercial and residential uses further west along Ocean Boulevard. Commercial and office uses also are located immediately northwest of the Project Site, with the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach (Transit Mall) station further to the north on 1st Street. To the north across Ocean Boulevard are the Renaissance Long Beach Hotel and several restaurants. Immediately to the east of the Project Site, separated by a retaining wall, are the Convention Center Walkway and an office building. Further to the east, across Locust Avenue, is the Breakers Hotel building, a Long Beach Historic Landmark, which is largely vacant at the present time and under renovation. To the south and

---

[1] *Per City Ordinance No. ORD-U-0017.*

[2] *Long Beach Redevelopment Agency, "Downtown Long Beach," www.longbeachrda.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=2456, accessed January 15, 2019.*

[3] *City of Long Beach, Revised Long Range Property Management Plan, www.lbds.info/documents/LongRangePropMgtPlan/LRPMP.pdf, p. 42, property 113, accessed January 15, 2019.*

southeast, across Seaside Way, is the Long Beach Convention and Entertainment Center. Various commercial uses including restaurant and retail uses are located to the southwest.

The Project Site is currently occupied by a surface parking lot consisting of 80 vehicular parking spaces and an automated pay station. There are no habitable structures or landscaping within the parking lot, and concrete retaining walls line the northern and eastern site boundaries. Access to the southern end of the Jergins Trust Tunnel is sealed along the northern retaining wall. The northern part of the Project Site includes a portion of Victory Park, which currently houses a temporary public art project known as "The Loop," along with seating areas and landscaping. A Long Beach Bike Share station is located at the northwestern corner of the Project Site. One street tree is located along Ocean Boulevard, and eight street trees are located along Pine Avenue adjacent to the Project Site. In addition, a single ingress/egress driveway is located along Seaside Way and two ingress/egress driveways are located along Ocean Boulevard. The Project Site slopes down towards the south at an approximately 7.9 percent grade, with the Ocean Boulevard elevation approximately 25 feet above Seaside Way.

2.2 Project Overview

The Project involves the replacement of the existing surface parking lot and related improvements on the Project Site with a new 537,075-square-foot hotel with 429 rooms comprised of 171 king rooms, 152 double queen rooms, 76 suites, and 30 penthouse suites; 23,512 square feet of restaurant uses; and 26,847 square feet of meeting rooms, ballrooms, and pre-function space. In addition, hotel amenities would include a pool deck and bar, fitness center, executive lounge, guest laundry, and a main floor lounge. The Project also includes improvements to Victory Park along Ocean Boulevard, including retaining the existing curb cuts on Ocean Boulevard to provide passenger loading and unloading, as well as providing pedestrian pathways, permeable hardscape, and new landscaping. The existing Long Beach Bike Share station located on the Project Site would remain. The proposed hotel uses would be located in a 30-story building of up to 375.5 feet in height, consisting of a tower over a podium, with new landscaping and outdoor amenity areas.

The Project would reconnect the Project Site with the Jergins Trust Tunnel, a subterranean walkway previously associated with the Jergins Trust Building that extends from the Project Site to the north side of Ocean Boulevard near a sub-grade level of the Renaissance hotel north of Ocean Boulevard (the north end of the tunnel would not be reopened as part of the Project). The tunnel would be used for educational tours, and interpretive signage and images would be introduced to describe the tunnel's history.

An outdoor patio would be located on Level 3, wrapping around the north, west, and south sides of the building. New palm trees would be planted along Seaside Way, Pine Avenue, and Ocean Boulevard within Victory Park, and water efficient plants such as agave, euphorbia, and bamboo muhly would be planted throughout the Project Site and Victory Park. Atop the podium, Level 6 would include various outdoor amenities, including a pool, spa, and planted areas. Level 7 would include an outdoor planted area along the building's eastern side. Levels 26 through 29 would include balconies, and an outdoor seating area with landscaping associated with the proposed restaurant would be located on Level 30.

Exterior lighting would be incorporated along the building and throughout the Project Site for security and wayfinding purposes, as well as entryway lighting along driveways and pedestrian paths for safety. In addition, decorative and architectural lighting would be added to enhance the Site. On-site lighting would be shielded to reduce light levels onto off-site uses as well as prevent light aimed upwards to remain in compliance with Dark Sky requirements. All Project signage would be visually integrated with the proposed development and would feature colors and lighting that are complementary to the architectural design of the proposed building and the surrounding community.

Vehicular access to the Project Site would be provided via driveways along Seaside Way and Pine Avenue, with primary access from Seaside Way. These driveways would provide access to the valet parking areas on Level 1 and subterranean Level P1. In addition, two existing curb cuts on Ocean Boulevard would be utilized for passenger drop-off and valet service along the main entrance to the hotel on Level 3. Access for delivery, trash, and other service vehicles would access the building via Seaside Way via a loading bay at the southeast corner of the Project Site. Primary pedestrian access to the hotel would be provided via the main entrance facing Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park on Level 3. Upon entering, the main lobby would provide stairway and elevator access to the other areas of the building. Secondary pedestrian access would be provided on Level 1 via a small lobby located at the corner of Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. An exit corridor to Pine Avenue would be provided on Level 2.

All on- and off-site parking would be valet only. The valet drop-off area would be located near the main entrance to the hotel on Level 3, accessible via Ocean Boulevard. In addition, the City has indicated it will impose a condition of approval requiring a second valet staging area at one of the other Project entrances along either Pine Avenue or Seaside Way during peak hours/peak events to prevent any queue spillback onto Ocean Boulevard. A total of 151 on-site parking spaces would be provided in a two-level parking garage, with primary access from Seaside Way and secondary access from Pine Avenue (both with driveways on Level 1, connecting to subterranean level P1). An additional 280 parking spaces would be located off-site at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage, approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the Project Site. Additional parking may be provided

off-site in the general Downtown area for special events and peak usage periods. Valet trips are expected to make a right turn on to eastbound Ocean Boulevard followed by a right at Locust Avenue to access Seaside Way and enter either the on- or off-site parking garage. The Project would also provide 30 long-term bicycle parking stalls in a secure room on Level 1 and 8 short-term bicycle parking stalls near the main entrance on Level 3. Delivery, trash, and other service vehicles would access the building via Seaside Way through a loading bay at the southeast corner of the Project Site.

The Project would incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability. "Green" principles have been incorporated in the Project to comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-09-0013), and the Project has been designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver® certification. Specific energy conservation, water conservation, and waste reduction features include, but are not limited to, the following:

Energy Conservation and Efficiency

- Use of full-cutoff or fully shielded on-street lighting oriented to pedestrian areas/ sidewalks so as to minimize overlighting, light trespass, and glare.
- Use of light emitting diode (LED) lighting or other energy-efficient lighting technologies, such as occupancy sensors or daylight harvesting and dimming controls, where appropriate, to reduce electricity use.
- Incorporation of energy-efficient design methods and technologies, such as high-performance window glazing; undergrounding parking to reduce heat island effects; high-efficiency domestic heaters; and enhanced insulation to minimize solar heat gain.
- Inclusion of outdoor air flow measuring devices, additional outdoor air ventilation, and use of low emitting materials to promote indoor environmental quality.
- Incorporation of generous operable windows and high-performance window glazing; and use of natural light.
- Use of insulated plumbing pipes and high-efficiency domestic water heaters.
- Use of insulated mechanical pipes and high-efficiency boilers.
- Use of updated boiler controls to improve efficiency.
- Use of refrigerants that reduce ozone depletion.

- Dedicated outside air units for decoupled heating/cooling.
- Variable air volume kitchen exhaust.
- Occupancy-based hotel room energy management system.
- Demand-controlled ventilation in high occupancy spaces.
- Carbon monoxide monitoring in the parking garage coupled with variable speed garage fans.
- Use of energy-efficient electrical and mechanical equipment and monitoring systems.
- Provision of conduit that is appropriate for future photovoltaic and solar thermal collectors.
- Post-construction commissioning of building energy systems performed on an ongoing basis to ensure all systems are running at optimal efficiency.

Water Conservation

- Inclusion of water conservation measures in accordance with Long Beach Water Department requirements for new development in the City of Long Beach.
- Use of high-efficiency fixtures and appliances.
- Use of high-efficiency Energy Star-rated dishwashers and clothes washers where appropriate.
- Individual metering and billing for water use for the restaurant tenant.
- Prohibition of the use of single-pass cooling equipment (i.e., equipment in which water is circulated once through the system, then drains for disposal with no recirculation).
- Installation of cooling tower automatic water treatment to minimize cooling tower blowdown and water waste.
- Installation of a separate water meter (or submeter), flow sensor, and master valve shutoff for irrigated landscape areas totaling 5,000 square feet and greater.

Water Quality

- Use of on-site storm water treatment and re-use system consisting of a below grade cistern and re-use pump located near the northwest corner of the Project Site. The system will be capable of accommodating up to 3,102 cubic feet of stormwater and a flow rate of up to 0.28 cubic feet per second (cfs). This system would include underground steel reinforced polyethylene detention tanks with an irrigation reuse pump. The detention system would retain stormwater until it reaches the overflow pipe that connects to the existing storm drain system. The treated stormwater may be used for on-site irrigation.

- Installation of catch basin inserts and screens to provide runoff contaminant removal.

- Preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan, City of Long Beach Low Impact Development Plan, and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan, all of which would include Best Management Practices to control stormwater runoff, minimize pollutant loading and erosion effects during and after construction.

Solid Waste Reduction

- Provision of on-site recycling containers to promote the recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable materials and adequate storage areas for such containers during construction and after the building is occupied.

- Use of building materials with a minimum of 10 percent recycled content for the construction of the Project.

- Implementation of a construction waste management plan to recycle and/or salvage a minimum of 75 percent of nonhazardous construction debris or minimize the generation of construction waste to 2.5 pounds per square foot of building floor area.

2.3 Project Construction and Scheduling

Project construction would commence with demolition of the existing parking lot. This phase would be followed by grading and limited excavation for the placement of building footings. Building foundations would then be laid, followed by building construction, paving/ concrete installation, and landscape installation. Project construction is anticipated to occur over approximately 30 months, with completion anticipated in 2022. It is estimated

that grading would require approximately 23,500 cubic yards of soil removal and export.[4] The Project would also involve a continuous concrete pour requiring 415 truck loads per day, to be poured over two days. As part of the Project, a Construction Traffic Management Plan would be implemented, subject to City review and approval, to minimize potential conflicts affecting local circulation and surrounding uses.

2.4 Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are to:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;

- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

[4] *Final earthwork numbers may change based on soil conditions.*

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

2.5 Necessary Approvals

To develop the Project, the Project Applicant is requesting approval of the following from the City:

- Site Plan Review;

- Local Coastal Development Permit;[5] and

- Other discretionary and ministerial permits and approvals that may be deemed necessary, including but not limited to temporary street closure permits, grading permits, excavation permits, a haul route permit, foundation permits, and building permits.

2.6 Agencies with Possible Jurisdiction Over Project

The state agencies, regional agencies, and City departments and commission that may have jurisdiction over the Project include, but are not limited to the following:

- Long Beach Development Services

- Long Beach Public Works

- Long Beach Public Works

- South Coast Air Quality Management District

[5] *Pursuant to the LBMC Section 21.25.902, "The Coastal Zone Boundaries are indicated on the official zone map." The City's Coastal Zone Map shows that the Project Site falls within the Coastal Appealable Area of the City's permit jurisdiction, which gives the Planning Commission (or City Council, upon appeal) the authority to issue coastal development permit approval. Local approval of a coastal development permit may be appealed to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to LBMC Section 21.25.908.*

- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board

2.7 Related Projects

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15130 and 15355, the City evaluated the Project's potential cumulative environmental impacts using a list of 57 proposed development projects in the Project's general vicinity (referred to as related projects) that could affect conditions in the Project area. The list of related projects was prepared based on information obtained primarily from City of Long Beach Development Services Planning Bureau (Long Beach Planning Bureau). The related projects are in varying stages of the approval/entitlement/development process and consist of a variety of land uses reflecting the diverse range of land uses in the vicinity of the Project Site. The related projects include primarily residential, commercial/retail, restaurant/entertainment, office, and industrial uses. These related projects would occur primarily as urban infill within the existing land use patterns in the area. Some of the related projects may not be built out by 2022 (the Project's buildout year), may ultimately never be built, or may be approved and built at reduced densities. To provide a conservative analysis, the future baseline forecast assumes all the Related Projects will be fully built out by 2022 in the City's environmental review. The related projects in the City of Long Beach include:

- Related Project No. 1—Add 51-unit condominium to a 47-unit motel, 1628–1724 E. Ocean Blvd. (Condominiums)

- Related Project No. 2—New mixed-use project on 1.7-acre site, 245 W. Broadway. (Residential/Retail)

- Related Project No. 3—New mixed-use project with shared amenities on a 1.04-acre site, 2010 Ocean Blvd. (Residential/Hotel)

- Related Project No. 4—Apartment building with two levels of parking, 207 Seaside Way. (Apartments)

- Related Project No. 5—Expand existing aquarium front by 22,642 sf., 100 Aquarium Way. (Theater Expansion)

- Related Project No. 6—Mixed-Use, 495 The Promenade North. (Apartments/ Retail)

- Related Project No. 7—Adaptive reuse conversion of existing 15-story Ocean Center Building from office use to residential. Re-establish retail use on Ocean & Pine, 110 W. Ocean Blvd. (Residential)

- Related Project No. 8— Apartments, 150 W. Ocean Blvd. (Apartments)

- Related Project No. 9—Mixed-Use, 1570–1598 Long Beach Blvd. (Condominiums/ Retail)
- Related Project No. 10— Develop a vacant parking lot into townhomes, 227 Elm Ave. (Townhomes)
- Related Project No. 11—Mixed-Use New Civic Center, 411–415 W. Ocean Blvd. (Residential/Office/Library/Park/Hotel/Retail/Restaurant)
- Related Project No. 12—Senior and veteran housing with parking garage, Senior and veteran housing with parking garage. (Senior/Veteran Housing)
- Related Project No. 13—Mixed-Use 35-Story Building, 777 Ocean Blvd. (Apartments/Retail)
- Related Project No. 14—Mixed-Use Four-Story Building, 507 Pacific Ave. (Residential/Retail)
- Related Project No. 15—Mixed-Use 145,506 sf total building area, 230 W. 3rd St. (Residential)
- Related Project No. 16—Mixed-Use, 434 E. 4th St. (Apartments/Retail)
- Related Project No. 17—Apartments, 825 E. 7th St. (Apartments)
- Related Project No. 18—Mixed-Use, 500 W. Broadway. (Residential/Commercial)
- Related Project No. 19—Apartments with 1.5-Level Subterranean Garage, 320 Alamitos Ave. (Apartments)
- Related Project No. 20—New Medical Office Building, 1078, 1080–1090 Atlantic Ave. and 1085–1095 Lime Ave. (Medical Office)
- Related Project No. 21—Hotel with 150,000 sf of floor area, restaurants, retail use, theater use, bowling alley, golf venue, museum, and children's museum, 1126 Queens Highway. (Hotel/Restaurants/Retail/Movie Theater/Bowling Alley/ Golf Venue/Museum)
- Related Project No. 22—Three-story warehouse with covered and uncovered parking, 1468 14th St. (Warehouse)
- Related Project No. 23—Mixed-Use Five-Story Building, 1795 Long Beach Blvd. (Residential/Commercial)
- Related Project No. 24—Mixed-Use, 245 W. Pacific Coast Hwy. (Residential/ Commercial)

- Related Project No. 25—Modification of a previously approved Site Plan Review to allow the installation of 8 car lifts within a five-story hotel with 34 guest rooms, 107 Long Beach Blvd. (Hotel Modification)

- Related Project No. 26—Mixed-Use, 1400 Long Beach Blvd. (Condominiums)

- Related Project No. 27—Mixed-Use, 3rd Street/Broadway/Alamo Court/Long Beach Blvd. (Apartments/Commercial)

- Related Project No. 28—Five-Story Apartment Building, 425 E. 5th St. (Apartments)

- Related Project No. 29—Mixed-Use Five-Story Building, 1900–1940 Long Beach Blvd. (Apartments/Retail)

- Related Project No. 30—Affordable housing with commercial space and parking, 1836–1852 Locust Ave. (Affordable Residential/Commercial)

- Related Project No. 31—Mixed-Use Seven-Story Building, 135 Linden Ave. (Apartments/Commercial Retail)

- Related Project No. 32—Industrial Building, 1901 W. Pacific Coast Hwy. (Industrial)

- Related Project No. 33—Mixed-use project located on two adjacent lots intersected by a public alley. The combined area of the lots is approximately 1.04 acres. Project consists of two eight-story buildings with ground floor shell retail space. Buildings will include up to 3 levels of subterranean parking and 5 levels of Type 11 residential units over 3 levels of Type 1 residential units above grade, 635 Pine Ave. and 636 Pacific Ave. (Apartments/Ground-Floor Retail)

- Related Project No. 34—Mixed-Use, 1101 Long Beach Blvd. (Residential/Retail)

- Related Project No. 35—Mixed-Use, 127–139 E. Broadway. (Apartments/Retail)

- Related Project No. 36—Industrial Building, 1675 Santa Fe. (Industrial)

- Related Project No. 37—New industrial manufacturing building, 2111 W. 14th St. (Manufacturing)

- Related Project No. 38—Residential, 1112 Locust Ave. (Residential)

- Related Project No. 39—Four-Story Apartment Building, 1341 Long Beach Blvd. (Apartments)

- Related Project No. 40—Apartment Building, 1401 Long Beach Blvd. (Apartments)

- Related Project No. 41—Mixed-Use, 125 Long Beach Blvd. (Residential/Retail)
- Related Project No. 42—Adaptive reuse of bank building into a hotel, 110 Pine Avenue. (Hotel)
- Related Project No. 43—Mixed-Use, 1 & 11 Golden Shore. (Residential/ Commercial)
- Related Project No. 44—Two Industrial Buildings, 1601 San Francisco Ave. (Industrial)
- Related Project No. 45—Adaptive reuse of the former Breakers Hotel back to a hotel from a 233-bed congregate care facility, 210 E. Ocean Blvd. (Hotel)
- Related Project No. 46—Assisted Living, 810 Pine Ave. (Assisted Living)
- Related Project No. 47—Mixed-use with 623,323 sf total project floor area, 131 W. 3rd St. (Residential/Ground-Floor Retail)
- Related Project No. 48—Adaptive reuse of a former Verizon office building into residential building with associated parking, 200 W. Ocean. (Residential)
- Related Project No. 49—Expand existing parking structure by 321,595 sf., 231 Windsor Way. (Parking)
- Related Project No. 50—Residential, 600 W. Broadway. (Residential)
- Related Project No. 51—Four-Story Affordable Housing, 469 Pacific Coast Hwy. (Affordable Housing)
- Related Project No. 52—Industrial Building, 700 W. 17th St. (Industrial)
- Related Project No. 53—No Description, 201 W. Pacific Coast Hwy. (Residential)
- Related Project No. 54—No Description, 123 W. First St. (Hotel)
- Related Project No. 55—No Description, 101 Alamitos Ave. (Residential/Retail)
- Related Project No. 56—No Description, 135 Linden Ave. (Residential)
- Related Project No. 57—No Description, 432–444 W. Ocean Blvd. (Residential)

The cumulative study areas for the Project are defined based on an analysis of the geographical scope relevant to each particular environmental issue. Therefore, the cumulative study area for each individual environmental impact issue may vary.

3.0 Procedural Findings & Regulatory Framework

3.1 Procedural Findings

The City finds as follows:

Based on the nature and scope of the Project, the City determined, based on substantial evidence, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment and prepared an EIR for the Project. The EIR was prepared, noticed, published, circulated, reviewed, and completed in full compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, sections 1500 et seq.), as follows:

- A Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for review and comment by the public, responsible, and reviewing agencies, was circulated by the City on December 4, 2018 for a 30-day review period. During the NOP comment period, the City received nine comment letters from agencies and organizations (the State Office of Planning and Research, California Department of Transportation, California Coastal Commission, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Native American Heritage Commission, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Gabrieleño Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, and UNITE HERE Local 11).

- An Initial Study (IS) was prepared for the Project in conjunction with the NOP in December 2018 pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15063. The Initial Study assisted the preparation of the EIR by focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be potentially significant, identifying the effects determined not to be significant, and explaining the reasons for determining that certain effects would not be significant.

- A Notice of Availability (NOA) of an EIR and copies of the Draft EIR were circulated for review and comment on August 13, 2019, to those public agencies that have jurisdiction by law with respect to the Project, or which exercise authority over resources that may be affected by the Project, and to other interested parties and agencies as required by law. Consistent with the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and 15105, the Draft EIR was also submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research along with a Notice of Completion (NOC). Additionally, the NOA was distributed to all property owners and occupants within a 750-foot radius of the Project Site. Comments from such agencies, interested parties, and the general public were sought on the Draft EIR from August 13, 2019, through October 7, 2019, for a total review period of 55 days.

- The NOA described the Project, the requested permits and approvals, and the anticipated significant environmental effects. The NOA also stated that a complete copy of the Draft EIR was made available online on the City's

Development Services website at www.lbds.info/planning/environmental_planning/environmental_reports.asp and in person at the following locations:

– Long Beach City Hall, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor

– Long Beach Library–Alamitos Branch, 1836 E. Third Street

- The City received seven comment letters on the Draft EIR from public agencies and organizations (the State Office of Planning and Research, California Department of Transportation, California Coastal Commission, Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Southern California Gas Company, Long Beach Heritage, and UNITE HERE Local 11/SWAPE).

- Following closure of the public comment period, all comments received on the Draft EIR during the comment period, the City's written responses to the significant environmental points raised in those comments, and additional information or clarification regarding the Draft EIR were compiled into a Final EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15089 and 15132. On May 13, 2020, the Final EIR and an NOA for the Final EIR were published and circulated to relevant public agencies and interested parties, including all those who commented on the NOP and Draft EIR. Additionally, the NOA was sent to all property owners and occupants within a 750-foot radius of the Project Site. The Final EIR was made available for public review online at the City of Long Beach website at www.longbeach.gov/lbds/planning/environmental/reports/. The Final EIR and an NOC were also submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research on May 13, 2020.

3.2 Record of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and these findings, the record before the City includes the following:

- The Initial Study;

- The Draft EIR and all appendices of the Draft EIR;

- The Final EIR and all appendices to the Final EIR;

- All notices required by CEQA, staff reports, and presentation materials related to the Project;

- All studies conducted for the Project and contained in, or referenced by, staff reports, the Draft EIR, or the Final EIR;

- All public reports and documents related to the Project prepared for the City and other agencies;

- For documentary and informational purposes, all locally adopted land use plans and ordinances, including, without limitation, general plans, specific plans and ordinances, master plans together with environmental review documents, findings, mitigation monitoring programs, and other documentation relevant to planned growth in the area; and

- Any additional items not included above if otherwise required by law.

The EIR is incorporated into these findings in its entirety. Without limitation, this incorporation is intended to elaborate on the scope and nature of mitigation measures, the basis for determining the significance of impacts, and the comparative analysis of alternatives.

3.3 CEQA Regulatory Framework

Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provide that a project may not be approved or carried out until the public agency makes written findings supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record regarding each of the significant effects. Three possible findings are specified in the CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a), as follows:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15092, subdivision (b), provides that no agency shall approve a project for which an EIR was prepared unless either:

1. The project approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or

2. The agency has:

    a. Eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects where feasible as shown in the findings under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091; and

b. Determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15093.

4.0 Findings of Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Supporting Facts Required Under CEQA

The City, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Draft EIR and Final EIR, finds pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which would mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen to below a level of significance the potential significant effects identified in the Final EIR, as summarized below. However, the Project would lead to a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to cumulative construction noise. The discussion below first summarizes the findings for the environmental impacts for which no further environmental review was necessary based on the Initial Study and then summarizes the findings for each environmental impact analyzed in the Project's Draft and Final EIR. The basis of the findings for each impact is set forth below.

Where appropriate, the Project incorporates both project design features and project mitigation measures. Project design features are elements of the Project, such as a setback or design element, that will be incorporated into the Project. Project design features are not specifically created or added to the Project to mitigate environmental impacts but may lessen the Project's environmental impacts. Mitigation measures are measures applied to the Project that will mitigate any potentially significant environmental impacts identified in the EIR.

4.1 Environmental Impacts Found in the Initial Study Not to Occur or to be Less Than Significant

The City determined through the preparation of an Initial Study (included as Appendix A to the Draft EIR) that the development and the operation of the Project would not result in potentially significant impacts relative to the following impact categories. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, the City determined there was no evidence that the Project would cause significant environmental effects for the following issues and that no further environmental review of these issues was necessary in the environmental impact report.

4.1.1 Aesthetics

As discussed in more detail in the Initial Study, the Project meets the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21099 definition of an employment center project as a commercially zoned site with a proposed floor area ratio (FAR) of greater than 0.75:1 within a transit priority area (i.e., within 0.5 mile of the Long Beach Transit Mall, which is served by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority [Metro] Blue Line, as well as numerous bus lines); and meets the PRC Section 21099 definition of an infill site as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed. Therefore, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743, the Project's aesthetic impacts shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment as a matter of law. Notwithstanding the mandate imposed by SB 743, an aesthetics analysis was provided for informational purposes only.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have a potentially significant impact related to aesthetics if it were to: (a) have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; (b) substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; (c) substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; or (d) create a new source of substantial light and glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features AES-1 through AES-4 are proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as ultimately adopted by the City, to ensure the Project leads to no significant impacts related to aesthetics:

Project Design Feature AES-1: Temporary construction fencing shall be placed around the perimeter of the Project Site to screen construction activity from views at street level. Temporary fencing shall adhere to the City of Long Beach's Graphic Guidelines for Temporary Fencing (06/2017).

Project Design Feature AES-2: The Applicant shall ensure through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways that are accessible/visible to the public and that such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period. Unauthorized postings shall be removed within 72 hours.

Project Design Feature AES-3: Light sources associated with Project construction shall be shielded and/or aimed so that no direct beam illumination is provided outside of the Project Site boundary.

Project Design Feature AES-4: All exterior lighting required for the Project shall be shielded and directed away from any off-site light-sensitive uses.

4.1.1.1 Scenic Vistas

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to scenic vistas would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. A scenic vista is a view of one or more visual resources. While the Project Site is relatively close to the Rainbow Harbor shoreline, views of this visual resource are not available from the Project Site due to intervening development. Views from and surrounding the Project Site generally are limited to the surrounding built environment of Downtown Long Beach.

Project development could obstruct views of the shoreline from some of the nearby buildings. However, such views are already largely obstructed by other high-rise buildings in the vicinity. Additionally, the Project would improve the overall visual quality of the Project Site itself. Given the surrounding topography, intervening development, limited views of the shoreline under existing conditions and improved on-site aesthetic conditions, the Project would not have an adverse effect on scenic vistas. Furthermore, in accordance with SB 743, impacts would not be considered significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to scenic vistas have been identified.

4.1.1.2 Scenic Resources

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would not result in impacts related to scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located along a state scenic highway. The nearest officially eligible state scenic highway is State Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway or PCH), approximately 3.3 miles northeast of the Project Site. With regard to scenic resources, there are no protected trees or rock outcroppings within the Project Site, and the Jergins Trust Building, a Long Beach Historic Landmark formerly located on-site, was demolished in 1988. The subterranean Jergins Tunnel is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), and as a City of Long Beach Historic Landmark; however, it is not visible from the street, nor is it open to the public. As such, it is

not considered a scenic resource for purposes of this analysis. Therefore, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. In any event, in accordance with SB 743, impacts would not be considered significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with scenic resources have been identified.

4.1.1.3 Aesthetics/Visual Character

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to aesthetics and the visual character of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

The visual appearance of the Project Site would be altered due Project construction activities and staging, which would be visible from adjacent land uses and pedestrians and motorists on Ocean Boulevard, Pine Avenue, and Seaside Way. In accordance with Project Design Feature AES-1, the Project would include the installation of temporary construction fencing around the perimeter of the Project Site, thereby minimizing views of construction activities from adjacent streets. The Project would also implement Project Design Feature AES-2, which would ensure that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways and that such barriers or walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner.

Project construction would not substantially degrade or alter the long-term visual character or quality of the Project Site or its surroundings. Implementation of project design features would further ensure that the overall aesthetic character would not be substantively degraded, and impacts would not be significant.

Operation

The aesthetic environment of the Project vicinity includes a variety of low-, mid-, and high-rise structures with various land uses, including hotels, government facilities, commercial, and residential uses. The Project would become part of this urban fabric, and the massing, height, and aesthetic character of the proposed building would be consistent with many of the existing and proposed structures in the vicinity. In particular, the proposed height of 30 stories would be consistent with other buildings in Downtown Long Beach, such as the 30-story

One World Trade Center building and the 29-story West Ocean Condominium building, located approximately 0.4 and 0.25 mile west of the Project Site, respectively. Furthermore, the Project area continues to change, with new and ongoing developments incorporating a variety of uses with mid- and high-rise buildings of contemporary design. The Project would not be in substantial conflict with the surrounding visual environment in terms of building height, design, massing, or scale.

Overall, while the Project would change the visual character of the Project Site, the building height, design, massing, and scale would be compatible with the existing urban uses in the vicinity, and impacts would not be considered significant. In any event, in accordance with SB 743, impacts would not be significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to aesthetics have been identified.

4.1.1.4 Shading Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the generation of shading and shadows would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. In the City of Long Beach, a project will have a significant shading impact if shadow sensitive uses would be shaded by project-related structures for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. Pacific Standard Time (between late October and early April), or more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time (between early April and early October).

While there are no shade sensitive uses adjacent to the Project Site, the portion of Victory Park within the Project Site is considered sensitive to shading. In addition, Mitigation Measure AES-3 adopted in the City's Downtown Plan requires proposed buildings over 45 feet in height located adjacent to light sensitive uses to prepare a shading study that includes calculations of the extent of shadowing arches for winter and equinox conditions. Accordingly, a shading study was completed as part of the Initial Study and determined the Project would shade portions of Victory Park for more than three hours during the Spring Equinox, Fall Equinox, and Winter Solstice. However, such shading is common in densely developed areas such as Downtown Long Beach, and the shadows would vary throughout the day. In addition, the park would be landscaped with plants that can thrive in a shaded urban environment. Furthermore, pursuant to SB 743, impacts with respect to shading would not be considered significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to shadow impacts have been identified.

4.1.1.5 Light/Glare

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to light and glare that could adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Project construction could generate light spillover affecting off-site uses in the immediately surrounding area. However, construction activities would generally occur during daylight hours; with only limited construction activities taking place after 4:00 P.M., construction during non-daylight hours would be confined to winter months. Any nighttime construction lighting would be used for safety and security and, per Project Design Feature AES-3, light sources associated with Project construction would be shielded and/or aimed so that no direct beam illumination is directed outside the Project Site boundary. Light associated with construction vehicle headlights would be similar to existing lighting sources (i.e., vehicles accessing the existing parking lot on-site) and would not result in increased lighting as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, Project construction would not create a new, permanent source of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

Daytime glare could potentially occur during construction if reflective construction materials or equipment are positioned in highly visible locations exposed to direct sunlight. However, any glare would be highly transitory and short-term, given the movement of construction equipment and materials within the construction area and the temporary nature of construction activities. Furthermore, flat, shiny surfaces that could reflect sunlight or otherwise cause glare are not typically an element of construction activities. Therefore, Project construction would not create new sources of substantial glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Furthermore, in accordance with SB 743, such impacts would not be considered significant.

Operation

Light sensitive uses in the vicinity include the Renaissance Long Beach hotel directly north of the Project Site and condominiums along Seaside Way to the east and west. While on-site lighting would add to the ambient lighting in the

area, it would not result in changes to the overall light environment at any nearby sensitive locations. All proposed lighting would comply with Dark Sky requirements, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and City of Long Beach lighting requirements. Further, Project lighting, including vehicle headlights, would be consistent with the surrounding developed, urban environment, and implementation of Project Design Feature AES-4 as well as the proposed setbacks and landscaping along the site perimeter would further limit the potential for light spillover onto surrounding uses. Overall, operation of the Project would not create new sources of substantial light that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

With respect to glare, the proposed building would be designed with a blend of precast concrete and aluminum framed glass systems. More specifically, over half of the building façade area would consist of precast concrete, metal panels, louvers, or opaque glass. This variety of materials and treated glass would minimize glare from the building. Substantial landscaping would be placed around the periphery of the Project Site, further limiting the potential for glare to affect off-site uses, including drivers on adjacent roadways. In addition, all on-site parking would be concealed within the building's parking levels, and the Project's use of an existing off-site parking area would not result in a substantial increase in glare. Based on the above, Project operation would not create new sources of substantial glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Furthermore, such impacts would not be considered significant pursuant to SB 743.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to light and glare have been identified.

4.1.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project may have a significant impact on agricultural or forestry resources if it were to: (a) convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agriculture uses; (b) conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; (c) conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production; (d) result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use; or (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.

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would not result in impacts to agricultural or forestry resources, including impacts related to designated Farmland, agricultural

zoning or a Williamson Act contract, forest land or timberland zoning, or the conversion of such lands to a non-agricultural or non-forest use.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area and does not include any land used or zoned for agriculture or subject to a Williamson Act contract. In addition, the Project Site and surrounding area are not mapped as Farmland pursuant to the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Additionally, the Project Site and surrounding area do not include any forest land or timberland. Therefore, no impact related to agriculture or forest resources would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no impacts associated with agriculture or forest resources have been identified.

4.1.3 Air Quality

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially a significant impact related to air quality if the project were to create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Additional thresholds of significance related to air quality impacts are addressed below in Sections 4.3.1 and 4.4.1.

4.1.3.1 Odors

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to odors during construction and operation would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. No objectionable odors are anticipated as a result of either construction or operation of the Project. Specifically, Project construction would involve the use of conventional building materials typical of construction projects of similar type and size. Any odors that may be generated during construction would be localized and temporary in nature and would not be sufficient to affect a substantial number of people. With respect to operations, the Project would not involve any of the types of uses typically associated with odor complaints. In addition, on-site trash receptacles would be contained and maintained in a manner that promotes odor control and would not result in substantially adverse odor impacts. Thus, impacts with regard to odors would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to odors have been identified.

4.1.4 Biological Resources

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to biological resources if it would: (a) 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 (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); (b) 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; (c) 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; (d) conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; or (e) conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Additional thresholds of significance related to biological resource impacts are addressed below in Section 4.2.1.

4.1.4.1 Riparian Habitat and Sensitive Natural Communities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project would not result in direct impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as none are located within or adjacent to the Project Site. With respect to indirect impacts, the Project would implement best management practices (BMPs), including erosion controls and planters, to minimize the amount of runoff and pollutants exiting the site that could affect off-site resources. Thus, the Project would not result in significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required since no significant impacts associated with riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities have been identified.

4.1.4.2 Federally Protected Wetlands

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pools, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. There are no federally protected waters or wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, within the Project Site. The nearest waters of the United States/California and wetlands are estuarine and marine deep-water wetlands associated with Rainbow Lagoon, approximately 1,000 feet south of the Project Site.[6] Rainbow Lagoon is separated from the Project Site by the Long Beach Convention Center and has been impacted through previous development associated with construction of the Long Beach Arena.[7] Furthermore, to protect sensitive species that may occur within Rainbow Lagoon, the Project would implement BMPs in accordance with regulatory requirements to minimize the amount of runoff and pollutants discharged into receiving waters. As such, potential impacts to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with federally protected wetlands have been identified.

4.1.4.3 Movement of Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife, Wildlife Corridors, and Wildlife Nursery Sites

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the following would be less than significant: (i) the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species; (ii) established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; and (iii) native wildlife nursery sites.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is fully developed in an urbanized area and does not support biologically significant wildlife movement or contain native wildlife nursery sites. The City of Long Beach is, however, located within the Pacific Flyway, which is identified as a major north-south route for travel by migratory birds in the Americas. Thus, Project development could pose a hazard to migrating bird species as they move through the area. However, there are extensive unobstructed flight paths within the City, including the Los Angeles River Channel, San Gabriel River Channel, Los Cerritos Wetlands, Los Cerritos Channel, and areas of low-scale urban development.

Additionally, the Project has been designed as a "bird-safe" building, with 28 percent of the building's vision glass exterior including bird safe treatments, such

---

[6] *USEPA, NEPAssist, https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx?wherestr=100+East+Ocean+Boulevard+Long+Beach%2C+CA, accessed May 8, 2018.*

[7] *City of Long Beach, Parks, Recreation and Marine, "Rainbow Lagoon," www.longbeach.gov/park/park-and-facilities/directory/rainbow-lagoon/, accessed May 8, 2018.*

as qualified fritting or acid etchings, to minimize the potential for bird strikes. The bulk of these treatments would be on the podium portion of the building because these lower levels are most susceptible to bird confusion through reflections of surrounding ground levels. Additionally, a consistent pattern of treatment of vision glass across the tower façade would increase the effective coverage area of bird-safe treatments. Furthermore, Project development would not funnel migrating birds into existing or proposed structures or constrain the flight paths within the extensive open-air space surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, the Project is not expected to impact the Pacific Flyway or otherwise substantially interfere with the movement or migration of any native or migratory wildlife species. Thus, Project impacts related to wildlife corridors would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts have been identified.

4.1.4.4 Policies Protecting Biological Resources

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The vegetation on-site consists almost entirely of ornamental, non-native shrubs and trees. The removal of any street trees would occur in accordance with the City's Tree Maintenance Policy. The Project also would provide landscaping and open space in accordance with the City's requirements for the Downtown Shoreline Plan area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources have been identified.

4.1.4.5 Adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or Other Approved Habitat Conservation Plan

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area and does not provide habitat for sensitive biological resources. As such, the Project

Site is not subject to an HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any such plans.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with any adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved habitat conservation plan have been identified.

4.1.5 Geology and Soils

Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project may have a significant impact if it were to: (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 active fault; (ii) strong seismic ground shaking; (iii) seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; (iv) landslides; (b) result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; (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; (d) be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property; or (e) 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.

4.1.5.1 Fault Rupture

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to 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 active fault, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located within an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone as identified by the California Geological Survey (CGS) or within the City's General Plan Seismic Safety Element. No active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the Project Site. The nearest active fault is the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, which is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the Project Site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture to occur on the Project Site is considered low. Furthermore, the Project would comply with the recommendations of the geotechnical engineer set forth in the Geotechnical Report and Memo, included in Appendix IS-3 of the Initial Study, as well as the

design-level geotechnical report to be prepared for the Project during the design phase. Impacts related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the rupture of a known fault have been identified.

4.1.5.2 Seismic Ground Shaking

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site could be subjected to moderate to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on one of the many active Southern California faults. As with other development projects in the region, the Project would comply with the current seismic design provisions of the California Building Standards Code to minimize seismic impacts. Additionally, the Project would be required to adhere to the seismic safety requirements contained in the Long Beach Building Code (Title 18), which incorporates by reference the California Building Standards Code. The Project also would be required to comply with the site plan review and permitting requirements of Long Beach Development Services, including the recommendations provided in a final, site-specific geotechnical report subject to review and approval by the Long Beach Bureau of Building and Safety. Through compliance with regulatory requirements and site-specific geotechnical recommendations, the Project would not cause or accelerate geologic hazards related to strong seismic ground shaking, which would result in substantial damage to structures or infrastructure, or expose people to substantial risk of injury. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with seismic ground shaking have been identified.

4.1.5.3 Seismic Ground Failure/Liquefaction

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Liquefaction involves a sudden loss in strength of saturated, cohesionless soils that are subject to ground vibration and results in temporary transformation of the soil to a fluid mass. Based on the Seismic

Hazards Maps of the State of California, the Project Site is located within a potentially liquefiable area.[8] In addition, the Project Site is located in an area with a significant liquefaction potential as mapped by the City.[9] Accordingly, the Geotechnical Report evaluated the potential for liquefaction to occur on-site.

The subsequent liquefaction analysis, which was based on a predominant earthquake magnitude of 6.86 and a peak ground acceleration of 0.628 g, indicates that the soils below the planned foundation levels are sufficiently dense and stiff to preclude liquefaction. In addition, the Project's design and construction would comply with California Building Code Title 24, Chapter 18 to minimize risks associated with liquefaction potential. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects associated with liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, have been identified.

4.1.5.4 Landslides

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to landslides would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Although the Project Site slopes from Ocean Boulevard down to Seaside Way, the area is characterized by a relatively flat topography. As such, the Project Site is not identified by the City within an area of steep slopes.[10] Additionally, the Project Site and surrounding area are not designated as an earthquake-induced landslide area by the CGS.[11] Furthermore, the Project would not require substantial alteration to the existing topography. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with landslides have been identified.

---

[8] *California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Long Beach Quadrangle, 2016.*

[9] *City of Long Beach General Plan, Seismic Safety Element, Plate 7, October 1988.*

[10] *City of Long Beach General Plan, Seismic Safety Element, Plate 9, October 1988.*

[11] *California Geological Survey, Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation Long Beach Quadrangle, 2016.*

4.1.5.5 Soil Erosion

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Development of the Project would require grading, limited excavation to support building foundations, and other construction activities that have the potential to disturb existing soils and expose soils to rainfall and wind, thereby potentially resulting in soil erosion. However, construction activities would occur in accordance with erosion control requirements, including grading and dust control measures, imposed by the City pursuant to grading permit requirements. Specifically, Project construction would comply with the Long Beach Building Standards Code (LBMC Title 18), which requires necessary permits, plans, plan checks, and inspections to ensure that the Project would reduce erosion effects. In addition, the Project would be required to have a stormwater management program, including a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) pursuant to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements. As part of the SWPPP, BMPs would be implemented during construction to reduce sedimentation and erosion levels to the maximum extent possible. Based on compliance with regulatory requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil have been identified.

4.1.5.6 Unstable Soils or Geologic Units

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to 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, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above, the Project would not be subject to seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides. While the Project Site's ground surface level slopes gently to the south, the potential for lateral spreading is not present on-site. Additionally, the Project Site is not located in an aquifer recharge area, and there are no groundwater wells or pumping activities on-site. As such, the potential for subsidence is low. Impacts with regard to unstable soils or geologic units would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with unstable soils or geologic units have been identified.

4.1.5.7 Expansive Soils

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to expansive soils that may create substantial risks to life or property would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Expansive soils are typically associated with fine-grained clayey soils that have the potential to shrink and swell with repeated cycles of wetting and drying. The on-site fill soils generally consist of medium dense to very dense silty sand and hard sandy silt, as well as various amounts of asphalt and brick fragments. Native soils encountered beneath the fill consist of medium dense to very dense sand, sand with silt, and silty sand with intermittent layers of very stiff to hard silt and sandy silt. As none of the soils encountered exhibited the potential for expansion, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with expansive soils have been identified.

4.1.5.8 Soils Supporting Septic Tanks and Wastewater Disposal Systems

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Wastewater generated by the Project would be accommodated via connections to the existing sewage infrastructure located in the Project area. As such, the Project would not require the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts related to the ability of soils to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the use of a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal systems have been identified.

4.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project may have a significant impact if it were to: (a) create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; (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; (c) emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste

within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; (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; (e) for a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 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; (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; (g) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; or (h) impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

4.1.6.1 Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's construction and operational impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding.* The types and amounts of hazardous materials used in connection with Project construction activities would be typical of those used during construction of commercial developments, including vehicle fuels, paints, oils, and transmission fluids. Similarly, the types and amounts of hazardous materials used during operation of the proposed hotel, amenities, and restaurant uses would be typical of such developments and would include cleaning solvents, pesticides for landscaping, painting supplies, and petroleum products. all potentially hazardous materials used during construction and operation of the Project would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in accordance with all applicable standards and regulations, including but not limited to, those set forth by the federal and State Occupational Safety and Health Acts. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials have been identified.

4.1.6.2 Upset and Accident Conditions From a Hazardous Materials Release

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. No hazards or hazardous materials were observed on-site during the site reconnaissance conducted as part of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, and no evidence of underground storage tanks (USTs) or aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) were observed. According to the California Department of Conservation Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), the Project Site is located in the Wilmington Oil and Gas Field; however, no oil wells are located on, adjacent to, or within 0.25 mile of the Project Site, and no impacts are anticipated from oil and gas wells. The Phase I did not identify any areas of environmental concern with respect to the Project Site and recommended no further actions or investigations. With compliance with regulatory requirements, the Project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment have been identified.

4.1.6.3 Hazardous Emissions or Hazardous Materials Handling Near a School

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The nearest school to the Project Site is Cesar Chavez Elementary School, located approximately 0.5 mile to the northwest. Therefore, the Project Site would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the emission or handling of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school have been identified.

4.1.6.4 Location on a Designated Hazardous Materials Site

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to a location included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is identified in three listings:

(1) The Edgewater on Ocean Condominium Project located at 100 Ocean Boulevard is listed on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) FINDS list related to an application for a dewatering permit. However, the project never started, and the permit was terminated on January 6, 2009. Therefore, this listing does not constitute a hazard on the Project Site.

(2) The Project Site is also listed as a historic gas station from 1952, as Standard Oil Company occupied multiple offices in the Jergins Trust Building from roughly 1945 to 1958. There is no indication that Standard Oil ever operated a service station on the Project Site.

(3) A historic cleaner, Mehesey Fur Company, is listed at 115 East Seaside Way from 1920. However, by 1949, 115 Seaside Way was listed as a store within the Jergins Trust Building. It is therefore unclear if Mehesey Fur Company ever operated on the Project Site or if it actually conducted cleaning as part of its services. The potential for contamination from this operation is minimal, based upon the suspected use of Stoddard in dry cleaning operations and not a chlorinated solvent like PCE.

Adjacent sites are also listed in various databases, including historic dry cleaners and UST sites. The majority of these sites are not listed due to a release, and none of those that indicate a release are located upgradient of the Project Site. In addition, the dry cleaners that may have used chlorinated solvents are located at sufficient distances rendering it unlikely that the Project Stie was impacted. Only one site, Landmark Square/Island Freeman, located at 125 West Ocean Boulevard, approximately 300 feet northwest of the Project Site, was identified as a potential concern. That site is listed as a leaking UST (LUST) case with affected soil and was closed on March 7, 2011. Based on its case status and location cross-gradient from the Project Site, that site is not anticipated to pose a threat to the Project Site. No other sites that have the potential to negatively impact the Project Site were identified within 0.25 mile.

Based on the above, the Project would not 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, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a site location included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, have been identified.

4.1.6.5 Safety Hazard Within Airport Land Use Plan or Near a Public/Public Use Airport

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to a potential safety hazard for people residing or working within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or public use airport. The nearest airport is the Long Beach Airport, which is located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts would .

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a potential safety hazard within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or public use airport have been identified.

4.1.6.6 Safety Hazard Near Private Airstrip

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to a potential safety hazard for people residing or working within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the creation of safety hazards in the vicinity of a private airstrip have been identified.

4.1.6.7 Emergency Response and Evacuation Plans

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and such impacts would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. During Project construction, the majority of construction activities would be confined to the Project Site itself; however, limited off-site infrastructure improvements may require some construction activities in adjacent street rights-of-way. As such, some partial lane closures adjacent to the Project Site, including on Ocean Boulevard, Pine Avenue, and Seaside Way, may occur. However, these closures would be temporary in nature, and both directions of travel on area roadways would be maintained so as not to physically impair access to and around the Project Site. Additionally,

the Project would not place any permanent physical barriers on any of the surrounding streets, and access along and through streets and highways in the area would be maintained. Therefore, the Project would not cause an impediment along surrounding streets, which may be used as evacuation routes in the event of an emergency, or otherwise impair implementation of an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan have been identified.

4.1.6.8 Wildland Fires

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is surrounded by urban development and is not adjacent to any wildlands. Therefore, the Project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to wildland fires have been identified.

4.1.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have a potentially significant impact related to hydrology and water quality if it would: (a) violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; (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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted); (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; (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; (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; (f)

otherwise substantially degrade water quality; (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; (h) place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impeded or redirect flood flows; (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; or (j) lead to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

Project Design Features

As previously described, the Project would incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability. "Green" principles have been incorporated in the Project to comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-09-0013), and the Project has been designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED Silver® certification. Specific water quality features include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Use of on-site storm water treatment and re-use system consisting of a below grade cistern and re-use pump located near the northwest corner of the Project Site. The system will be capable of accommodating up to 3,102 cubic feet of stormwater and a flow rate of up to 0.28 cfs.

- Installation of catch basin inserts and screens to provide runoff contaminant removal.

- Preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution and Prevention Plan, City of Long Beach Low Impact Development Plan, and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan, all of which would include Best Management Practices to control stormwater runoff, minimize pollutant loading and erosion effects during and after construction.

4.1.7.1 Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Construction activities could contribute to pollutant loading in stormwater runoff, particularly sediment or soil particles. However, as the construction site would be greater than 1 acre in size, Project construction activities would be regulated by the NPDES Construction General Permit ((Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ

and subsequent amendments 2010-0014-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ). In accordance with the permit requirements, the Project Applicant would prepare and implement a SWPPP that would specify BMPs to target pollutants of concern and reduce or eliminate pollutants in stormwater discharges. Through compliance with NPDES requirements and local regulations, including the implementation of BMPs, Project construction would not result in discharges that would violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Operation

Operation of the Project would introduce sources of potential stormwater pollution that are typical of commercial uses (e.g., cleaning solvents, pesticides for landscaping, and petroleum products associated with circulation areas). Stormwater runoff from precipitation events could potentially carry urban pollutants into municipal storm drains. However, the Project would implement BMPs for managing stormwater runoff in accordance with the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development (LID) BMP Design Manual. Due to its size, the Project would also implement BMPs required by the Los Angeles County Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) Manual. A detention system would be constructed that would capture 3,102 cubic feet of runoff volume, thereby exceeding the Project-related increase in stormwater flows of 2,936 cubic feet (based on a 10-year storm) and meeting SUSMP requirements. Furthermore, the detention system would provide stormwater treatment such that the water could be used for on-site irrigation. Therefore, impacts related to water quality standards and waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures would be required, as no significant impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements have been identified.

4.1.7.2 Groundwater Supplies and Recharge

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge, such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Groundwater was encountered at depths of 7.0 and 12.5 feet below ground surface (bgs) in borings completed as part of the Project's Geotechnical Report.

As the Project would include excavations to a maximum depth of approximately 22 feet below Seaside Way for building footings and foundations, temporary dewatering would likely be required. Any temporary dewatering system(s) would extract, treat, and discharge groundwater to the public storm drain system per the NPDES General Permit and would not adversely impact the flow rate or direction of groundwater. Furthermore, the Project Site is not located within an aquifer recharge area, and there are no groundwater wells or pumping activities within the Project Site. Therefore, Project construction would not change potable water levels sufficiently to reduce the ability of a water utility to use the groundwater basin for public water supplies, reduce yields in adjacent wells, deplete groundwater supplies, result in a demonstrable and sustained reduction of groundwater recharge capacity, or interfere with groundwater recharge. As such, impacts during Project construction would be less than significant.

Operation

The Project Site is comprised of 75 percent impervious surfaces under existing conditions, which would increase to 93 percent under the Project. However, as noted above, the Project Site is not located in an aquifer recharge area, and there are no groundwater wells or pumping activities within the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not affect production levels of groundwater supply wells or groundwater recharge in the vicinity. Given the depth to groundwater, the Project's foundations would be designed in a manner to support the proposed structure in saturated soil conditions. This foundation design would result in only minor impacts to the top of the groundwater table and would not affect any supply wells. Therefore, operation of the Project would result in less than significant impacts to groundwater hydrology.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the depletion of groundwater supplies or substantial interference with groundwater recharge have been identified.

4.1.7.3 Drainage Patterns and Erosion or Siltation

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to alteration of the existing drainage patterns of the site or area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

The Project Site is not crossed by any natural waterways, and stormwater flows over land (i.e., as sheet flow) to the surrounding streets. Construction activities associated with the Project have the potential to temporarily alter existing drainage patterns and flows on the Project Site by exposing the underlying soils, modifying flow direction, and making the Project Site temporarily more permeable. However, the Project includes the implementation of a SWPPP that would specify BMPs and erosion control measures to be used during construction to manage runoff flows so that runoff would not impact off site drainage facilities and receiving waters. In addition, the Project would comply with all applicable City grading permit regulations that require necessary measures, plans, and inspections to reduce sedimentation and erosion and ensure impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Impervious surfaces on the Project Site would increase to 93 percent with implementation of the Project. The on-site drainage patterns would be modified through the introduction of drainage infrastructure, although these improvements would reduce the potential for erosion or siltation. More specifically, stormwater would be conveyed via roof drains and drive aisle trench drains to the proposed capture and reuse system, which would ultimately connect to the existing 27-inch public storm in Pine Avenue. The stormwater detention system would be designed to provide 3,102 cubic feet of underground storage, in excess of the Project-related increase in stormwater flows. The Project would also implement BMPs required by the SUSMP Manual and the City. Based on the design of the Project's drainage improvements and through compliance with all applicable NPDES requirements, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the Project Site or surrounding area such that substantial erosion, siltation, or on- or off-site flooding would occur. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site have been identified.

4.1.7.4 Drainage Patterns and Flooding

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to alteration of the existing drainage patterns of the site or area in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above, while changes in on-site drainage patterns would occur, the proposed capture and reuse system would represent an improvement over existing conditions. The detention system would capture 3,102 cubic feet of runoff volume, thereby exceeding the Project-related increase in stormwater flows of 2,936 cubic feet (based on a 10-year storm) and meeting SUSMP requirements. Accordingly, the Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the substantial alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site have been identified.

4.1.7.5 Stormwater Drainage Capacity and Polluted Runoff

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the creation or contribution of runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above, the proposed capture and reuse system would represent an improvement over existing conditions both in terms of flow management and stormwater treatment. The detention system would capture 3,102 cubic feet of runoff volume, in excess of the Project-related increase in stormwater flows (based on a 10-year storm) and meeting SUSMP requirements, and would provide stormwater treatment such that the water could be used for on-site irrigation. Accordingly, the Project would not 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with runoff water have been identified.

4.1.7.6 Other Water Quality Degradation

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to any other degradation of water quality would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As previously discussed, both Project construction and operational activities would incorporate BMPs to manage stormwater runoff and associated water quality through implementation of a SWPPP and SUSMP, in accordance with NPDES and City requirements, including LID requirements. The proposed stormwater detention system would provide treatment such that the water could be used for on-site irrigation. As such, impacts on water quality during operation would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with any substantial degradation of water quality have been identified.

4.1.7.7 Housing within 100-Year Flood Hazard Area

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts related to placing 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.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located within a 100-year floodplain as mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The Project Site is located in FEMA's Flood Zone X, which is defined as an area of moderate flood hazard or within the limits of one percent and 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. Similarly, according to the City of Long Beach Flood Zones Map, the Project Site is located within a 0.2 percent annual chance flood hazard zone. Furthermore, the Project does not propose the development of residential uses. Therefore, the Project would not place development within a 100-year floodplain, and no impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to placing housing within a 100-year flood hazard area have been identified.

4.1.7.8 Structures within 100-Year Flood Hazard Area

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would lead to no impacts relating to placing structures within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above, the Project Site is not located within a designated 100-year floodplain area. Thus, the Project would not place structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year floodplain. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to placing structures within a 100-year floodplain have been identified.

4.1.7.9 Flooding/Dam or Levee Failure

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to exposing 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, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Based on the City's General Plan Public Safety Element, three flood control dams lie upstream of the City, including the Sepulveda Basin, Hansen Basin, and Whittier Narrows Basin. As provided in Public Safety Element, due to the intervening low and flat topography and the distance of the Sepulveda Basin and the Hansen Basin more than 30 miles upstream from where the Los Angeles River passes through the City, any flooding resulting from a dam failure at either of these locations would be expected to dissipate prior to reaching the City. In addition, any flooding from the Whittier Narrows Basin would occur along the San Gabriel River, which is located 5.4 miles east of the Project Site. Furthermore, dams in California are continually monitored by various governmental agencies (such as the State of California Division of Safety of Dams and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) to guard against the threat of dam failure. Current design and construction practices and ongoing programs of review, modification, or total reconstruction of existing dams are intended to ensure that all dams are capable of withstanding the maximum considered earthquake for the site. Given the distance of the nearest dams to the Project Site and regulatory oversight and inspections, the potential for substantial adverse impacts related to inundation at the Project Site as a result of dam failure would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with exposing 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, have been identified.

4.1.7.10 Seiche, Tsunami, or Mudflow

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located in the low-lying shoreline area of Downtown Long Beach, approximately 0.3 mile north of Queensway Bay and approximately 1,000 feet north of Rainbow Lagoon. As such, the Project Site is located within an area potentially affected by a tsunami or seiche as mapped in the City's General Plan Seismic Safety Element. However, tsunami warning systems are in place, such as the seismic Sea-Wave Warning System for the Pacific Ocean operated by a cooperative program of nations around the Pacific Rim, and the Alaska Tsunami Warning Center operated by the National Weather Service, and evacuation plans are in place to minimize hazards from tsunamis. In addition, the presence of the harbor breakwater and intervening urban development would limit potential effects from a seiche or tsunami on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts related to a potential seiche or tsunami would be less than significant.

   With respect to mudflows, although the Project Site slopes southward from Ocean Boulevard to Seaside Way, the area is not identified by the City as an area of steep slopes. The Project Site is not positioned downslope from an area of potential mudflow, and impacts with respect to mudflows would not occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow have been identified.

4.1.8 Land Use and Planning

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have a potentially significant impact related to land use if it would: (a) physically divide an established community; (b) 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; or (c) conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

4.1.8.1 Division of an Established Community

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the physical division of an established community would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As previously discussed, the Project Site is located in Downtown Long Beach and is surrounding by urban land uses, including the Long Beach Convention and Entertainment Center and various commercial, office, hotel, retail, restaurant, and residential uses, associated parking, and the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach station. The Project's hotel uses and related restaurant space and amenities would be consistent with other uses in the surrounding area and would be compatible in terms of building heights and massing with surrounding development. In addition, the Project would provide greater connectivity in the community by completing the walkway connecting the corner of Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard to the existing Convention Center Walkway east of the Project Site. Furthermore, Project development would not physically alter surrounding parcels or properties. Therefore, the Project would not physically divide, disrupt, or isolate an established community. Rather, implementation of the Project would result in further infill of an already developed community with similar and compatible land uses. No significant impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the physical division of an established community have been identified.

4.1.8.2 Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, or Regulations

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed at length in the Initial Study and summarized below, the Project would not conflict with the City of Long Beach General Plan, Local Coastal Program, Long Beach Strategic Plan, Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC), or the City's former Downtown Redevelopment Plan.

City of Long Beach General Plan

The Project Site is designated as LUD No. 7, Mixed Use District, and LUD No. 11, Open Space and Park District, by the City's General Plan. Uses intended for LUD No. 7 include employment centers, such as retail uses, offices, and medical facilities; higher density residences; visitor-serving facilities; personal and professional services; and recreational facilities. LUD No. 11 includes open space and park areas which are intended to remain in or be redeveloped in the future in (essentially) an open condition. The Project would develop hotel and restaurant uses on the southern portion of the Project Site which is designated

LUD No. 7 and would provide improvements to the portion of Victory Park located on the northern portion of the Project Site, which is designated LUD No. 11. These proposed uses are permitted by their respective LUD designations, and the Project would not require a General Plan amendment. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the General Plan land use designations for the site.

In general, the Project also would be consistent with relevant General Plan goals and policies, including those set forth in the Land Use, Mobility, Conservation, Noise, Open Space, Public Safety, Air Quality, Seismic Safety, and Scenic Routes Elements. Relevant goals found within the Land Use Element and promoted by the Project include: managed growth, economic development, Downtown revitalization, quality services, facilities maintenance, arts and culture support, and financial stability.[12] The Project represents managed growth, as contemplated in the PD-6 zoning document, previous Redevelopment Agency-era planning, as well as the Successor Agency Long Range Management Plan. The Project includes hotel uses that would promote tourism and create employment, consistent with the City's overall economic development plan; would develop a currently vacant and underutilized site into active uses, consistent with greater Downtown revitalization efforts; would provide improved services and facilities, maintenance through upgrades, and active management of Victory Park; and would support arts and culture within the design and programming of the restored Jergins Tunnel element of the Project. Furthermore, the Project would involve redevelopment of an underutilized site with high-quality hotel and restaurant uses that would serve the needs of the City's population and the tourism industry while enhancing the overall quality of life. The Project would improve the aesthetic quality of the Project Site and immediate surroundings by providing a design that would complement existing development and include pedestrian amenities and landscaped park space. In addition, the Project Site is well-served by public transit and is accessible via alternative transportation modes, thus supporting a functional transportation system. The Project also would include the necessary infrastructure improvements to serve the proposed uses and would install water-efficient plumbing fixtures and landscaping. As such, the Project would further the City's goals and policies regarding its utility infrastructure systems. Overall, the Project would support the City's land use guidelines. The Project also would support goals to increase mobility, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, enhance quality of life, improve water quality, create compact and transit-oriented development, and

[12] *City of Long Beach Land Use Element, 1989, pp. 18-19.*

create walkable neighborhoods and districts.[13] While no open space is required for the proposed uses, the Project would provide 37,404 square feet of open space, including improvements to Victory Park totaling 13,158 square feet, new landscaping, and a variety of amenities for hotel guests and visitors including an 11,288-square-foot pool deck and bar. The Project would also incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability, including measures aimed at transportation, energy and water conservation, construction, and indoor air quality. As also discussed below, the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions, including the goals of California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] 32) and South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which aims to minimize particular emissions and control dust during construction. Furthermore, the Project would comply with all applicable regulations and standards related to aesthetics, views, and visual resources. Thus, the Project would be consistent with relevant goals and policies of the Long Beach General Plan.

Long Beach Local Coastal Program

The Project Site is located within the Long Beach Coastal Zone and subject to the requirements of the Local Coastal Program of the City's General Plan. Accordingly, the Project would require a Local Coastal Development Permit.[14] As discussed above, the Project would be consistent with the land use and zoning guidelines set forth by the City and would support the City's goal to prevent the disruption of existing neighborhoods. Additionally, the Project would be consistent with the Local Coastal Program's transportation and access policies, which focus on increasing the use of public transit, walking, and bicycling opportunities, given the Project's location in an area well served by public transit, the proposed construction of a new walkway connecting Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard with the existing Convention Center Walkway, and the provision of bicycle parking on-site.[15] In addition to forwarding Local Coastal Program policies, the provision of recreational and visitor-serving amenities both in the hotel and Victory Park would promote Coastal Act policies including those set forth in Sections 30213, 30222, 30250, 30252, and 30253, among other

[13] *City of Long Beach Mobility Element, 2013, p. 13.*

[14] *Pursuant to LBMC Section 21.25.902, "The coastal zone boundaries are indicated on the official zoning map." The City's Coastal Zone Map shows that the Project Site falls within the Coastal Appealable Area of the City's permit jurisdiction, which gives the Planning Commission (or City Council, upon appeal) the authority to issue coastal development permit approval. Local approval of a coastal development permit may be appealed to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to LBMC Section 21.25.908.*

[15] *City of Long Beach Local Coastal Program, 1980, p. II-2.*

Coastal Act provisions. Therefore, with approval of a Local Coastal Development Permit, the Project would be consistent with the Local Coastal Program.

Long Beach Municipal Code

The Project Site is zoned by the LBMC as Subarea 7 of PD-6, the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District. The Project would further the six goals of PD-6, including: a mixture of public and private uses of a variety of land use types; significant public access through and around uses, whether public or private, and to coastal resources; an emphasis on uses of a recreational or recreational access nature; strong land use interaction and access connections with Downtown; an urban park-like setting with a variety of strolling, bicycling, and active and passive recreational areas, interesting water features, and abundant landscaping; and the highest quality of development.[16] More specifically, the Project would enhance public access through new vehicular, pedestrian, bicycle, and other transportation modes and amenities, focusing on access to the recreational amenities of Victory Park while connecting the greater Downtown area to the Convention Center and shoreline beyond. The Project also involves the infill of an underutilized site, physically creating greater interaction with Downtown, while also enhancing the cultural and historic connection to Downtown through the restoration of and new public access to the Jergins Tunnel. Further, the Project's high-quality design would improve and complement the site's urban park-like setting.

The Downtown Shoreline Plan specifically identifies residential, hotel, and office uses within Subarea 7 and includes specific requirements pertaining to ancillary uses, as well as access, building design, and setbacks. In addition, as the former site of the Jergins Trust Building, Subarea 7's requirement to provide a corner cut-off at the northeast corner of the site to create a cohesive entry feature to the Promenade South from Pine Avenue applies to the Project. The Project would provide new hotel and restaurant uses, which is consistent with the uses intended for Subarea 7, and consistent with Subarea 7 Subsection (a), the proposed restaurants would be located on the promenade (Level 3) and rooftop levels of the proposed building. In addition, at the northeastern corner of the building, the lower floors would have an indented, angled footprint to create a corner cut-off in accordance with the Subarea 7 requirements. In accordance with Subarea 7 Requirement (b)1, the driveways on Ocean Boulevard would be used for passenger loading and unloading only, with access to the on-site

[16] *City of Long Beach Ordinance 11-0017, p.3.*

parking garage provided from Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. The Project would also include the completion of the walkway connecting the corner of Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard to the existing Convention Center Walkway east of the Project Site, consistent with Subarea 7 Subsection (c). Building design would further comply with the requirements of Subarea 7 Subsection (c), which pertain to height, design features, and site coverage. Open space areas would be landscaped in accordance with the requirements of PD-6. The Project is, therefore, consistent with the existing zoning for the Project Site and related LBMC requirements.

Long Beach Strategic Plan

The Project would support applicable goals of the Long Beach Strategic Plan regarding neighborhood community, economic opportunity, and the environment.[17] Specifically, the Project's commercial uses would complement the existing land uses in the area and serve the needs of the local tourism industry. In addition, the Project would incorporate energy conservation, water conservation, and waste reduction features to promote the City's Green Building Ordinance and meet the requirements of LEED® Silver certification. Furthermore, the Project would provide landscaped and open space areas within and around the Project Site to beautify the area and enhance open space. Accordingly, the Project would promote the Strategic Plan's goals.

Redevelopment Plans

The Project Site was formerly owned by the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency. Prior to the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency, the Project Site was identified for future development within the Downtown Long Beach Project Area.[18] The Project Site is identified in the approved Successor Agency Long Range Management Plan for "high-density development to maximize overall economic benefit to downtown and in accordance with the use of eminent domain."[19] The Project would be consistent with this goal by providing new hotel and restaurant uses, which would provide jobs and complement existing uses in the area such as the Convention Center.

---

[17] *City of Long Beach, 2010 Strategic Plan Goals and Strategic Actions, www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/finance/media-library/documents/city-budget-and-finances/budget/budget-documents/fy-06-adopted-budget-webpage/appendices, accessed November 30, 2018.*

[18] *Long Beach Redevelopment Agency, "Downtown Long Beach," www.longbeachrda.org/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=2456, accessed November 26, 2018.*

[19] *City of Long Beach, Revised Long Range Property Management Plan, www.lbds.info/documents/LongRangePropMgtPlan/LRPMP.pdf, p.42, property 113, accessed November 26, 2018.*

Based on the above, the Project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation, and impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation have been identified.

4.1.8.3 Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project will have no impact related to a potential conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located in an urbanized area and does not provide habitat for sensitive biological resources. As such, the Project Site is not subject to a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the Project would not result in impacts associated with or conflict with the provisions of any such plans.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to potentially conflicting with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan have been identified.

4.1.9 Mineral Resources

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts on mineral resources if it would: (a) result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state; or (b) result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resources recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

4.1.9.1 Mineral Resources of Regional or State Value

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is of value to the region and the residents of the state would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located within an urbanized area and has been previously disturbed by development. Although the Project Site is mapped within the Wilmington Oil Field, there are no production or exploratory

wells on or in the immediate vicinity of the site.[20] Based on the lack of historic and/or active mineral extraction activities, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource or a mineral resource recovery site. No significant impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is of value to the region and the residents of the state have been identified.

4.1.9.2 Locally Important Mineral Resources

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to 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 would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As noted above, the Project Site is mapped within the Wilmington Oil Field, but there are no active oil wells on-site and no evidence of historic wells.[21] In addition, the Project Site is not classified by the City as an area containing significant mineral deposits, nor is the Project Site located in an aggregate producing area as classified by the California Geological Survey.[22] Therefore, the Project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with locally important mineral resources have been identified.

4.1.10 Noise

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have significant impacts related to noise if it would result in the following: (a) for a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels; or (b) for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, exposure of people residing

---

[20] *SCS Engineers, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, June 2018. See Appendix IS-6 of this Initial Study.*

[21] *SCS Engineers, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, June 2018. See Appendix IS-6 of this Initial Study.*

[22] *State of California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey, Aggregate Sustainability in California, 2012.*

or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. Additional thresholds of significance related to noise impacts are addressed below in Sections 4.3.4 and 4.4.3.

4.1.10.1 Noise Exposure Within an Airport Land Use Plan or Near an Airport

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would have no impacts related to the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to a location within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 mile of an airport. The closest airport to the Project Site is the Long Beach Airport located approximately 3.8 miles north of the Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with an airport. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to exposing residents or workers in the project area to excessive noise due to being located in an airport land use plan or within 2 mile of a public airport have been identified.

4.1.10.2 Noise Exposure Near a Private Airstrip

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would have no impacts related to the exposure of people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels due to a location within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with such operations. No impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to exposing people living or working in the project area to excessive noise from a private airstrip have been identified.

4.1.11 Population and Housing

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts related to population and housing if it would: (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); (b) displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing; or (c)

displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4.1.11.1 Population Growth

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the induction of population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project does not involve the development of residential uses and thus would not directly contribute to population growth. While Project construction would create temporary construction-related jobs, the work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized such that construction workers remain at a job site only for the time in which their specific skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process. Thus, Project-related construction workers would not be anticipated to relocate their household's place of residence as a consequence of working on the Project and, therefore, new permanent residents generally would not be generated during Project construction.

   With respect to Project operation, the proposed hotel and restaurant uses would include a range of full-time and part-time positions that would typically be filled by persons already residing in the vicinity of the workplace and who generally would not relocate their households for such employment opportunities, thus benefiting the local economy and workforce. As such, the Project would be unlikely to create new households in the area or generate an indirect demand for additional housing. Therefore, potential growth impacts would not be substantial. As such, the Project would not result in a notable increase in demand for new housing, and any new demand, should it occur, would be minor in the context of forecasted growth for the City. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the induction of population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, have been identified.

4.1.11.2 Displacement of Existing Housing

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would have no impacts related to displacing existing housing that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is currently developed with a surface parking lot and a portion of Victory Park and does not include any

existing dwelling units. Therefore, the Project would not displace any existing housing. No impact would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to the displacement of existing housing have been identified.

4.1.11.3 Displacement of People

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would have no impacts related to displacing substantial numbers of people that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is currently developed with a surface parking lot and a portion of Victory Park and does not include any existing dwelling units. Therefore, development of the Project would not cause the displacement of any persons or require the construction of housing elsewhere. No impacts would .

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts replaced to the displacement of people have been identified.

4.1.12 Public Services

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts related to public services if it would result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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 related to: (a) fire protection; (b) police protection; (c) schools; (d) parks; or (e) other public facilities.

Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features POL-1 and POL-2 are proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to ensure the Project does not lead to significant impacts with respect to public services:

Project Design Feature POL-1: During construction, the Project Applicant shall implement temporary security measures including perimeter security fencing, lighting, and locked entry.

Project Design Feature POL-2: The Project shall incorporate permanent security features, including a private on-site security patrol, security cameras,

and appropriate night lighting in parking, circulation, and common areas.

4.1.12.1 Fire Protection

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to fire protection would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The nearest fire station to the Project Site is Fire Station No. 1, located at 100 Magnolia Avenue, approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the Project Site. While the Project would introduce a new service population to the Project Site, the Project does not include uses that pose a significant fire hazard. In addition, Project traffic would result in less than significant impacts at all study intersections, so Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) access and response times would not be significantly impacted by the addition of Project traffic. Nevertheless, the increase in development on the Project Site could increase the demand for fire protection services in the area. LBMC Chapter 18.23, Fire Facilities Impact Fee, was adopted to ensure development projects pay their fair share of the costs required to support needed fire facilities and related costs necessary to accommodate such development. With compliance with existing California Fire Code, California Building Code, LBMC, and LBFD requirements, including payment of the fire facilities impact fee, impacts with respect to fire protection services would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with fire protection would have been identified.

4.1.12.2 Police Protection

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to police protection would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located in the Long Beach Police Department's (LBPD) South Patrol Division, which is headquartered at 400 West Broadway, approximately 0.5 mile northwest of the Project Site. The officer-to-resident ratio in the South Patrol Division is 1.4 officers per 1,000 residents, while the citywide officer-to-resident ratio is 1.58 officers per 1,000 residents, both of which meet the service standards set forth by LBPD. As the Project does not include the development of residential units, the residential population in the South Patrol Division service area would not increase. Nevertheless, the Project would result in an increase in development and would introduce an employee and visitor population in the area, which would increase the demand for police protection services provided by the LBPD. However, as discussed above, the

Project is not anticipated to result in notable indirect residential population growth, thus the officer-to-resident ratios for the South Patrol Division and City would not be expected to change. Additionally, in accordance with LBMC Chapter 18.22, the Project Applicant would pay the appropriate police facilities impact fee. The Project would also include Project Design Features POL-1 and POL-2, listed above, to further minimize impacts on police protection services.

Based on the above, the Project would not generate an additional demand for police protection services that would substantially exceed the capability of the LBPD to serve the Project Site. Impacts to police protection services would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with police protection have been identified.

4.1.12.3 Schools

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to schools would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project does not include the development of residential land uses, which directly generate school-aged children and a demand for school services. Thus, implementation of the Project would not result in a direct increase in the number of students within the service area of the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD). In addition, the number of new students that could be indirectly generated by the Project and that could attend LBUSD schools is not anticipated to be substantial since, as discussed above, the Project is not expected to induce a substantial number of persons to change their residence as a result of employment at the Project Site. Furthermore, pursuant to SB 50, the Applicant would be required to pay development fees to the LBUSD prior to the issuance of building permits. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65995, the payment of these fees is considered mitigation of any Project-related school impacts. Therefore, impacts on schools would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with schools have been identified.

4.1.12.4 Parks

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to parks would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project does not include the development of residential land uses, which typically create the greatest demand for parks and recreational facilities. The Project includes 37,404 square feet of open space, including improvements to Victory Park, new landscaping, and a variety of amenities for hotel guests and visitors, including an 11,288-square-foot pool deck and bar. While it is possible that some new employees associated with the Project may utilize local parks and recreational facilities, this increased demand likely would be negligible. Additionally, the new employment opportunities generated by the Project are not anticipated to result a substantial number of persons relocating to the Project vicinity. Therefore, new demand for public parks and recreational facilities associated with Project development would be limited. In addition, the proposed renovations to Victory Park, which would include new landscaping and completion of a pedestrian walkway connecting the corner of Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard to the existing Convention Center Walkway east of the Project Site, would improve the facility and would further the Local Coastal Program's goal of re-establishing Victory Park as a unified park throughout Downtown. Thus, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with parks have been identified.

4.1.12.5 Other Public Facilities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to other public facilities would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. With respect to library services, no new residents would be generated on-site; thus, the Project would not result in a direct increase in the service population of the Main Library, located approximately 500 feet northwest of the Project Site. In addition, as Project employees would be more likely to use library facilities near their homes during non-work hours and given that the Project is not anticipated to result in a substantial number of persons relocating to the Project vicinity, Project employees would generate minimal demand for library services. As such, demand for library services generated by the Project would be negligible. Therefore, impacts on library facilities would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with other public facilities have been identified.

4.1.13 Recreation

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts related to recreation if it would: (a) 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; or (b) include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

4.1.13.1 Recreational Facility Deterioration

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to an increase in 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, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. New residential land uses, which typically create the greatest demand for parks and recreational services, are not proposed. Thus, the Project would generate residents to utilize nearby neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. The Project would nevertheless include 37,404 square feet of open space, including improvements to Victory Park, new landscaping, and a variety of amenities for hotel guests and visitors, including an 11,288-square-foot pool deck and bar. In addition, while it is possible that some of the Project's employees may utilize local parks and recreational facilities, this increased demand would be negligible as people are most likely to utilize facilities close to their place of residence. Furthermore, the new employment opportunities generated by the Project are not expected to result in a substantial number of persons relocating their residence. Therefore, new demand for public parks and recreational facilities associated with Project development would be limited. As such, the Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that a substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. Thus, impacts on parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with recreational facility deterioration have been identified.

4.1.13.2 Adverse Effects Due to Recreational Facilities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the inclusion, construction, or expansion of recreational facilities would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project includes improvements to a portion of Victory Park, including new walkways and new landscaping. As the portion of the park where these changes would occur is within the boundaries of the Project Site, impacts associated with such improvements are included in the Project impacts evaluated throughout the Initial Study and EIR. As discussed therein, all impacts related to the proposed recreational facilities would be less than significant, either with or without mitigation.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the inclusion, construction, or expansion of recreational facilities have been identified.

4.1.14 Transportation/Traffic

As evaluated in the Initial Study and based on then-current CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts related to transportation or traffic if it would: (a) 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; (b) substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); or (c) result in inadequate emergency access. Additional thresholds of significance related to transportation/traffic impacts are addressed below in Sections 4.3.3 and 4.4.4.

4.1.14.1 Air Traffic Patterns

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As previously described, the Project Site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private airport or within the planning boundary of any airport land use plan. In addition, the approximately 375.5-foot-tall building proposed by the Project would be similar to nearby buildings in Downtown and would not increase or change air traffic patterns or increase levels of risk with respect to air traffic. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with a change in air traffic patterns have been identified.

4.1.14.2 Hazards Due to Design Features or Incompatible Uses

A. *Finding—No Impact*. The Project would have no impacts related to from a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The roadways adjacent to the Project Site are part of the urban roadway network and contain no sharp curves or dangerous intersections. The Project does not include any major modifications to the street system or any dangerous design features. In addition, the Project would not result in incompatible uses, as the proposed uses are consistent with other commercial uses in the Project vicinity. Thus, no impacts related to increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to increasing hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use have been identified.

4.1.14.3 Emergency Access

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to inadequate emergency access would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. While the majority of Project construction activities would be confined on-site, the Project may require partial lane closures on Ocean Boulevard, Pine Avenue, and Seaside Way. The closures would be temporary in nature, and both directions of travel on area roadways would be maintained so as not to physically impair access to and around the Project Site. The Project would also implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan (refer to Project Design Feature TRA-1, below) to facilitate traffic and pedestrian movement and minimize potential conflicts between construction activities, street traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians. Additionally, the Project would not place any permanent physical barriers on any of the existing surrounding streets, and access along and through streets and highways in the area would be maintained. Therefore, the Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with inadequate emergency access have been identified.

4.1.15 Utilities and Service Systems

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have significant impacts related to water supply and infrastructure if the project would: (a) exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; (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; (c) require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; (d) have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or whether new or expanded entitlements are needed; (e) 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; (f) be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; (g) comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; or affect (h) other utilities and service systems.

Project Design Features

As previously described, the Project would incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability. "Green" principles have been incorporated in the Project to comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-09-0013), and the Project has been designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED Silver® certification. Specific water conservation and waste reduction features include, but are not limited to, the following:

Water Conservation

- Inclusion of water conservation measures in accordance with Long Beach Water Department requirements for new development in the City of Long Beach.
- Use of high-efficiency fixtures and appliances.
- Use of high-efficiency Energy Star-rated dishwashers and clothes washers where appropriate.
- Individual metering and billing for water use for the restaurant tenant.
- Prohibition of the use of single-pass cooling equipment (i.e., equipment in which water is circulated once through the system, then drains for disposal with no recirculation).

- Installation of cooling tower automatic water treatment to minimize cooling tower blowdown and water waste.

- Installation of a separate water meter (or submeter), flow sensor, and master valve shutoff for irrigated landscape areas totaling 5,000 square feet and greater.

Solid Waste Reduction

- Provision of on-site recycling containers to promote the recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable materials and adequate storage areas for such containers during construction and after the building is occupied.

- Use of building materials with a minimum of 10 percent recycled-content for the construction of the Project.

- Implementation of a construction waste management plan to recycle and/or salvage a minimum of 75 percent of nonhazardous construction debris or minimize the generation of construction waste to 2.5 pounds per square foot of building floor area.

4.1.15.1 Wastewater Treatment

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to wastewater treatment requirements would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The City of Long Beach Water Department (LBWD) provides wastewater collection and treatment services for the Project Site. Wastewater generated during Project operation would be collected and discharged into existing sewer mains and conveyed to the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in the City of Carson or the Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (LBWRP). The wastewater generated by the Project would be typical of hotel and restaurant uses, and no industrial discharges would occur. Additionally, restaurant kitchens would be equipped with grease traps as required. As the JWPCP is in compliance with the State's wastewater treatment requirements, the Project would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with wastewater treatment have been identified.

4.1.15.2 New or Expanded Water or Wastewater Treatment Facilities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Water

Water service is provided by the LBWD through an underground water distribution pipe network. New connection points would be required for the Project, but no upgrades to the mainlines serving the Project Site would be required. Proposed laterals would include 1- to 8-inch pipes and would provide service for domestic, fire, and irrigation systems. Most construction impacts associated with the installation of the water distribution lines are expected to be confined to trenching in order to place the lines below surface and would be limited to the Project Site and its immediate vicinity. Minor off-site construction activities associated with connections to the public water mains would occur. Vehicular and pedestrian access immediately surrounding the Project Site could be affected during construction of new water connections to the public water mains. However, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (refer to Project Design Feature TRA-1, below) would be implemented during Project construction to ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and near the Project Site during construction activities. In addition, prior to conducting any ground disturbing activities, Project contractors would coordinate with the LBWD to identify the locations and depths of existing water lines in the Project Site vicinity to avoid disruption of water service. With respect to fire flow, an automatic sprinkler system would be included in the Project in addition to the construction of on-site water connections to comply with the fire flow set for the Project by the LBFD during the plan check process. Based on the above, Project impacts associated with water supply infrastructure would be less than significant.

Wastewater

LBWD is also responsible for operation and maintenance of the City's sewer system. As described above, wastewater generated during Project operation would be collected and discharged into existing sewer mains and conveyed to the JWPCP or the LBWRP. The Project would either utilize the existing lateral or install a new lateral that would connect to the existing 10-inch sewer main within Seaside Way, a portion of which currently constricts to 8 inches and would be replaced with a 10-inch line following the same alignment and utilizing the same

connection points as the existing line. As discussed above, any impacts to vehicular or pedestrian access would be addressed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan (refer to Project Design Feature TRA-1, below)**.** Prior to conducting any ground disturbing activities, Project contractors would coordinate with the LBWD to identify the locations and depths of existing sewer lines in the Project Site vicinity to avoid disruption of sewer service. LBWD has issued a "will-serve" letter indicating sewer service is available to serve the Project. Given the amount of wastewater expected to be generated by the Project, adequate wastewater treatment capacity would be available to serve the Project Site. As such, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to wastewater treatment and infrastructure.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities have been identified.

4.1.15.3 New or Expanded Stormwater Drainage Facilities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. While the Project would increase the amount of stormwater runoff from the Project Site, the capture and reuse system would provide 3,102 cubic feet of underground storage to accommodate the Project-related increase in runoff (based on a 10-year storm), prior to flowing to the existing 27-inch public storm drain in Pine Avenue. During storms greater than a 10-year event, the detention system would overflow via the drive aisle trench drains and sheet flow to the existing curb and gutters that lead to an existing catch basin, entering the public storm drain system. All of the new improvements would be within the boundaries of the Project Site, and the Project would not require the construction of new off-site stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to storm drain facilities.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities have been identified.

4.1.15.4 Sufficient Water Supplies

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the availability of sufficient water supplies from existing entitlements and resources would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. LBWD receives its domestic water from three sources: imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), groundwater pumped and treated by LBWD, and recycled water. Development of the Project would result in an increase in long-term water demand of approximately 80,493 gallons per day (gpd) or 86.41 acre-feet per year (AFY). It should be noted that the Project's estimated water demand is conservative as it does not account for water conservation features that would be included as part of the Project (i.e., a 20-percent reduction in water usage as required by CalGreen), or the potential use of treated stormwater for irrigation. In 2022, LBWD projects 63,550 AFY of demand and 77,491 AFY of supply, for a surplus of 13,941 AFY, and LBWD projects it can meet all water demand through 2040. The Project's estimated in water demand of 86.41 AFY would comprise approximately 0.11 percent of the City's water demand in 2022. Therefore, the Project would be well within the available and projected water supplies from 2022 through the year 2040 and, as such, the LBWD would be able to meet the water demand for the Project in combination with existing and planned water demand in its future service area. LBWD has also issued a "will-serve" letter for the Project indicating they are available to serve the Project. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with having sufficient water supplies available to serve the project have been identified.

4.1.15.5 Wastewater Treatment Capacity

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Based on wastewater generation rates published by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LASAN), the Project would generate an estimated average flow of 80,493 gpd of wastewater and a peak flow of 154,710 gpd of wastewater, which would represent 0.06 and 0.11 percent, respectively, of the JWPCP's available capacity of 143 million gallons per day (mgd). Accordingly, adequate wastewater treatment capacity would be available,

and the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to wastewater treatment and infrastructure.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with having a determination by the wastewater treatment provider have been identified.

4.1.15.6 Landfill Capacity

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the landfill capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Construction activities would generate construction and demolition wastes (e.g., concrete, asphalt, brick, and metal) that would be recycled or collected by private waste haulers contracted by the Applicant and taken for disposal at the County's inert landfills. Based on construction and debris rates established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency, it is anticipated that construction of the Project would generate a total of approximately 2,873 tons of demolition debris and approximately 1,044 tons of construction debris, for a combined total of approximately 3,918 tons of construction-related waste generation.[23] Waste reduction measures included in the Project would include, among others, the implementation of a construction waste management plan to recycle and/or salvage a minimum of 75 percent of nonhazardous construction debris or minimize the generation of construction waste to 2.5 pounds per square foot of building floor area. The amount of construction and debris waste generated by Project construction would represent approximately 0.007 percent of the existing remaining disposal capacity of 56.3 million tons for the unclassified landfill accepting waste from the City. Thus, the total amount of construction and demolition waste generated by the Project would represent a fraction of the remaining capacity at the unclassified landfill serving the Project Site.

Operation

Based on solid waste generation factors provided by CalRecycle, the Project would generate approximately 2,500 pounds per day (lbs/day) of solid waste

[23] *Numbers may not sum exactly due to rounding.*

upon completion.[24] The waste generation factors utilized do not account for recycling or other waste diversion measures, and as such, the estimated solid waste generated by the Project is conservative. The estimated solid waste generated by the Project would represent approximately 0.1 percent of the daily solid waste disposed of by the City. Furthermore, the solid waste generated by the Project would represent approximately 0.003 percent of the remaining daily disposal capacity of the Class III landfills open to the City.

Based on the above, the landfills that serve the Project Site would have adequate capacity to accept the solid waste generated by Project construction and operation. Impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with landfill capacity have been identified.

4.1.15.7 Solid Waste Statutes and Regulations

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project would be consistent with applicable regulations associated with solid waste. Specifically, the Project would comply with AB 939, AB 341, AB 1826, and City goals, as applicable, through measures such as the provision of clearly marked, source-sorted receptacles to facilitate recycling. Since the Project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, no significant impacts would occur.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with compliance with applicable solid waste statutes and regulations have been identified.

4.1.15.8 Other Utilities and Service Systems

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to other utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. An analysis of the Project's potential impacts related to energy, including electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based or transportation-related fuels, is provided below in Section 4.1.16. As discussed

[24] *CalRecycle, Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, 2016.*

therein, impacts would be less than significant. No other utilities or service systems are anticipated to be affected as a result of the Project.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with other utilities and service systems have been identified.

4.1.16 Energy Conservation and Infrastructure

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix F, the potentially significant energy implications of a project should be considered in an EIR. In the context of the guidance in Appendix F, the Project would have a significant impact on energy use if it would: (a) cause wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy during construction, operation, and/or maintenance; (b) result in an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects; (c) conflict with adopted energy conservation plans; or (d) violate state or federal energy standards.

Project Design Features

As previously described, the Project would incorporate features to support and promote environmental sustainability. "Green" principles have been incorporated in the Project to comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-09-0013), and the Project has been designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED Silver® certification. Specific energy conservation features include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Use of full-cutoff or fully shielded on-street lighting oriented to pedestrian areas/sidewalks so as to minimize overlighting, light trespass, and glare.
- Use of light emitting diode (LED) lighting or other energy-efficient lighting technologies, such as occupancy sensors or daylight harvesting and dimming controls, where appropriate, to reduce electricity use.
- Incorporation of energy-efficient design methods and technologies, such as high-performance window glazing; undergrounding parking to reduce heat island effects; high-efficiency domestic heaters; and enhanced insulation to minimize solar heat gain.
- Inclusion of outdoor air flow measuring devices, additional outdoor air ventilation, and use of low emitting materials to promote indoor environmental quality.
- Incorporation of generous operable windows and high-performance window glazing; and use of natural light.

- Use of insulated plumbing pipes and high-efficiency domestic water heaters.
- Use of insulated mechanical pipes and high-efficiency boilers.
- Use of updated boiler controls to improve efficiency.
- Use of refrigerants that reduce ozone depletion.
- Dedicated outside air units for decoupled heating/cooling.
- Variable air volume kitchen exhaust.
- Occupancy-based hotel room energy management system.
- Demand-controlled ventilation in high occupancy spaces.
- Carbon monoxide monitoring in the parking garage coupled with variable speed garage fans.
- Use of energy-efficient electrical and mechanical equipment and monitoring systems.
- Provision of conduit that is appropriate for future photovoltaic and solar thermal collectors.
- Post-construction commissioning of building energy systems performed on an ongoing basis to ensure all systems are running at optimal efficiency.

4.1.16.1 Wasteful, Inefficient, and Unnecessary Consumption of Energy

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project would consume energy in the form of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuels such as diesel and gasoline during construction and operational activities. The Project Site is located within Southern California Edison's (SCE) 50,000-square-mile planning area, which includes portions of central and southern California.[25] Natural gas is provided to the Project area by the City of Long Beach Energy Resources Department

[25] *Southern California Edison, Who We Are, www.sce.com/about-us/who-we-are, accessed November 26, 2018.*

(LBER). With respect to transportation fuels, petroleum-based fuels currently account for 90 percent of California's transportation energy sources.[26]

Project Energy Requirements and Energy Use Efficiency

Construction

Electricity: Approximately 68,013 kilowatt-hours (kWh) of electricity is estimated to be consumed during Project construction. The estimated construction electricity usage represents approximately 1.5 percent of the Project's estimated net annual operational demand which would be within SCE's supply and infrastructure service capabilities.[27] When not in use, electric equipment would be powered off so as to avoid unnecessary energy consumption. In addition, construction lighting providing illumination for the site and staging areas for longer than 120 days would be subject to applicable Title 24 requirements, including limits on the wattage allowed per specified area, in order to conserve energy.[28]

Natural Gas: Natural gas would not be supplied to support Project construction activities; thus, there would be no demand generated by construction.

Transportation Energy: On- and off-road vehicles would consume an estimated 66,778 gallons of gasoline and approximately 76,184 gallons of diesel fuel throughout the Project's construction period. This petroleum-based fuel usage would represent less than 0.01 percent of the annual on-road gasoline-related energy consumption and less than 0.1 percent of the annual diesel fuel-related energy consumption projected in Los Angeles County in 2021.[29] In addition, on-road vehicles (i.e., haul trucks, worker vehicles) would be subject to federal fuel efficiency requirements, and Project construction activities would comply with existing energy standards with regard to transportation fuel consumption.

---

[26] *California Energy Commission, 2016–2017 Investment Plan Update for the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program, March 2016.*

[27] *The percentage is derived by taking the total amount of electricity usage during construction (68,013 kWh) and dividing that number by the total amount of net electricity usage during operation (4,690,078 kWh) to arrive at 1.5 percent.*

[28] *California Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Title 24, Part 6, Sections 110.9, 130.0, and 130.2.*

[29] *Although the Project is anticipated to become operational in early 2022, this energy analysis evaluates a buildout year of 2021 which is considered conservative since energy efficiency standards are more stringent in future years, resulting in less energy consumption per capita over time.*

Operation

Based on compliance with 2019 Title 24 standards and applicable 2019 CalGreen requirements, the Project's operational energy demand would be approximately 4,690 megawatt-hours (MWh) of electricity per year; 15,818,630 cubic feet (cf) of natural gas per year; 218,310 gallons of gasoline per year; and 13,899 gallons of diesel fuel per year.

Electricity: The Project's annual electricity consumption of 4,690 MWh per year would represent less than 0.006 percent of SCE's sales in 2017. In addition to complying with CalGreen, the Applicant would implement design measures to meet LEED Silver® requirements which collectively would be capable of exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency requirements by at least 10 percent, include the use of Energy Star-labeled appliances.

Natural Gas: The Project's estimated operational demand for 15,818,630 cf of natural gas per year (43,339 cf per day) would account for less than 0.2 percent of the 2021 forecasted consumption in LBER's planning area. The Applicant would implement design measures to meet LEED Silver® requirements, which would include natural gas conservation measures in order to collectively be capable of exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency requirements by at least 10 percent.

Transportation Energy: Project-related traffic would result in the consumption of petroleum-based fuels related to vehicular travel to and from the Project Site. The Project Site is located within ¼-mile of the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach Station, the use of which by Project employees and guests would reduce vehicle trips and miles travelled. Furthermore, the Project would provide short- and long-term bicycle parking spaces in addition to bicycle-serving amenities that would encourage biking. The Project would also incorporate characteristics to reduce trips and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) as compared to standard trip generation rates.

The Project characteristics listed below are consistent with the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) guidance document, *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*, which identifies the VMT and vehicle trips reductions for the Project Site relative to the standard trip and VMT rates in CalEEMod (i.e., the model used to estimate fuel usage), which

corresponds to reduction in relative greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.[30] Measures applicable to the Project are listed below, and a brief description of the Project's relevance to each measure is provided. Based on these measures, the Project's siting would minimize transportation fuel consumption through the reduction of vehicle trips and VMT.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-1—Increase Density:** Increased density, measured in terms of persons, jobs, or dwelling units per unit area, reduces emissions associated with transportation as it reduces the distance people travel for work or services and provides a foundation for the implementation of other strategies, such as enhanced transit services. The Project would increase the site density from roughly 0 jobs per acre to approximately 1,690 jobs per acre.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-4—Increase Destination Accessibility:** The Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach (Transit Mall) station is located 0.15 mile from the Project Site. In addition, public bus service in the Project vicinity is provided by Metro and Long Beach Transit, with 11 bus lines serving the area. The Project would also provide bicycle parking spaces and amenities to encourage utilization of alternative modes of transportation. Further, the Project Site is located within 0.5 mile of Downtown Long Beach, thus promoting walking while reducing vehicle trips to and from the Project Site.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-5—Increase Transit Accessibility:** As discussed immediately above, the Project would be located 0.15 mile from the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach station, and 11 Metro and Long Beach Transit bus lines serve the Project area. The Project would also provide bicycle parking spaces and amenities to encourage utilization of alternative modes of transportation.

When accounting for the Project measures that would be implemented to reduce VMT, the Project's estimated petroleum-based fuel usage would be 218,310 gallons of gasoline and 13,899 gallons of diesel per year, for a total of 232,208 gallons of petroleum-based fuels annually.

Based on the above, Project construction and operations would not cause the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy resources, including electricity, natural gas, and petroleum-based fuels.

[30] *CAPCOA, Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, August 2010.*

Compliance with Energy Standards

Project construction and operational activities would comply with existing energy standards with regards to electricity and natural gas usage and the use of transportation fuels, including energy efficiency requirements contained in the Federal Energy Independence and Security Act or previous Energy Policy Acts for electrical motors and equipment,[31] 2019 Title 24 standards and applicable 2019 CalGreen requirements, CARB's anti-idling regulations as well as the In-Use Off-Road Diesel-Fueled Fleets regulation, and corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) fuel economy standards.

Efficient Transportation Alternatives

As discussed above, the Project includes features, such as dedicated bicycle parking facilities, to reduce VMT during operational activities. The Project is also required to implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures during operations to further reduce employee trips (refer to Project Design Feature TRA-2, below). The Project represents an infill development within an existing urbanized area that would concentrate new hotel and restaurant uses within a High-Quality Transit Area (HQTA), as defined by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Eleven Metro and Long Beach Transit bus routes run within 0.25 mile of the Project site. The Project Site is also located 0.15 mile from the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach station. These features would allow for a reduction in VMT by approximately 67 percent in comparison to a standard project, as estimated by CalEEMod, with a corresponding reduction in the Project's petroleum-based fuel usage. Therefore, the Project would encourage the use of efficient transportation modes and alternatives.

Consistency with Adopted Energy Conservation Plans

As previously discussed, the Project would comply with applicable 2019 CalGreen Code and Title 24 requirements and would implement design measures to meet LEED Silver® requirements which would exceed certain Title 24 standards. The Project would also be consistent with regional planning strategies that address energy conservation, including the 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2016–2040 RTP/SCS), notably as an infill development within an existing urbanized area that would concentrate new hotel and restaurant uses within a HQTA, as discussed above.

[31] *Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. Pub.L. (110-140).*

In addition, consistent with both the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and CARB's VMT reduction targets adopted in March 2018, the Project would reduce VMT by 67 percent, thereby reducing fuel usage. All of these features would serve to reduce the consumption of electricity, natural gas, and transportation fuel. Based on the above, the Project would be consistent with adopted energy conservation plans.

Based on the analysis presented in the Initial Study, the Project would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy and thus would not generate significant impacts with regard to energy use and consumption.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy have been identified.

4.1.16.2 Electricity or Natural Gas Demand that Exceeds Available Supply or Infrastructure Capacity

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to an increase in demand for electricity or natural gas that exceeds available supply or distribution infrastructure capabilities that could result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As energy consumption during Project construction activities would be relatively negligible, the Project would not noticeably affect regional energy consumption levels during the construction period. In addition, the operational energy requirements of the Project would fall within SCE's and LBER's service capabilities. Specifically, the Project's estimated annual electricity consumption of 4,690 MWh per year would represent less than 0.006 percent of SCE's sales in 2017. Furthermore, SCE has confirmed that the Project's electricity demand can be served by the facilities in the Project area.[32] Similarly, the Project's estimated natural gas demand of 15,818,630 cf per year would account for less than 0.2 percent of the 2021 forecasted consumption in LBER's planning area, and LBER has confirmed that the Project's natural gas demand can be served by the facilities in the Project area.[33,34] Therefore, the Project impacts related to energy usage would be less than significant.

---

[32] *Southern California Edison, Will Serve Letter, May 10, 2018. Refer to Appendix IS-12 of the Initial Study.*

[33] *California Gas and Electric Utilities, 2018 California Gas Report, p. 111*

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with an increase in energy demand have been identified.

4.2 Environmental Impacts Found in the Initial Study Not to be Significant After Mitigation

The following impact categories were concluded in the Initial Study to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the City finds and determines that the mitigation measures described in the Initial Study would reduce potentially significant impacts identified for the following environmental impact areas to below the level of significance. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid each of the following significant effects on the environment.

4.2.1 Biological Resources

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have a potentially significant impact related to biological resources if it would 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 CDFW or USFWS. Additional thresholds of significance related to biological resource impacts are addressed above in Section 4.1.4.

4.2.1.1 Sensitive Species

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts, either resulting 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 CDFW or USFWS would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Given the developed nature of the Project Site and surrounding area, species likely to occur on-site are limited to small terrestrial and avian species typically found in urban settings. While on-site vegetation is limited to ornamental shrubs and trees, some on-site mature trees could

[34] *City of Long Beach Energy Services, Will Serve Letter, June 6, 2018. Refer to Appendix IS-12 of the Initial Study.*

potentially be used for roosting and nesting purposes by migratory birds. In order to avoid direct impacts to migratory birds and ensure compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) as well as California Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513, removal of on-site mature trees would be conducted in accordance with Mitigation Measure BIO-1 set forth below. As such, efforts would be made to schedule the removal of mature trees between September 1 and February 14 to avoid the nesting season, suitable habitats would be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist prior to removal, and appropriate buffers would be established in the event active nests are present. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measure and associated compliance with regulatory requirements, the Project would not have a substantial adverse direct effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFW or USFWS and would not result in a significant direct impact.

As discussed in more detail in the Initial Study, the Project could result in indirect impacts to sensitive species within the adjacent Victory Park or Rainbow Lagoon, located approximately 1,000 feet to the south, through the introduction of invasive species, changes in lighting and noise, changes to stormwater drainage and water quality, and/or the introduction of new vehicular hazards. As discussed therein, Project landscaping could serve to support foraging or nesting of native wildlife species, and the potential for the proliferation of invasive species into native habitats would be limited. In addition, Project lighting would be directed and installed according to City lighting standards to avoid excessive lighting and minimize off-site light spill, and overall light levels in the Project area would not change substantially. With regard to noise, Project construction noise would be temporary and intermittent, and standard construction practices would be implemented to reduce off-site construction noise to the extent feasible. Operational noise would be consistent with the existing types of noise and associated noise levels in the Project vicinity, to which any wildlife present is already adapted. As also previously discussed, compliance with regulatory requirements, including the implementation of BMPs, would reduce impacts related to stormwater runoff and water quality, thus minimizing indirect impacts to sensitive species and habitats. Finally, the Project's anticipated increase in traffic along local roadways would not substantially increase vehicular collisions with sensitive species. Please also refer to Section 4.1.4.3 above regarding the Project's design as a "bird-safe" building. In summary, potential indirect impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in the vicinity of the Project Site would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in a significant impact to nesting birds, Mitigation Measure BIO-1 will be required. Under Mitigation Measure BIO-1, efforts would be made to schedule the removal of mature trees between September 1 and February 14 to avoid the nesting season. If activities were to occur during the nesting season, all suitable habitats would be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist prior to removal. If any active nests are detected, the area would be flagged, along with a minimum 300-foot buffer (buffer may range between 300 and 500 feet as determined by the monitoring biologist), and would be avoided until the nesting cycle has completed or the monitoring biologist determines that the nest has failed. With implementation of this measure, impacts to any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure is proposed to reduce impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: The Applicant shall perform one or more of the following to reduce potential impacts to migratory raptor and songbird species to a less than significant level: (1) vegetation removal activities shall be scheduled outside the nesting season for raptor and songbird species (nesting season typically occurs from February 15 to August 31) to avoid potential impacts to nesting species (this will ensure that no active nests will be disturbed and that habitat removal could proceed rapidly); and/or (2) any construction activities that occur during the raptor and songbird nesting season shall require all suitable habitat to be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting raptor and songbird species by a qualified biologist no earlier than seven days prior to commencement of disturbance. If any actives nests are detected, a buffer of at least 300 feet (500 feet for raptors) or as determined by the qualified biologist shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete, as determined by the qualified biologist. The results of the survey(s) shall be reported to the lead agency to document compliance with applicable state and federal laws pertaining to the protection of nesting native birds.

4.2.2 Cultural Resources

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources if the project would: (a) cause a substantial adverse change in

the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5; (b) directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; or (c) disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. An additional threshold of significance related to cultural (historic) resource impacts is addressed below in Section 4.4.2.

4.2.2.1 Archaeological Resources

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Based on a records search conducted by the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC) at California State University, Fullerton, the Project Site may be sensitive to archaeological resources, although none were identified on-site. Accordingly, although the surface and subsurface areas of the Project Site have been previously disturbed, there is a potential for the discovery of prehistoric cultural or archaeological resources. Such a find would constitute a potentially significant impact. This impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation Mitigation Measure CUL-1, detailed below.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to archaeological resources, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 will be required. Under Mitigation Measure CUL-1, monitoring of excavation and grading activities within native soils would be conducted by a qualified archaeological monitor; in the event of a find, earthwork activities would be halted and directed away from the area; an Archaeologist would evaluate any potential resource and prepare an appropriate treatment plan; and any cultural resource(s) that are uncovered would be deposited in an appropriate repository. With implementation of this measure, the Project's impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-1: A qualified Project archaeologist or archaeological monitor approved by the City shall monitor excavation and grading activities within native soils on the Project Site that have not been previously disturbed. In the event cultural resource(s) are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall halt or redirect such activities away from the area of the find to allow

evaluation, and work may continue outside the vicinity of the find. Deposits shall be treated in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local guidelines, including those set forth in California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2. In addition, if it is determined that an archaeological site is a historical resource, the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 21084.1 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 shall be implemented.

An Archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards shall evaluate the discovered resource(s) and if significant, notify the Project Applicant, the City, and an appropriate Native American representative (if prehistoric or Native American in nature), and then develop an appropriate treatment plan. Treatment plans shall consider preservation of the resource(s) in place as a preferred option. The Archaeologist shall then prepare a report to be reviewed and approved by the City and file it with the Project Applicant, the City, and the South Central Coastal Information Center located at the California State University, Fullerton. The report shall describe any resource(s) unearthed, the treatment of such resource(s), and the evaluation of the resource(s) with respect to the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. If the resource(s) are found to be significant, a separate report detailing the results of the recovery and evaluation process shall be prepared. The City shall designate one or more appropriate repositories for any cultural resource(s) that are uncovered.

4.2.2.2 Paleontological Resources

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to the direct or indirect destruction of a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Based on a records search conducted by the Los Angeles County Natural History Museum (LACM), there are no vertebrate fossil localities that lie directly within the boundaries of the Project Site. However, the records search indicates that within the greater Project vicinity, there are fossil localities from the same sedimentary deposits that occur on-site, as close as 0.33 mile away and as shallow as 25 feet bgs. The surficial sediments in the vicinity consist of older Quaternary Alluvium, derived primarily as fluvial deposits from the Los Angeles River to the west, but possibly estuarine or beach deposits. These deposits may contain significant vertebrate fossils, as they are known in the area to be fossiliferous.

Shallow excavations in the Quaternary Alluvium on the Project Site are unlikely to uncover any significant vertebrate fossils. Deeper excavations, however, could potentially encounter significant fossil vertebrate remains. The Project may, therefore, result in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-2, detailed below, would mitigate this potential impact to a less than significant level.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to paleontological resources, Mitigation Measure CUL-2 will be required. Under Mitigation Measure CUL-2, if evidence of subsurface paleontological resources is found, earthwork activities would be halted and directed away from the area; the find would be evaluated by a certified paleontologist, and a mitigation plan detailing salvage and curation would be prepared. With implementation of this measure, the Project's impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: If evidence of subsurface paleontological resources is found during excavation and other ground disturbing activities, all work within 50 feet of the discovery shall cease and the construction contractor shall contact the City of Long Beach Development Services Department. With direction from the Development Services Department, a paleontologist certified by the County of Los Angeles shall evaluate the find. If warranted, the paleontologist shall prepare a complete a standard Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program for the salvage and curation of identified resources.

4.2.2.3 Human Remains

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project would require excavation to a maximum depth of 22 feet and grading of an estimated 23,500 cubic yards for placement of building footings and foundations. Thus, there is a possibility of encountering human remains within native soils. Accordingly, impacts with regard to archaeological resources and the discovery of human remains would be potentially significant. However, this impact would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 set forth below.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to human remains, Mitigation Measure CUL-3 will be required. Under Mitigation Measure CUL-3, if human remains are encountered, earthwork activities would be halted and directed away from the area; the County Coroner and potentially an Archaeologist and Native American monitor would be notified; and any remains and associated grave goods would be treated in accordance with state regulations. With implementation of this measure, the Project's impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during ground-disturbing activities, work in the affected area and the immediate vicinity shall be halted immediately. The construction manager at the Project Site shall be contacted and shall notify the County Coroner. If the County Coroner determines the remains to be Native American, the Archaeologist and Native American monitor shall then be contacted, if they are not on-site at the time, as well as the responsible lead agency of the discovery, who in turn shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission. Disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods shall be in accordance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and Public Resources Code Sections 5097.91 and 5097.98. The Archaeologist and the Native American monitor, with the concurrence of the City, shall determine the area of potential impact and the timing when construction activities can resume. Preservation of the remains in place shall be considered as a possible course of action by the Project Applicant, the City, and the Most Likely Descendent.

4.2.3 Tribal Cultural Resources

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have significant impacts related to population and housing if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: (a) listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or (b) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

4.2.3.1 California or Local Register of Historical Resources

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a Local Register of Historical Resources, would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. AB 52 consultation letters were sent on June 20, 2018, to local tribal councils based on a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission. No response was received from any of the tribes contacted during or immediately following the mandated 30-day response period, which concluded on July 20, 2018. However, on October 12, 2018, the City received a request for consultation from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation. On November 1, 2018, the City had a conference call with tribal Chairman Andrew Salas. Chairman Salas agreed that a mitigation measure requiring tribal monitoring during all earth disturbance activities would satisfy his concerns and no further consultation would be needed. Therefore, Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, provided below, will be included as part of the Project. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a Local Register of Historical Resources, Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 listed below will be required. Under Mitigation Measure TCR-1, Native American monitoring during ground-disturbing activities would occur; if evidence of any tribal cultural resource(s) is found, earthwork activities would be halted and directed away from the area, and an appropriate plan of recovery for the resource would be prepared. Under Mitigation Measure TCR-2, any archaeological resource(s) found would be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor, and if Native American in origin, the relevant tribe would coordinate treatment and curation of the resource. With implementation of those measures, the Project's impacts to listed or eligible tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for the Project, the City of Long Beach Development Services Department shall ensure that the construction contractor provide unencumbered access for Native American monitoring during ground-disturbing activities. This provision shall be included on Project plans and

specifications. The Project Site shall be made accessible to any Native American tribe requesting to be present, provided adequate notice is given to the construction contractor and that a construction safety hazard does not occur. The monitor(s) shall be approved by a local tribal representative and shall be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground disturbing activities. The monitor(s) shall possess Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) certification, which shall be submitted to the City for review. In addition, the monitor(s) shall be required to provide insurance certificates, including liability insurance, for any archaeological resource(s) encountered during grading and excavation activities pertinent to the provisions outlined in the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Division 13, Section 21083.2 (a) through (k). Neither the City of Long Beach, Project Applicant, or construction contractor shall be financially obligated for any monitoring activities. If evidence of any tribal cultural resources is found during ground-disturbing activities, the monitor(s) shall have the capability to halt construction in the immediate vicinity of the find in order to recover and/or determine the appropriate plan of recovery for the resource. The recovery process shall not unreasonably delay the construction process. On-site monitoring shall end when the Project grading and excavation activities are completed or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for tribal cultural resources and monitoring is no longer necessary.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Any archaeological resource(s) unearthed during Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and Native American monitor. If the resource(s) are Native American in origin, the relevant tribe shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of the resources. The treatment plan established for the resource(s) shall comply with California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources and Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) shall be the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis.

4.2.3.2 Resources Determined by the Lead Agency to be Significant

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to resources determined by the lead agency to be significant would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures TCR-1 through TCR-2.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above, following the conclusion of the AB 52 consultation 30-day response period, the City received a request for consultation from the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation. On November 1, 2018, the City had a conference call with tribal Chairman Andrew Salas. Chairman Salas agreed that a mitigation measure requiring tribal monitoring during all earth disturbance activities would satisfy his concerns and no further consultation would be needed. Therefore, Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2, provided below, will be included as part of the Project. With implementation of these mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to resources determined by the lead agency to be significant, Mitigation Measures TCR-1 and TCR-2 will be required. With implementation of those measures, appropriate monitoring of ground-disturbing activities would occur, and the Project's impacts to tribal cultural resources determined by the lead agency to be significant would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Mitigation Measure TCR-1 and Mitigation Measure TCR-2, above.

4.3 Environmental Impacts Found in the EIR Not to be Significant Prior to Mitigation

The following impacts were determined in the EIR to be less than significant, and based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the City finds and determines that the following environmental impact categories will not result in any significant impacts and that no mitigation measures are needed.

4.3.1 Air Quality

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to air quality if the project were to: (a) conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan; (b) violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; (c) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); or (d) expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Additional thresholds of significance related to air quality impacts are addressed above in Section 4.1.3 and below in Section 4.4.1.

In the context of the guidance in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the thresholds of significance used to evaluate the Project's potential air quality impacts during construction and operation and impacts related to toxic air contaminants are based on the thresholds set forth by the SCAQMD in its *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. Additionally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 requires an analysis of project consistency with applicable governmental plans and policies. More specifically, based on criteria set forth in SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, the Project would have a significant impact with regard to construction emissions if any of the following would occur:[35]

- Regional emissions from both direct and indirect sources would exceed any of the following SCAQMD prescribed threshold levels: (1) 100 pounds per day for nitrogen oxides (NO_X); (2) 75 pounds a day for volatile organic compounds (VOC); (3) 150 pounds per day for respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}) or sulfur oxides (SO_X); (4) 55 pounds per day for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$); and (5) 550 pounds per day for carbon monoxide (CO).

- Maximum on-site daily localized emissions exceed the Localized Significance Thresholds (LST), resulting in predicted ambient concentrations in the vicinity of the Project Site greater than the most stringent ambient air quality standards for CO (20 ppm [23,000 µg/m^3] over a 1-hour period or 9.0 ppm [10,350 µg/m^3] averaged over an 8-hour period) and NO_2 (0.18 ppm [338.4 µg/m^3] over a 1-hour period, 0.1 ppm [188 µg/m^3] over a three-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average, or 0.03 ppm [56.4 µg/m^3] averaged over an annual period).

- Maximum on-site localized PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ emissions during construction exceed the applicable LSTs, resulting in predicted ambient concentrations in the vicinity of the site to exceed the incremental 24-hr threshold of 10.4 µg/m^3 or 1.0 µg/m^3 PM_{10} averaged over an annual period.

Based on criteria set forth in SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, the Project would have a significant impact with regard to operational emissions if any of the following would occur:[36]

- Operational emissions exceed any of the following SCAQMD prescribed threshold levels: (1) 55 pounds a day for VOC; (2) 55 pounds per day for NO_X; (3) 550 pounds per day for CO; (4) 150 pounds per day for PM_{10} or SO_X; and (5) 55 pounds per day for $PM_{2.5}$.

---

[35] *SCAQMD, SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, revised March 2015.*

[36] *SCAQMD, SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, revised March 2015.*

- Maximum on-site daily localized emissions exceed the Localized Significance Thresholds (LST), resulting in predicted ambient concentrations in the vicinity of the Project Site greater than the most stringent ambient air quality standards for CO (20 parts per million (ppm) over a 1-hour period or 9.0 ppm averaged over an 8-hour period) and NO_2 (0.18 ppm over a 1-hour period, 0.1 ppm over a 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average, or 0.03 ppm averaged over an annual period). [37]

- Maximum on-site localized operational PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions exceed the incremental 24-hr threshold of 2.5 µg/m^3 or 1.0 µg/m^3 PM_{10} averaged over an annual period.[38]

- The project causes or contributes to an exceedance of the California 1-hour or 8-hour CO standards of 20 or 9.0 ppm, respectively; or

Based on criteria set forth in SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, the Project would have a significant impact with regard to toxic air contaminant emissions if any of the following would occur:[39]

- The Project emits carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that exceed the maximum incremental cancer risk of 10 in one million or an acute or chronic hazard index of 1.0.[40] For projects with a maximum incremental cancer risk between 1 in one million and 10 in one million, a project would result in a significant impact if the cancer burden exceeds 0.5 excess cancer cases.

- Hazardous materials associated with on-site stationary sources result in an accidental release of air toxic emissions or acutely hazardous materials posing a threat to public health and safety.

- The Project would be occupied primarily by sensitive individuals within 0.25 mile of any existing facility that emits air toxic contaminants which could result in a health risk for pollutants identified in District Rule 1401.

- The Project would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that exceed the maximum incremental cancer risk of 10 in

---

[37] *SCAQMD, Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology, revised July 2008.*

[38] *SCAQMD, Final—Methodology to Calculate Particulate Matter (PM) 2.5 and $PM_{2.5}$ Significance Thresholds, October 2006.*

[39] *SCAQMD, SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds, revised March 2015.*

[40] *Hazard index is the ratio of a toxic air contaminant's concentration divided by its Reference Concentration, or safe exposure level. If the hazard index exceeds one, people are exposed to levels of TACs that may pose noncancer health risks.*

one million or an acute or chronic hazard index of 1.0. For projects with a maximum incremental cancer risk between 1 in one million and 10 in one million, a project would result in a significant impact if the cancer burden exceeds 0.5 excess cancer cases.

Based on CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 and in accordance with the SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, the following criteria were used to evaluate the Project's consistency with SCAQMD and SCAG regional plans and policies, including the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP):[41]

- Will the Project result in any of the following:
  - An increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations;
  - Cause or contribute to new air quality violations; or
  - Delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emission reductions specified in the AQMP?
- Will the Project exceed the assumptions utilized in preparing the AQMP?
  - Is the Project consistent with the population and employment growth projections upon which AQMP forecasted emission levels are based;
  - Does the Project include air quality mitigation measures; or
  - To what extent is Project development consistent with the AQMP land use policies?

In addition *to the* SCAQMD's AQMP and SCAG's regional plans and policies, the Project's consistency with the City of Long Beach General Plan Air Quality Element is discussed.

Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features AIR-1 through AIR-7 are proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to ensure the Project's impacts related to air quality remain less than significant:

Project Design Feature AIR-1: In accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, the Project shall incorporate fugitive dust control measures at least as effective as the following measures:

[41] *SCAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993, p. 12-3.*

- Use watering to control dust generation during the demolition of structures such that visible dust plumes are not generated;
- Clean-up mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site daily;
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- All haul trucks would be covered or would maintain at least 6 inches of freeboard;
- All materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of spillage or dust;
- Suspend earthmoving operations or additional watering would be implemented to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 mph;
- The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by construction and hauling, and at all times provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind. All unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be wetted at least three times daily during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust emissions; and
- Prior to demolition or ground disturbing activities, an information sign shall be posted at the entrance to the construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. A construction relations officer shall be appointed to act as a community liaison concerning on-site activity, including investigation and resolution of issues related to fugitive dust generation.

Project Design Feature AIR-2: In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 13, Section 2485, the idling of all on-road diesel-fueled commercial haul and dump trucks (weighing over 10,000 pounds) during construction shall be limited to five minutes at any location.

Project Design Feature AIR-3: In accordance with California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93115, operation of any stationary, diesel-fueled, compression-ignition engines shall meet specified fuel and fuel additive requirements and emission standards.

Project Design Feature AIR-4: The Project shall comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1113 limiting the volatile organic compound content of architectural coatings.

Project Design Feature AIR-5: The Project shall install odor-reducing equipment in accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1138.

Project Design Feature AIR-6: New on-site facility nitrogen oxide emissions shall be minimized through the use of emission control measures (e.g., use of best available control technology for new combustion sources such as boilers and water heaters) as required by South Coast Air Quality Management District Regulation XIII, New Source Review.

Project Design Feature AIR-7: During the mat pour foundation phase, all trucks hauling concrete shall be model year 2007 or newer.

4.3.1.1 Air Quality Standards

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation would be less than significant for most criteria pollutants during both construction and operations, except construction-related regional NO_X emissions (addressed below in Section 4.4.1).

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Regional Impacts

Construction of the Project has the potential to generate regional emissions from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and vehicle trips associated with construction workers traveling to and from the Project Site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from demolition and construction activities. As presented in Table IV.A-3 on page IV.A-35 of the Draft EIR, construction-related daily maximum regional construction emissions (i.e., combined on-site and off-site emissions) would not exceed the thresholds for VOC, CO, SO_X, PM_{10}, or $PM_{2.5}$. Accordingly, impacts related to these emissions would be less than significant. (Refer to Section 4.4.1 below for a discussion of NO_X emissions.)

Localized Impacts

The nearest sensitive receptors to Project construction activities are proposed residential uses located west of the site (approximately 100 feet or roughly 30 meters). As presented in presented in Revised Table IV.A-4 on page II-5 of the Final EIR, construction-related daily maximum localized emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and

$PM_{2.5}$. Therefore, the Project's localized construction emissions would result in less than significant impacts.

Operation

Regional Impacts

Project design features incorporated in this analysis include the Project Site's increase in job density, walkability, accessibility to transit, and the provision of on-site pedestrian improvements, among others. As shown in Revised Table IV.A-5 on page II-6 of the Final EIR, the Project would result in an increase in criteria pollutant emissions that would fall below the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds for long-term regional emissions of each of the criteria pollutants. Therefore, impacts associated with regional operational emissions would be less than significant.

Localized Impacts

Operation of the Project would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. The emissions estimates for criteria air pollutants from on-site sources shown in Revised Table IV.A-6 on page II-6 of the final EIR indicate that on-site operational emissions would not exceed any of the LSTs. Accordingly, localized operational impacts would be less than significant.

CO "Hot Spots" Analysis

The Project did not trigger the need for a detailed CO hotspots model and would not cause any new or exacerbate any existing CO hotspots. As a result, impacts related to localized mobile-source CO emissions are considered less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. As no significant air quality impacts associated with Project construction and operations, including regional and localized emissions have been identified (aside from construction-related regional NO_X emissions, discussed below in Section 4.4.1), no mitigation measures are required.

4.3.1.2 Sensitive Receptors and Toxic Air Contaminants

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, specifically TACs, would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

The greatest potential for TAC emissions during Project construction would be from diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities. Given the short-term nature of Project construction activities, the Project would not result in a substantial, long-term (i.e., 70-year) source of TAC emissions. As such, Project-related TAC impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

The Project is not considered a substantial source of diesel particulate matter warranting a refined health risk assessment (HRA) since daily truck trips to the Project Site would not exceed 100 trucks per day or more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units. Additionally, compliance with SCAQMD Rule 1470 and Best Available Control Technology (BACT) would ensure that potential health risk impacts related to the Project's emergency generator would be less than significant. As the Project would not contain substantial TAC sources and is consistent with the CARB and SCAQMD guidelines, the Project would not result in the exposure of off-site sensitive receptors to carcinogenic or toxic air contaminants that exceed the maximum incremental cancer risk of 10 in one million or an acute or chronic hazard index of 1.0, and potential TAC impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. As the Project would not request in significant air quality impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, specifically TACs, no mitigation measures are required.

4.3.1.3 Consistency with Air Quality Management Plan and Other Plans

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to implementation of an applicable air quality management plan would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The determination of AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of the proposed Project on air quality in the Air Basin. While development of the Project would result in short-term regional impacts, Project implementation would not have a significant long-term impact on the region's ability to meet state and federal air quality standards. The Project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 and would implement all necessary feasible mitigation measures for control of NO_X (as discussed below in

Section 4.4.1). In addition, the Project would be consistent with the AQMP goals and policies regarding fugitive dust control. The Project is also considered consistent with the AQMP because: its construction and operational emissions would be less than significant; Project Design Feature AIR-1 requires implementation of emission control measures; and the Project is consistent with SCAG's population growth projections. The Project's long-term influence would be consistent with the goals and policies of the AQMP and is, therefore, considered consistent with SCAQMD's AQMP.

In addition, the Project would be consistent with the land use designations in the General Plan of the City of Long Beach, and more specifically, the Downtown Shoreline Plan. Further, the Project would meet or support relevant air quality policies set forth in the City's General Plan Air Quality Element, including those aimed at reducing pollutant and particulate emissions, reducing energy consumption, and promoting environmental sustainability. As such, impacts related to conflicts with an applicable air quality plan would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with consistency with an air quality plan have been identified.

4.3.1.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's contribution to cumulative impacts related to an increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

According to the SCAQMD, individual construction projects that exceed their recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts would cause a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions for those pollutants for which the Air Basin is in non-attainment. As discussed above in Section 4.3.1.1, the Project's construction-related daily emissions of most criteria pollutants would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional or localized significance thresholds; in addition, as discussed below in Section 4.4.1, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1 to reduce the Project's construction-related daily emissions of NO_X, all construction impacts would be less than significant level. Accordingly, the Project's contribution to cumulative construction-related regional and localized

emissions would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Per SCAQMD rules and mandates, as well as the CEQA requirement that potentially significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, all construction projects Air Basin-wide would comply with these same requirements (i.e., SCAQMD Rule 403) and would implement all feasible mitigation measures when potentially significant impacts are identified. Additionally, construction activities with respect to each related project would not result in a long-term (i.e., 70-year) substantial source of TAC emissions. In addition, an HRA is not required for short-term construction emissions. As such, cumulative toxic emission impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

According to the SCAQMD, if an individual project results in air emissions of criteria pollutants that exceed SCAQMD's recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, then the project would also result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of these criteria pollutants. Operational emissions from the Project would not exceed any of SCAQMD's regional or localized significance thresholds at Project buildout. Therefore, the emissions of non-attainment pollutants and precursors generated by Project operation would not be cumulatively considerable.

With respect to TAC emissions, neither the Project nor any of the related projects (which include residential, commercial/retail, hotel, office, and restaurant uses), would represent a substantial source of TAC emissions. The Project and related projects would be consistent with the recommended screening level siting distances for TAC sources set forth in CARB's Land Use Guidelines, as well as SCAQMD Regulation XIV that specifically addresses TAC emissions and has resulted in substantial Air Basin-wide TAC emissions reductions. As such, cumulative TAC emissions during long-term operations would be less than significant, and the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. As cumulative air quality impacts have not been identified, no mitigation measures would be required.

4.3.2 Cultural Resources

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Additional thresholds of significance related to cultural resource impacts are addressed above in Section 4.2.2.

4.3.2.1 Historic Resources—Indirect Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's indirect impacts to historic resources located off-site would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Two off-site historic resources are located in the Project vicinity: the Ocean Center Building, located west of the Project Site across Pine Avenue, and the Breakers, located east of the Project Site at 200–220 East Ocean Boulevard. Implementation of the Project would not impact the historic integrity of either the Ocean Center Building or the Breakers with regard to their location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association.[42] While the Project would alter the setting adjacent to these two historic properties, the change is not extensive enough for either the Ocean Center Building or the Breakers to lose their overall integrity or historic status, particularly since the original setting around both buildings has been substantially altered since their construction in the 1920s. The Ocean Center Building and the Breakers are also sufficiently large and separated from the Project Site that they would remain distinguishable and distinct along Ocean Boulevard. The Project would also respect the continuous line of Victory Park and would be set back from the street, in line with both the Ocean Center Building and the Breakers.

   Overall, the Project would continue the trend of changes to the area around the Ocean Center Building and the Breakers, but not to the extent that the integrity of these historic resources would be materially impacted. The Project Site itself has not been part of the historic setting of the nearby buildings since the Jergins Trust Building was demolished, and by reopening the Jergins Trust Tunnel, the Project would have a positive impact on the historic setting of the buildings. Indirect impacts on historic resources would be less than significant.

---

[42] *Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b), integrity is the ability of a resource to convey its historic significance through its physical features and is defined by the National Park Service as "the authenticity of property's historic identity, evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property's historic period."*

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with indirect impacts to historic resources have been identified.

4.3.2.2 Cumulative Historic Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to cumulative historic impacts would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. While the majority of the related projects are located a fair distance from the Project Site and are not considered historic resources, Related Project No. 7, the Ocean Center redevelopment project, is located across Pine Avenue west of the Project Site; and Related Project No. 47, The Breakers redevelopment, involves the adaptive reuse of historic buildings. As discussed above in Section 4.3.2.1, Project-related impacts associated with the historic resources adjacent to the Project Site would be less than significant. To the extent that any related projects have the potential to affect the integrity of historic resource(s), mitigation would be required. In particular, any improvements to the Breakers building would be subject to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which is generally considered as mitigated to a less than significant level. Therefore, the Project would not result in any incremental increase in impacts to historic resources, and the Project's impacts to historic resources would not be cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with cumulative impacts to historic resources have been identified.

4.3.3 Greenhouse Gasses

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have a potentially significant impact related to greenhouse gasses if it would: (a) generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; or (b) conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 recommends that lead agencies consider several factors in determining the significance of project-related GHG emissions, including: the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions; whether the project exceeds an applicable significance threshold; and the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a reduction or mitigation of GHGs.

Lead agencies have the discretion to establish significance thresholds for their respective jurisdictions, as long as any selected threshold is supported by substantial evidence (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.7(c)).

In the absence of any adopted, numeric threshold, the significance of the Project's GHG emissions is evaluated in a manner consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2) by considering whether the Project would comply with applicable regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. For this Project, as a land use development project, the most directly applicable adopted regulatory plan to reduce GHG emissions is the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, which is designed to achieve regional GHG reductions from the land use and transportation sectors as required by SB 375 and the State's long-term climate goals. This analysis also considers consistency with regulations or requirements adopted by the 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan and subsequent plans and the City of Long Beach's Sustainability City Action Plan.

It is noted that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative in nature and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis.[43] Moreover, the CEQA Guidelines were amended in response to SB 97 to specify that compliance with a GHG emissions reduction plan renders a cumulative impact insignificant. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact will not be cumulatively considerable if the project would comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements to avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area of the project.[44] Thus, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3) allows a lead agency to make a less than significant finding for GHG emissions if a project complies with adopted programs, plans, policies and/or other regulatory strategies to reduce GHG emissions.[45]

---

[43] *See, generally, CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f); see also Letter from Cynthia Bryant, Director of the Office of Planning and Research to Mike Chrisman, Secretary for Natural Resources, dated April 13, 2009.*

[44] *14 CCR Section 15064(h)(3).*

[45] *See, for example, San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, CEQA Determinations of Significance tor Projects Subject to ARB's GHG Cap-and-Trade Regulation, APR—2030 (June 25, 2014), in which the SJVAPCD "determined that GHG emissions increases that are covered under ARB's Cap-and-Trade regulation cannot constitute significant increases under CEQA…" Further, SCAQMD has taken this position in CEQA documents it has produced as a lead agency. SCAQMD has prepared three Negative Declarations and one Draft Environmental Impact Report that demonstrate SCAQMD has applied its 10,000 MTCO$_2$e/yr. significance threshold in such a way that GHG emissions covered by the Cap-and-Trade Program do not constitute emissions that must be measured against the threshold. See: SCAQMD, Final Negative Declaration for: Ultramar Inc. Wilmington Refinery Cogeneration Project, SCH No. 2012041014 (October 2014); SCAQMD, Final Negative Declaration tor Phillips 66 Los Angeles*

(Footnote continued on next page)

Project Design Features

The Project incorporates a number of features to support and promote sustainability. "Green" principles have been incorporated in the Project to comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance (Ordinance No. ORD-09-0013), and the Project has been designed to achieve the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED® Silver certification. The following Project Design Feature GHG-1, which includes energy conservation, transportation, waste reduction, and other related measures, is proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to ensure the Project does not lead to significant impacts with respect to GHG emissions:

Project Design Feature GHG-1: The design of the new buildings shall incorporate features of the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) program to be capable of meeting the standards of LEED Silver® or equivalent green building standards under LEED v4. Specific sustainability features that are integrated into the Project design to enable the Project to achieve LEED Silver® certification will include, but are not limited to the following:

a. Meeting or exceeding Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code baseline standard requirements by 10 percent for energy efficiency, based on the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards requirements.

b. Use of Energy Star–labeled products and appliances.

c. Use of light-emitting diode (LED) lighting or other energy-efficient lighting technologies, such as occupancy sensors or daylight harvesting and dimming controls, where appropriate, to reduce electricity use.

d. Use of high-efficiency Energy Star-rated dishwashers and clothes washers where appropriate.

e. Incorporation of generous operable windows and high-performance window glazing; and use of natural light.

f. Provision of conduit that is appropriate for future photovoltaic and solar thermal collectors.

Refinery Carson Plant—Crude Oil Storage Capacity Project, SCH No. 2013091029 (December 2014); Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for Toxic Air Contaminant Reduction for Compliance with SCAQMD Rules 1420.1 and 1402 at the Exide Technologies Facility in Vernon, CA, SCH No. 2014101040 (December 2014); and Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Breitburn Santa Fe Springs Blocks 400/700 Upgrade Project, SCH No. 2014121014 (April 2014).

g. Installation of a separate water meter (or submeter), flow sensor, and master valve shutoff for irrigated landscape areas totaling 5,000 square feet and greater.

h. Provision of on-site recycling containers to promote the recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable materials and adequate storage areas for such containers during construction and after the building is occupied.

i. Use of building materials with a minimum of 10 percent recycled-content for the construction of the Project.

j. Water-efficient plantings with drought-tolerant species; and

k. Pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly design with short-term and long-term bicycle parking.

Also refer to Project Design Feature TRA-2 detailed in Section 4.3.5 below, which describes the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program proposed as part of the Project. TDM measures would include bicycle parking, bicycle rental, an active transportation-oriented ground floor, wayfinding signage, end-of-trip bicycle facilities, car share parking, car share membership, a guaranteed ride home program, pre-loaded transit cards/bike share passes, unbundled parking, hotel confirmation with multi-modal information, and in-room transportation options.

In addition, as previously described, the Project would include a stormwater capture and reuse system designed to accommodate up to 3,102 cubic feet of stormwater and a flow rate of up to 0.28 cubic feet per second. This system would include underground steel reinforced polyethylene detention tanks with an irrigation reuse pump. The detention system would retain stormwater until it reaches the overflow pipe that connects to the existing storm drain system. The treated stormwater may be used for on-site irrigation, which would reduce water demand.

4.3.3.1 GHG Emissions

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to GHG emissions, in the context of consistency with state, SCAG, and City of Long Beach GHG emission reduction goals and objectives (discussed below in Section 4.3.3.2), would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project's construction and operational activities would generate human activity-related GHG emissions, as summarized below.

Construction

As shown in Table IV.C-4 on page IV.C-47 of the Draft EIR, the GHG emissions from Project construction are estimated at 1,931 metric tons (MT) measured as an equivalent mass of carbon dioxide (CO_2e), or 64 $MTCO_2e$ per year when amortized over the 30-year lifetime of the Project as recommended by SCAQMD.

Operation

As detailed in Revised Table IV.C-5 on page II-10 of the Final EIR, Project operations would generate the following estimated annual GHG emissions: less than 1 $MTCO_2e$ from area sources; 2,015 $MTCO_2e$ from electricity and natural gas usage (a 4-percent reduction in energy emissions compared to a Project without Reduction Measures); 2,015 $MTCO_2e$ from mobile sources (which accounts for a 61-percent reduction in mobile source emissions when taking into account the Project's specific characteristics and incorporation of CAPCOA measures to reduce VMT, discussed below); 1 $MTCO_2e$ from stationary sources; 64 $MTCO_2e$ from solid waste generation (which accounts for a 69-percent recycling/diversion rate, consistent with the current diversion rate within the City of Long Beach); and 80 $MTCO_2e$ related to water usage and wastewater generation (which represents a reduction of approximately 18 percent in comparison to a Project without Reduction Measures).

Combined Construction and Operational Impacts

When taking into consideration implementation of the Project's GHG reducing measures, including the requirements set forth in the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance and full implementation of current State mandates, the GHG emissions associated with the Project would equal 64 $MTCO_2e$ per year during construction and 4,175 $MTCO_2e$ per year during operation, for a combined total of 4,239 $MTCO_2e$ per year. The Project's emissions of 4,239 MTCO2e would be approximately 45 percent below the emissions generated by the Project without implementation of GHG reducing features and strategies. With implementation of the Project's design, sustainability, site, and land use characteristics, combined with compliance with regulatory requirements (discussed below in Section 4.3.3.2), impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with greenhouse gasses have been identified.

4.3.3.2 Consistency with Applicable Plans and Policies

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to consistency with applicable plans and policies addressing GHG emissions would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The following summarizes the Project's compliance with or exceedance of the performance-based standards outlined in applicable GHG reduction plans and policies.

Climate Change Scoping Plan

Table IV.C-6 on page IV.C-53 of the Draft EIR provides an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category to determine how the Project would be consistent with or exceed the reduction actions/strategies outlined in the California Air Resources Board's (CARB) 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan and First Update.[46] The plans and policies evaluated in the EIR include compliance with various State Senate and Assembly Bills, applicable requirements set forth in the California Code of Regulations, fuel standards, CARB regulations, SCAQMD rules, and Title 24 energy requirements, among others. Regarding the latter, for example, the Project would meet or exceed Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and incorporate energy-efficient design methods and technologies, such as high-performance window glazing, undergrounding parking to reduce heat island effects, high-efficiency domestic heaters, and enhanced insulation to minimize solar heat gain. As discussed therein, the Project would be consistent with the GHG reduction-related actions and strategies of these plans.

2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

Project consistency with various aspects of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS was assessed to determine the extent to which the Project would help fulfill and exceed the SCAG region's portion of SB 375 compliance with respect to meeting the State's GHG emission reduction goals. As it relates to consistency with the integrated growth forecast, the Project's estimated 588 net new employees would constitute approximately 0.3 percent of the Subregion's employment forecasted in 2022.[47] Accordingly, the Project's employment generation would be consistent with the employment projections contained in the 2016–2040

[46] *CARB, 2014 Update, May 2014, p. 4.*

[47] *Long Beach Unified School District, Commercial/Industrial Development School Fee Justification Study, March 7, 2018, Table 4.*

RTP/SCS. The Project also would support increased use of alternative fuel vehicles through implementation of a TDM Program that would include strategies to promote non-auto travel and reduce the use of single-occupant vehicle trips. Such TDM measures would include the provision of bicycle parking, showers and lockers; rideshare parking spaces; wider sidewalks and lighting to encourage walking; and the display of information (signage) to promote the use of alternative transportation. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with this aspect of the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. The Project would further support improved energy efficiency through achievement of LEED® Silver, which would result in energy usage exceeding Title 24 energy efficiency requirements. Accordingly, the Project would be consistent with the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS energy efficiency strategies and policies.

Regarding consistency with VMT reduction strategies and policies, the Project characteristics listed below are consistent with the CAPCOA guidance document, *Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures*, which identifies the VMT and vehicle trips reductions for the Project Site relative to the standard trip and VMT rates in CalEEMod and which corresponds to a reduction in relative GHG emissions.[48] Measures applicable to the Project are listed below, and a brief description of the Project's relevance to each measure is provided.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-1—Increase Density:** Increased density, measured in terms of persons, jobs, or dwelling units per unit area, reduces emissions associated with transportation as it reduces the distance people travel for work or services and provides a foundation for the implementation of other strategies, such as enhanced transit services. The Project would increase the site density from 0 jobs per acre to approximately 440 jobs per acre.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-4—Increase Destination Accessibility:** The Project Site is located in Downtown Long Beach. Access to the Downtown Long Beach employment center would reduce vehicle trips and VMT compared to the statewide average and would result in corresponding reductions in transportation-related emissions as a result of the Project.

- **CAPCOA Measure LUT-5—Increase Transit Accessibility:** The Project would be located within 0.15 mile of the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach station. The Project would also provide adequate bicycle parking spaces for guest and commercial uses to encourage utilization of alternative modes of transportation.

[48] *CAPCOA, Quantifying Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures, 2010.*

- **CAPCOA Measure SDT-1—Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements:** The Project would provide pedestrian access that minimizes barriers and links the Project Site with existing or planned external streets to encourage people to walk instead of drive. The Project would provide direct access to the existing off-site pedestrian network including existing off-site sidewalks, to encourage and increase pedestrian activities in the area, which would further reduce VMT and associated transportation-related emissions.

- **CAPCOA Measure SDT-2—Traffic Calming Measures:** The Project would provide traffic calming measures to encourage people to walk or bike instead of using a vehicle, including the introduction of several signalized intersections. This mode shift results in a decrease in VMT. Over 75 percent of streets within 0.5 mile of the Project Site include sidewalks with crosswalks.

Overall, the Project would result in an approximately 61-percent reduction in GHG emissions from mobile sources and would therefore be consistent with the reduction in transportation emission per capita provided in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. This reduction is attributable to the Project characteristics of being an infill project near transit that supports multi-modal transportation options.

The Project would also be consistent with the following key GHG reduction strategies in SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, which are based on changing the region's land use and travel patterns: Compact growth in areas accessible to transit; jobs closer to transit; fob growth focused in HQTAs; and biking and walking infrastructure to improve active transportation options and transit access. The Project represents an infill development within an urbanized area that would concentrate new hotel and restaurant uses within an HQTA, which is defined by the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS as generally walkable transit villages or corridors that are within 0.5 mile of a well-serviced transit stop or a transit corridor with 15-minute or less service frequency during peak commute hours. In the Project vicinity, the Metro Blue Line Downtown Long Beach station is located approximately 0.15 mile from the Project Site, and public bus transit service is provided by Metro and Long Beach Transit, with 11 bus lines serving the area. The Project would also provide bicycle storage areas for hotel guests and visitors, and the existing Long Beach Bike Share station located on-site would remain. The Project would thus provide hotel guests and visitors with convenient access to public transit and opportunities for walking and biking, which would facilitate a reduction in VMT and related vehicular GHG emissions, consistent with the goals of SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

In sum, the Project is the type of land use development that is encouraged by the RTP/SCS to reduce VMT and expand multi-modal transportation options in order

for the region to achieve the GHG reductions from the land use and transportation sectors required by SB 375, which, in turn, advances the State's long-term climate policies.[49] By furthering implementation of SB 375, the Project would support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state regulatory requirements. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with the GHG reduction-related actions and strategies contained in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

Sustainable City Action Plan

The Sustainable City Action Plan is intended to guide operational, policy, and financial decisions to create a more sustainable Long Beach through measurable goals and actions. As detailed in Table IV.C-8 on page IV.C-71 of the Draft EIR, the Project would be consistent with applicable GHG-reducing actions from the Sustainable City Action Plan, including those related to buildings and neighborhoods, transportation, waste reduction and water reduction.

Conclusion

As evaluated in the EIR and summarized above, the Project would be consistent with the emission reduction measures discussed within CARB's 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan and subsequent updates. The Project would result in a VMT reduction of approximately 67 percent as a result of various site characteristics, consistent with SCAG's RTP/SCS. Given the Project's consistency with state, SCAG, and City of Long Beach GHG emission reduction goals and objectives, the Project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. In the absence of adopted standards and established significance thresholds, and given this regulatory consistency, it is concluded that the Project's impacts with respect to GHG emissions would be less than significant and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Post-2030 Analysis

CARB's 2017 Update identifies additional GHG reduction measures necessary to achieve the 2030 state target. The Project's design features would advance these goals by reducing VMT, increasing the use of electric vehicles, improving energy efficiency, and reducing water usage. Although the Project would be

[49] *As discussed above, SB 375 legislation links regional planning for housing and transportation with the GHG reduction goals outlined in AB 32.*

consistent with the 2017 Update and any quantified evaluation of post-2030 Project emissions would be speculative, the EIR includes a discussion for informational purposes.

It is reasonable to expect the Project's emissions level (4,239 metric tons of CO_2e per year) to decline as the regulatory initiatives identified by CARB in the First Update are implemented and as other technological innovations occur. Stated differently, the Project's total emissions at build out represents the maximum emissions inventory for the Project as California's emissions sources are being regulated (and foreseeably expected to continue to be regulated in the future) in furtherance of the State's environmental policy objectives. As such, given the reasonably anticipated decline in Project emissions once fully constructed and operational, the Project would be consistent with the goal to reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Further, the Project's consistency with SCAG's RTP/SCS demonstrates that the Project would be consistent with post-2030 GHG reduction goals.

The Project would result in a VMT reduction of approximately 67 percent in comparison to a Project without Reduction Measures and a 61-percent reduction in GHG emissions from mobile sources, which would be consistent with the reduction in transportation emissions per capita provided in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS and the updated SB 375 targets. By furthering implementation of SB 375, the Project would support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state climate targets for 2020 and beyond. For the reasons described above, the Project's post-2030 emissions trajectory is expected to follow a declining trend, consistent with the 2030 and 2050 targets and Executive Orders S-3-05 and B-30-15.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to Project consistency with applicable plans and policies addressing GHG emissions have been identified.

4.3.4 Noise

Per CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would result in impacts with regard to noise if it would 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; (b) exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels; (c) a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project above levels existing without the project; or (d) a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity

above levels existing without the project. Additional thresholds of significance related to noise impacts are addressed below in Sections 4.4.3 and 4.5.1.

With respect to construction activities, the City does not have a quantitative noise limit for construction activities if such activities occur during permitted hours. However, in the context of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, changes in noise levels greater than 5 A-weighted decibels (dBA) are readily noticeable and considered a significant increase. Therefore, the Project would have a significant construction noise impact if:

- Construction activities produce noise exceeding existing ambient exterior sound levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise-sensitive use.

Impacts relative to ground-borne vibration associated with potential building damage would be considered significant if any of the following future events were to occur:

- Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 0.5 peak particle velocity (PPV) at the nearest off-site reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber building.
- Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 0.3 PPV at the nearest off-site engineered concrete and masonry building.
- Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 0.2 PPV at the nearest off-site non-engineered timber and masonry building.
- Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 0.12 PPV at buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage, such as historic buildings.

Construction vibration impacts associated with human annoyance would be significant if the following were to occur:

- Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 75 velocity level in decibel (VdB) at off-site sensitive uses, including residential uses.

The Project would have a significant operational noise impact if:

- The Project causes the ambient noise levels measured at the property line of affected noise-sensitive uses to increase by 3 dBA based on the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) metric to or within the “normally unacceptable” or

"clearly unacceptable" category (see Table IV.D-2 on page IV.D-7 of the Draft EIR for a description of these categories);

- The Project causes the ambient noise levels measured at the property line of affected noise-sensitive uses to increase by 5 dBA CNEL or greater; or

- Project-related operational (i.e., non-roadway) noise sources such as outdoor building mechanical/electrical equipment, outdoor activities, or parking facilities exceed the City Exterior Noise Standard or the measured ambient noise level, whichever is greater.

Project Design Features

The following Project Design Features NOI-1 through NOI-5 are proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to ensure the Project's impacts related to noise remain less than significant:

Project Design Feature NOI-1: Power construction equipment (including combustion engines), whether fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices (consistent with manufacturers' standards). All equipment shall be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise due to worn or improperly maintained parts would be generated.

Project Design Feature NOI-2: Project construction shall not include the use of driven piles systems.

Project Design Feature NOI-3: During operation, Project-related outdoor mechanical equipment shall be designed so as not to exceed 55 dBA at the Project property line, in accordance with the LBMC.

Project Design Feature NOI-4: Project loading dock and trash collection areas shall be designed such that the line of sight between these noise sources and any adjacent noise sensitive land use shall be obstructed to the extent necessary to comply with LBMC.

Project Design Feature NOI-5: Outdoor amplified sound systems shall be designed so as not to exceed a maximum noise level of 80 dBA (L_{eq}) at a distance of 50 feet from the amplified sound system.

To establish baseline noise conditions, existing ambient noise levels were monitored at five representative noise receptor locations in the vicinity of the Project Site, shown on Figure IV.D-1 on page IV.D-13 and described in Table IV.D-5 on page IV.D-14 of the Draft EIR. The nearest noise sensitive use is the Renaissance Hotel located 200 feet north of the Project Site, across Ocean Boulevard (Receptor R2). Residential uses are located approximately 450 feet west of the Project Site on Seaside Way (Receptor R1), 560 feet to

the west on Ocean Boulevard (Receptor R5), and 950 feet to the east on Seaside Way (Receptor R4). Receptor R3 represents an on-site location along the Project Site's western boundary.

4.3.4.1 Temporary or Periodic Increase in Ambient Noise/Noise in Excess of Standards

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise or noise in excess of construction noise standards would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Construction activities would comply with the City of Long Beach Noise Ordinance, Chapter 8.80.202, which restricts construction and demolition activities to the hours of 7:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. Monday through Friday, and 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday.

On-Site Construction Noise

As indicated in Table IV.D-8 on page IV.D-23 of the Draft EIR, the estimated construction-related noise levels would be below the significance threshold of 5 dBA over ambient levels at all sensitive receptor locations. The estimated noise levels represent a worst-case scenario in which all construction equipment was assumed to operate simultaneously and assumed to be located at the construction area nearest to the affected receptors. The analysis also assumes that construction equipment would be equipped with standard noise mufflers and noise shielding to reduce noise. Therefore, temporary noise impacts associated with the Project's on-site construction activities would be less than significant.

Off-Site Construction Noise

The peak period of construction truck trips would be during the mat foundation (concrete pour) phase, when there would be up to a maximum of 415 concrete trucks (830 inbound and outbound trips) per day. Based on an 8-hour daily haul period and a uniform distribution of trips, there would be an average of approximately 52 trucks (104 inbound and outbound trips) per hour. With granting of a permit from the City's Health Department Noise Control Officer, the concrete trucks could operate during nighttime hours (7 P.M.–7 A.M.) during the mat foundation concrete pour phase in order to avoid traffic impacts during daytime hours. Noise generated by these trucks along the anticipated haul route would be approximately 71.7 dBA (hourly L_{eq}), which would be below the significance threshold of 5 dBA above ambient levels measured at Receptor R5 along Ocean Boulevard for both daytime and nighttime hours. As such, significant noise impacts would not be expected from off-site construction traffic.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Although no Project-specific significant impacts related to construction noise have been identified, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 are proposed to reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative construction-related noise impacts (refer to Section 4.5.1, below).

Mitigation Measures

Although Project-specific construction noise impacts would be less than significant, cumulative on-site construction noise levels may result in exceedances of significance thresholds (as discussed in Section 4.5.1, below). Therefore, the following mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative construction-related noise impacts:

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Stationary source equipment that is flexible with regard to relocation (e.g., generators and compressors) shall be located so as to maintain the greatest distance from noise-sensitive land uses, and unnecessary idling of such equipment shall be prohibited.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Loading and unloading of heavy construction materials shall be located on-site and away from noise-sensitive uses, to the extent feasible.

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: A temporary and impermeable 15-foot-high sound barrier shall be erected at the locations listed below. At plan check, building plans shall include documentation prepared by a qualified noise consultant verifying compliance with this measure. The sound barriers would only be required if construction of the related projects specified below overlap with Project construction activities.

- Along the north property line of the Project Site. The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 10-dBA noise reduction at 50 feet of distance. This proposed temporary sound barrier shall be installed if the project proposed at 110 Pine Avenue will have construction activities overlap with Project construction.
- Along the eastern property line of the Project Site. The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a minimum 10-dBA noise reduction at 50 feet of distance as specified by the manufacturer. This proposed temporary sound barrier shall be installed if the project proposed at 210 East Ocean Boulevard will have construction activities overlap with Project construction.

4.3.4.2 Ground-Borne Vibration or Ground-Borne Noise Levels

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to construction vibration associated with potential building damage (for most buildings) and human annoyance would be less than significant. Refer to Section 4.4.3 for a discussion of construction vibration affecting the Jergins Tunnel.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Table IV.D-9 on page IV.D-25 of the Draft EIR provides the estimated vibration velocity levels at the off-site structures nearest to the Project construction area. As indicated, the Ocean Center Building would experience vibration velocities up to 0.042 PPV, and the Breakers would experience vibration levels of less than 0.019 PPV. The estimated vibration velocity levels (from all construction equipment) would be well below the significance thresholds of 0.3 PPV, applicable to the commercial buildings surrounding the Project Site. Therefore, vibration impacts associated with potential building damage during construction would be less than significant.

With regard to vibration causing human annoyance, at a distance of 450 feet, the vibration level from the Project construction area would be attenuated to a maximum of 59 VdB at the nearest off-site residential use (Receptor R1), or well below the 75 VdB significance threshold. Therefore, temporary vibration impacts related to human annoyance period would be less than significant.

An analysis of potential vibration impacts associated with building damage and human annoyance from ground-borne vibration along the local haul route was also conducted. There are existing buildings along the Project's haul route approximately 25 feet from the roadway and that would be exposed to ground-borne vibration levels of approximately 0.016 PPV or 72 VdB, which would be well below the most stringent building damage threshold of 0.12 PPV for buildings extremely susceptible to vibration. Residential uses at Receptor R5 would experience vibration levels of 50 VdB (0.0013 PPV) due to haul truck activity, which is well below the 0.2 PPV significance threshold for building damage and below the 75 VdB threshold for human annoyance. Therefore, potential impacts associated with vibration from haul trucks traveling along the designated haul route would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels have been identified.

4.3.4.3 Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise/Noise in Excess of Standards

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's impacts related to a permanent increase in ambient noise or noise in excess of operational noise standards would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Specific operational noise sources include: (a) on-site stationary noise sources, which consist of outdoor mechanical equipment (i.e., rooftop condenser units), activities associated with the outdoor spaces, and parking facilities; and (b) off-site mobile (roadway traffic) noise sources.

On-Site Stationary Noise Sources

The Project's mechanical equipment would be located on the building's rooftop or in the interior of the building, shielded from nearby land uses to attenuate noise. All mechanical equipment would be designed with appropriate noise control devices, such as sound screen/parapet walls, to comply with the noise limitation requirements set forth in LBMC, which limits the noise from air conditioning equipment to 55 dBA at the property line. Noise from the Project's mechanical equipment would be reduced to below the existing nighttime ambient noise levels due to distance attenuation.

The Project includes various outdoor spaces, including a pool deck and bar (Level 6), an outdoor patio (Level 3), an outdoor planted area (Level 7), private balconies (Levels 26 through 29), and an outdoor restaurant seating area (Level 30). Noise associated with the outdoor spaces would include people talking and background music associated with an amplified sound system possibly used at the outdoor patio area (Level 3), the pool deck and bar (Level 6), and the rooftop (Level 30). Table IV.D-10 on page IV.D-29 of the Draft EIR presents the estimated noise levels associated with use of the outdoor spaces at the off-site sensitive receptors within 500 feet of the site. As indicated, the estimated noise levels at all off-site receptors would be below the significance threshold of 5 dBA (L_{eq}) above ambient noise levels.

As for parking uses, noise generated within the subterranean parking level would be effectively shielded from the off-site sensitive receptors, since the subterranean parking level would be fully enclosed. In addition, off-site valet parking spaces at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage would be used to handle overflow parking during peak demand. Noise from on-site and off-site parking lots would be regulated by LBMC Chapter 8.80, which limits noise generated by motor vehicles within Project parking facilities.

The Project's loading dock and trash compactor would be provided at the southeast corner of the Project Site and would be shielded from off-site sensitive receptors. Delivery trucks and trash collection trucks would access the loading dock and trash compactor from Seaside Way. As shown in Table IV.D-11 on page IV.D-30 of the Draft EIR, the estimated noise levels at off-site receptors would be below the significance threshold.

In summary, noise impacts from all on-site stationary noise sources associated with Project operations would be less than significant.

Off-Site Traffic (Mobile Sources)

Prior to any reductions for pass-by trips or internal capture, the Project is expected to generate a total of 6,224 daily trips, based on the Project's Traffic Study. As shown in Table IV.D-12 on page IV.D-33 of the Draft EIR, Project traffic would result in an increase in noise levels of up to 2.1 dBA along Seaside Way and minimal increases in noise at other study roadway segments under Future Plus Project Conditions. Under Existing Plus Project Conditions, the Project would result in a maximum 2.2 dBA (CNEL) increase in traffic-related noise levels along Seaside Way east of Pine Avenue. Typically, a minimum 3-dBA change in the noise environment (increase and/or decrease) is considered the threshold of human perception, and thus these noise increases generally would not be perceptible. The estimated noise increases also would be below the more stringent 3 dBA significance threshold (applicable when noise levels fall within the normally unacceptable category) under both existing and future scenarios. Therefore, off-site traffic noise impacts would be less than significant.

Composite Noise Level Impacts from Project Operations

An evaluation of the potential composite noise level increase (i.e., noise levels from all noise sources combined) at the sensitive receptor locations was also performed. Table IV.D-13 on page IV.D-34 of the Draft EIR presents the estimated composite noise levels in terms of CNEL at the off-site receptors. As indicated therein, the Project would result in an increase of 1.9 dBA at the nearest off-site residential use (Receptor R1), which would be below the more stringent 3-dBA significance threshold. Therefore, composite noise level impacts associated with Project operations would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to a permanent increase in ambient noise or exceedance of a related noise standard have been identified.

4.3.4.4 Cumulative Operational Noise Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact.* The Project's cumulative impacts related to off-site construction noise, construction vibration, and operational noise would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The potential for cumulative noise impacts to occur is specific to the distance between each related project and their respective stationary noise sources, as well as the cumulative traffic that these projects would add on the surrounding roadway network.

Construction

Off-site construction haul trucks would not result in a cumulative impact as the Project's haul route (Pine Avenue, Ocean Boulevard, West Shoreline Drive, and I-710) does not include sensitive uses. Therefore, cumulative noise due to construction truck traffic from the Project and other related projects would not exceed ambient noise levels along the haul route by 5 dBA at sensitive receptors.

In addition, as ground-borne vibration decreases rapidly with distance, potential vibration impacts due to construction activities are generally limited to buildings/structures located in close proximity of a construction site (i.e., within 50 feet). Since the nearest related project is approximately 100 feet from the Project, there is no potential for a cumulative construction impact with respect to ground-borne vibration, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

Due to provisions set forth in the LBMC that limit stationary source noise from mechanical equipment, noise levels would be less than significant at the property line for each related project. In addition, with implementation of the proposed project design features, noise impacts associated with Project operations would be less than significant. Based on the distance of the related projects from the Project Site and the Project's noise levels, cumulative stationary source noise impacts associated with operation of the Project and related projects would be less than significant.

However, each project would produce traffic volumes that are capable of generating roadway noise impacts. As shown in Table IV.D-12 on page IV.D-33 of the Draft EIR, cumulative traffic volumes would result in a maximum increase of 2.2 dBA CNEL along Seaside Way, east of Pine Avenue under Future Plus Project Conditions. Under Existing Plus Project Conditions, cumulative traffic volumes would also result in a maximum increase of 2.2 dBA CNEL along

Seaside Way, east of Pine Avenue, as indicated in Table IV.D-14 on page IV.D-37. At all other analyzed roadway segments, the increase in cumulative traffic noise would be lower. These increases in cumulative traffic noise would be below the most stringent 3 dBA significance threshold. Therefore, cumulative noise impacts due to off-site mobile noise sources associated with the Project, future growth, and related projects would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts related to cumulative off-site construction noise, construction vibration, or operational noise have been identified.

4.3.5 Transportation/Traffic

As evaluated in the Initial Study and based on then-current CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would have a significant impact related to traffic and access if it would: (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; (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; or (c) conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.[50] Additional thresholds of significance related to transportation/traffic impacts are addressed in Sections 4.1.14 and 4.4.4 herein.

Based on City of Long Beach criteria and as evaluated in the EIR, a significant impact would occur at a signalized study intersection when Project-related traffic causes:

[50] *Following preparation and public circulation of the Initial Study and EIR, CEQA Guidelines Appendix G was revised and now references CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) in the Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 became effective statewide on July 1, 2020, after publication of the Final EIR. As such, the transportation analysis provided in the Project's Traffic Study and presented in the EIR is based on the adopted rules and policies in effect at that time, based on level of service (LOS). The EIR analysis does, however, recognize the benefits of transit-oriented development and address relevant goals of reducing VMT, as discussed elsewhere throughout this document. In addition, a VMT analysis was prepared for the Project for informational purposes in accordance with the City's VMT guidelines adopted after publication of the Final EIR, findings for which are found in Section 4.3.5.5, below.*

- A signalized intersection to degrade from an acceptable LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F; or

- The volume to capacity (V/C) ratio to increase by 0.02 or more at a signalized intersection operating at LOS E or LOS F; or

- Adds traffic to an unsignalized intersection operating at an unacceptable LOS E or LOS F such that is satisfies the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices Peak Hour Volume Warrant for traffic signalization.

With respect to parking, the Project's parking impacts are not considered a significant impact pursuant to SB 743. Nevertheless, the Project would be required to provide parking pursuant to LBMC Chapter 21.41 and the Downtown Shoreline PD-6 Ordinance.

Project Design Features

The Project would implement the following Project Design Features TRA-1 and TRA-2 in accordance with the MMRP to reduce the Project's potential impacts related to traffic and access:

Project Design Feature TRA-1: Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant shall prepare a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, including haul routes and a staging plan, and submit it to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau for review and approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Traffic control for any street/lane closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.

- Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Project Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project.

- Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets.

- Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets daily, as

directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

- Hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends or federal holidays.
- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.
- Construction-related parking and staging of vehicles shall occur on-site to the extent possible but may occur on nearby public and/or private parking lots/garages, as approved by the City Engineer prior to use.
- Appropriate signage and facilities shall be installed to ensure safety and direct pedestrians in the event of any temporary sidewalk closure or the temporary relocation of any bus stop. Any temporary relocation of a bus stop shall be coordinated with Long Beach Transit.
- The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall meet standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD)* as well as City of Long Beach requirements.

Project Design Feature TRA-2: In compliance with LBMC Section 21.64.030(B) 1, 2, and 3, the Project shall implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage the use of public transit and other alternative modes of transportation. These measures shall include, but not be limited to: bicycle parking, bicycle rental, end-of-trip bicycle facilities, an active transportation-oriented ground floor, wayfinding signage, car share parking, car share membership, guaranteed ride home program, pre-loaded transit cards/bike share passes, unbundled parking, hotel confirmation with multi-modal information, in-room information regarding transportation options, website transit and commute information, and designation of a Transportation Coordinator. Details of the proposed TDM Plan are set forth in *100 E. Ocean Boulevard Transportation Demand Management Plan* prepared by Fehr & Peers, provided in Revised Appendix E.3 of the Draft EIR. The TDM Plan shall be verified prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

In accordance with the LBMC, the Project Applicant also would be required to pay a Transportation Improvement Fee. The fee will be determined by the City upon issuance of Project building permits.

4.3.5.1 Performance of the Circulation System

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to the performance of the circulation system would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The following fifteen signalized intersections that provide both regional and local access to the Project Site were analyzed for the A.M. and P.M. peak periods on weekdays. The locations of the study intersections are shown in Figure IV.E-1 on page IV.E-12 of the Draft EIR.

- Intersection No. 1: Pacific Avenue & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 2: Pine Avenue & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 3: Long Beach Boulevard & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 4: Pine Avenue & Shoreline Drive
- Intersection No. 5: Pine Avenue & Seaside Way
- Intersection No. 6: Magnolia Avenue & Broadway
- Intersection No. 7: Golden Shore (I-710 Access) & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 8: Queens Way/Magnolia Avenue & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 9: East Shoreline Drive/Alamitos Avenue & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 10: Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive & Ocean Boulevard
- Intersection No. 11: Alamitos Avenue & Broadway
- Intersection No. 12: Alamitos Avenue & 3rd Street
- Intersection No. 13: Alamitos Avenue & 4th Street
- Intersection No. 14: Alamitos Avenue & 6th Street
- Intersection No. 15: Alamitos Avenue & 7th Street

The Project would generate 4,906 new daily trips, including 320 A.M. peak-hour trips and 372 P.M. peak-hour trips.

Construction

Construction Traffic Impacts

The Project's excavation and grading phase would involve an estimated 180 haul truck trips (round trips) per day, or an average of 21.2 trucks per hour, which based on a passenger car equivalent of 3.0 would yield the equivalent of 64 passenger car trips per hour in each direction or 128 inbound and outbound passenger car trips.[51] As shown in Table 8 of the Traffic Study, with the addition of these trips during the A.M. peak hour (since daily construction activities would end before the P.M. peak hour), the study intersections along the haul route would still operate at LOS A. Therefore, construction traffic impacts to levels of service would be less than significant.

Access and Safety

Any temporary lane closures along Pine Avenue and Seaside Way adjacent to the Project Site that are necessary during Project construction would be coordinated with and approved by the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau. In addition, the sidewalks along Seaside Way and Pine Avenue may be temporarily closed to pedestrians during construction for safety purposes. In accordance with Project Design Feature TRA-1, traffic control would be provided for any street/lane closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and appropriate detour signage would be installed, as appropriate. In addition, access to the Convention Center Walkway would be maintained. Therefore, access and safety impacts during Project construction would be less than significant.

Public Transit

Refer to Section 4.3.5.3 below regarding transit impacts during construction.

[51] *It is noted that the continuous concrete pour planned during the building foundation phase would involve a greater number of haul truck trips; however, that activity would occur over a 12- to 18-hour period beginning on a Friday evening and lasting until Saturday, and thus would occur during off-peak hours. Accordingly, the construction traffic analysis is based on the maximum number of haul trips occurring during the mass excavation and grading phase in order to evaluate the effect of haul trips on typical weekday peak roadway conditions.*

Operation

Intersection Levels of Service

Table IV.E-5 on page IV.E-30 of the Draft EIR summarizes the peak hour LOS results at the 15 study intersections under Existing Plus Project Conditions. As shown, Project traffic would not cause a significant impact at any of the study intersections. All study intersections would operate acceptably at LOS D or better, except for Intersection No. 10, Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard, which would operate at LOS E during the P.M. peak period, although the Project-related increase in traffic would not meet the applicable significance threshold. Based on the above, under Existing Plus Project Conditions, traffic impacts at all 15 study intersections would be less than significant during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours.

Table IV.E-6 on page IV.E-32 of the Draft EIR summarizes the intersection levels of service under Future Plus Project Conditions during the weekday peak hours. As shown, under Future Plus Project Conditions, the Project would not cause a significant impact at any of the study intersections, and 11 of the 15 study intersections would continue to operate acceptably at LOS D or better. Operating conditions at the remaining four study intersections (Intersection No. 10, Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive & Ocean Boulevard; Intersection No. 11, Alamitos Avenue & Broadway; Intersection No. 13, Alamitos Avenue & 4th Street; and Intersection No. 15, Alamitos Avenue & 7th Street) would be LOS E or F during the P.M. peak hour, although the Project-related increases in traffic at these intersections would not meet the applicable significance thresholds. In summary, under Future Plus Project Conditions, traffic impacts at all 15 study intersections would be less than significant during both the A.M. and P.M. peak hours.

Public Transit/Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Refer to Section 4.3.5.3 below regarding operational impacts related to transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Access and Circulation

Vehicular access to the Project garage would be provided via driveways along Seaside Way and Pine Avenue, with primary access from Seaside Way. These driveways would provide access to the valet parking areas on Level 1 and subterranean Level P1. In addition, two existing curb cuts on Ocean Boulevard would be utilized for passenger drop-off and valet service at the main hotel

entrance on Level 3.[52] All visitors arriving by personal vehicle would be required to valet their vehicle. Deliveries, trash, and other service vehicles would access the building from Seaside Way via a loading bay at the southeast corner of the Project Site. As evaluated in the Traffic Study, Project access was determined to be adequate.

Parking

A strict application of the LBMC parking requirements would require 1,052 parking spaces for the Project. However, since the hotel's parking demand would peak at different times of the day or week, this parking requirement would result in an oversupply of parking, and a shared parking study was conducted (see the Parking Memo provided in Appendix E.2 of the Draft EIR).

The Project would provide 151 parking spaces within the on-site garage, and the Applicant has arranged for off-site parking at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage located at 300 Seaside Way, which would provide 280 overflow spaces. According to the shared parking analysis, the scenario with the greatest estimated parking demand would be a worst-case weekend event entailing full occupancy of the hotel, restaurant, and event space. During a worst-case weekend event, the estimated parking demand would be 304 spaces, which includes 48 spaces for employees, resulting in a need for 256 guest spaces. Accounting for a 20-space parking buffer required by the City, 125 off-site parking spaces would be required. Accordingly, a surplus of 155 parking spaces would remain available at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage. Furthermore, as set forth in Project Design Feature TRA-2, the Project's TDM Plan would reduce vehicular trips, which in turn would reduce parking demand.

The Project meets the PRC Section 21099 definition of an employment center project as a commercially zoned site with a proposed FAR of greater than 0.75:1 within a transit priority area and meets the PRC Section 21099 definition of an infill site as a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed. Therefore, pursuant to SB 743, the Project's parking impacts shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment as a matter of law.

[52] *Additionally, the City has indicated it will impose a condition of approval requiring a second valet staging area at one of the other Project entrances along either Pine Avenue or Seaside Way during peak hours/peak events to prevent any queue spillback onto Ocean Boulevard.*

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with performance of the circulation system, including conflicts with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, have been identified.

4.3.5.2 Regional Transportation System/Congestion Management Plan

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to consistency with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (Metro) Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Two CMP arterial monitoring locations are located in proximity to the Project Site: East Shoreline Drive/Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard (Intersection No. 10) and Alamitos Avenue and 7th Street (Intersection No. 15). At Intersection No. 10, the Project would add 64 A.M. peak hour trips and 74 P.M. peak-hour trips. At Intersection No. 15, the Project would add 48 A.M. peak hour trips and 54 P.M. peak-hour trips. Since the Project would add 50 or more trips at the identified CMP intersections during the A.M. peak hour and/or P.M. peak hour, a CMP intersection traffic impact analysis was conducted. Per CMP guidelines, impacts are considered significant at CMP intersections if the Project increases V/C by 0.02 and causes LOS F, or if the facility is already at LOS F and the Project increases the intersection V/C by 0.02. Since Project traffic would not increase V/C by 0.02 at these intersections, impacts on CMP monitoring intersections would be less than significant.

The nearest mainline freeway monitoring location is CMP Station No. 1078: I-710 Freeway between Pacific Coast Highway and Willow Street. The Project is not anticipated to add 150 or more trips in either direction to any freeway facility during the A.M. or P.M. peak hours. Therefore, a CMP freeway traffic impact analysis was not required.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with the regional transportation system and CMP consistency have been identified.

4.3.5.3 Public Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Public Transit

Public transportation in the Project area is provided by Metro and Long Beach Transit. The Project is located approximately 650 feet from the First Street Transit Gallery (also referred to as the Long Beach Transit Mall), and 11 bus lines serve the area.

Construction

The bus stop on Ocean Boulevard near Pine Avenue would be permanently relocated in coordination with Long Beach Transit. Additionally, temporary relocation of the Pine Avenue bus stop at Seaside Way may be needed due to temporary sidewalk closures for pedestrian safety during construction. Appropriate detour signage would be installed per Project Design Feature TRA-1, and a new temporary bus stop would be provided in coordination with Long Beach Transit to ensure uninterrupted service. Therefore, impacts to transit service during Project construction would be less than significant.

Operation

The Project would generate an estimated 92 transit riders in the A.M. peak hour and 102 transit riders in the P.M. peak hour. The Project's estimated transit riders would utilize up to 1.6 percent of available transit capacity during peak hours; given the availability of public transit in the Project area, it is anticipated that the existing transit service in the Project area would be able to accommodate the Project-generated transit trips. Additionally, transit service providers routinely adjust service up to two times a year to reflect demand, and additional transit riders would increase farebox recovery on transit lines. Therefore, the existing public transit system would not be substantially impacted by the Project, and impacts to the public transit system would be less than significant.

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Vehicular Safety

There are no existing or proposed bike routes adjacent to the Project Site, although there are existing bike lanes on Seaside Way that terminate eastbound at Pine Avenue. The bike share docking station currently located at the northwest corner of the Project Site would remain. TDM measures would be implemented as part of the Project and would include bicycle parking (bike racks located outside and secure bike parking within the garage), end-of-trip bicycle facilities (bike storage, showers, lockers, and a maintenance station) for employees, and the availability of bike share passes for guests. Given that

Project access would be adequate (as evaluated above) and the provision of bike facilities, including retention of the on-site bike share station, the Project would not substantially increase hazards to bicyclists, pedestrians, or vehicles or negatively affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Impacts related to bicycle and pedestrian safety and facilities would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant impacts associated with public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities have been identified.

4.3.5.4 Cumulative Traffic Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's impacts related to cumulative traffic impacts would be less than significant.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*.

Construction

Like the Project, construction workers associated with the 57 related projects would generally arrive and depart their respective construction sites during off-peak hours. In addition, it is anticipated that the haul routes for the related projects would be approved by the City according to the location of the individual construction sites and the ultimate disposal destination(s) in a manner that reduces impacts to the local and regional roadway systems as much as possible. The City's established review process takes into consideration overlapping construction projects and would balance haul routes to minimize the impacts of cumulative hauling on any particular roadway.

As evaluated in the Traffic Study and summarized above, the Project's construction traffic impacts would be less than significant, and all study intersections along the haul route would continue to operate at LOS A during the A.M. peak-hour (daily construction activities would end before the P.M. peak hour). Accordingly, the Project's impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative construction-related traffic impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The traffic models used in the Project analysis incorporate forecasted traffic increases due to ambient growth as well as the related projects identified in the area through the year 2022. Furthermore, the CMP analysis presented above

evaluates traffic impacts on a larger, regional scale. Therefore, cumulative impacts on intersections and the regional transportation system as a result of the Project are accounted for in the analysis summarized above.

Intersection Levels of Service

Under cumulative conditions (Future Plus Project Conditions), none of the study intersections would experience significant impacts as a result of the Project. Therefore, the Project's impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts at all study intersections would be less than significant.

Regional Transportation System

As discussed in Section 4.3.5.2, since Project traffic would not increase V/C by 0.02 at the CMP intersections, impacts on CMP monitoring intersections would be less than significant. Additionally, the Project would not add 150 or more trips (in either direction) during the A.M. or P.M. weekday peak periods at the nearest mainline freeway monitoring location. Therefore, the Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact at these locations.

Public Transit

As with the Project, the related projects would generate an overall increase in transit ridership. However, this effect is a considered a positive impact and is consistent with City land use and transportation policies to reduce traffic. Given the availability of public transit in the Project area, the anticipated increased transit ridership associated with the Project and related projects is not expected to exceed the capacity of transit systems. Thus, Project impacts with regard to transit would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Access and Circulation

Due to the distance of the related projects from the Project Site, it is not anticipated that the Project, when combined with the related projects, would create a significant cumulative impact relative to access and circulation. In addition, the related projects would be subject to review by the City for compliance with standard requirements regarding adequate access and circulation. Therefore, the Project's impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts to access and circulation would be less than significant.

Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Vehicular Safety

As discussed in Section 4.3.5.3, Project impacts related to bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be less than significant. Future related projects would be subject to City review to ensure adequate safety specifications and facilities for bikes and pedestrians, including standards for sight distance, sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian movement controls. Thus, Project impacts with regard to bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Parking

As with the Project, all related projects would be subject to City review to ensure adequate parking is provided. In addition, pursuant to SB 743, the Project's parking impacts shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment as a matter of law. Therefore, Project impacts with regard to parking would not be cumulatively considerable, and cumulative parking impacts would be less than significant.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant cumulative traffic impacts have been identified.

4.3.5.5 Supplemental Vehicle Miles Traveled Analysis

State law SB 743, signed into law in 2013, directed the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to consider different metrics for identifying transportation impacts under CEQA to more effectively balance congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, the promotion of public health through active transportation, and reductions of greenhouse gas emissions. The Final OPR Technical Advisory was released in December 2018 and identified VMT as the preferred metric for transportation impact analyses as part of CEQA assessments. The City of Long Beach adopted local guidelines for VMT assessments in June 2020, after publication of the Final EIR for the Project.[53]

The City's VMT guidelines include a list of screening criteria that screen projects with certain characteristics out of the requirement to conduct a project-level assessment under the presumption that those projects will result in a less-than-

[53] *City of Long Beach, Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines, June 2020; available at www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/environmental/environmental-planning/tia-guidelines, accessed January 2021.*

significant impact. Projects located within a Transit Priority Area (TPA), as defined in PRC Section 21099, may be screened from a full VMT assessment and are presumed to result in a less-than-significant VMT impact. A TPA is defined as a 0.5-mile area around an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor.

In addition, projects can be screened from further VMT analysis and are presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact when they meet the following requirements outlined in the City's guidelines for screening: (1) the project is located within 0.5 mile of high-quality transit; (2) the project has a minimum FAR of 0.75; (3) the project shall not supply more parking than is required by the City code; (4) the project is consistent with the RTP/SCS land use assumptions; and (5) the project does not replace affordable housing with market-rate housing units.

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact*. The Project's VMT impact is presumed to be less than significant based on the City's screening criteria under its adopted VMT guidelines.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site is located within 0.5 mile of the Downtown Long Beach Blue Line Station and within 0.5 mile of a high-quality transit corridor and thus is located in a TPA. The Project also meets the City's other screening criteria, as follows: (1) as indicated, the Project Site is located within 0.5 mile of high-quality transit; (2) the Project has a proposed FAR of 14.3:1; (3) the Project would include the minimum amount of parking required by code; (4) the Project, as a high-density commercial mixed-use hotel and restaurant development along a commercial, high-quality transit corridor and regional center that serves a variety of nearby visitor-serving uses, including convention, entertainment, cruise, and other tourist-related uses as described in Section 4.3.3.2, above, is consistent with the applicable RTP/SCS land use assumptions; and (5) the Project would replace an existing surface parking lot and improve an existing public park space and therefore would not replace any affordable housing units. Because the Project is located in a TPA and meets the City VMT guidelines' additional screening eligibility, this Project is eligible to be screened from a full VMT assessment and is presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. No mitigation measures are required, as no significant VMT impacts have been identified.

4.4 Environmental Impacts Found in the EIR Not to be Significant After Mitigation

The following impacts were concluded in the EIR to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Based on that analysis and other evidence in the administrative record relating to the Project, the City finds and determines that the mitigation measures described in the EIR will reduce potentially significant impacts identified for the following environmental impact categories to below the level of significance. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project which mitigate or avoid each of the following significant effects on the environment.

4.4.1 Air Quality

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to air quality if the project were to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Additional thresholds of significance related to air quality impacts, including numeric thresholds established by the SCAQMD, are addressed above in Sections 4.1.3 and 4.3.1.

4.4.1.1 Air Quality Violations

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impact related to the violation of an air quality standard or a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, specifically with regard to construction-related regional NO_X emissions, would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-1.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As discussed above in Section 4.3.1, the Project's construction-related and operational emissions of most criteria pollutants would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional or localized significance thresholds, nor would the Project result in any significant impact related to TACs, sensitive receptors, or implementation of an air quality plan. However, mobile source emissions resulting from the use of construction equipment would exceed the SCAQMD regional significance threshold for NO_X, and mitigation measures would be required to reduce emissions to a less than significant level. More specifically, the Project's grading and excavation activities would result in an exceedance of the NO_X regional threshold mainly due to the use of heavy equipment and trucks exporting soil. In order to reduce NO_X emissions to a less than significant level, proposed Mitigation Measure AIR-1, detailed below, would require use of USEPA Tier 4 emissions-compliant excavators and loaders during

soil excavation and grading activities. As shown in Table IV.A-3 on page IV.A-35 of the Draft EIR, the maximum mitigated regional construction emissions would not exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds. Thus, with mitigation, NO_X emissions would be reduced to a less than significant level.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project's construction activities would result in an exceedance of the NO_X regional threshold, Mitigation Measure AIR-1 will be required. Under Mitigation Measure AIR-1, Tier 4 construction equipment would be required, which would reduce maximum regional NO_X emissions by approximately 17 percent. With implementation of this measure, the impact will be reduced and all of the Project's impacts related to the violation of an air quality standard or a substantial contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure AIR-1: *Tier 4 Final Construction Equipment.* The Project shall utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds CARB and USEPA Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards for excavators and loaders during Project excavation and grading activities. To the extent possible, pole power shall be made available for use with electric tools, equipment, lighting, etc. These requirements shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's BACT documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

4.4.2 Cultural Resources

Under CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project could have potentially significant impacts related to cultural resources if it would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. Additional thresholds of significance related to cultural resource impacts are addressed above in Section 4.2.2.

4.4.2.1 Historic Resources—Direct Impacts

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's direct impacts to historic resources would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures HIS-1 through HIS-2.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Project Site was the former location of the Jergins Trust Building, a Long Beach Historic Landmark. An underground arcade and tunnel (the Jergins Tunnel) extended from below the building to the northern side of Ocean Boulevard. The northern entrance to the Jergins Tunnel was closed in 1967, and the Jergins Trust Building itself was demolished in 1988. However, the Jergins Tunnel remains in place and is considered a historic resource.

As part of Project development, the Jergins Trust Tunnel would be reopened and connected to the lower level of the proposed building. Improvements include a new entry lobby adjacent to the tunnel which would feature an interpretive exhibit with signage, salvaged artifacts from the Jergins Trust Building, a wood artifact installation to re-create one wall from available wood artifacts, and an audio/video display. The tunnel would be cleaned, stabilized, and improved to allow public tours to access the tunnel; such improvements may include cleaning and minor repair of the tiled surfaces, improving lighting and ventilation, and a new wall or enclosure at the tunnel's south end connecting to the proposed lobby. The Project therefore has the potential to materially alter historic aspects of the tunnel. In addition, ground movement and vibration from construction of the Project may have the potential to damage the tunnel. These impacts could significantly affect the tunnel.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to historic resources, Mitigation Measures HIS-1 and HIS-2 will be required. Specifically, Mitigation Measure HIS-1 will require all work to be performed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 is generally considered to mitigate potential impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measure HIS-2 will require a Construction Monitoring Plan to ensure the protection of Jergins Trust Tunnel during construction. With implementation of those measures, impacts to the Jergins Trust Tunnel would be sufficiently reduced, and the Project's impacts to historic resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure HIS-1: All work in and around the Jergins Trust Tunnel shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. This includes, among others, using the gentlest means possible for cleaning, retaining distinctive materials and features, and designing alterations and news construction that is compatible with its historic character. Other specific measures to ensure work complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards include the following:

- A qualified professional historic architect or historic preservation consultant that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards shall be retained as part of the Project team. The historic architect or preservation professional shall participate in the design of the Project as it relates to Jergins Trust Tunnel through design development and construction documents to ensure compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.
- The historic architect or preservation professional shall prepare a report at the conclusion of the design development phase of the Project analyzing compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The report should identify and catalog all character defining features of the tunnel and provide recommendations for protection and treatment. The report shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach's preservation staff for their review and approval prior to the issuance of building permits.
- The historic architect or preservation professional shall participate in period monitoring of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards compliance during construction to completion. The monitoring shall include field notes, photographs, and other documentation of the Project as it relates to Jergins Trust Tunnel. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards monitoring may be performed in conjunction with the construction monitoring required pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIS-2.

Mitigation Measure HIS-2: The Applicant shall implement a Construction Monitoring Plan prepared by a qualified structural engineer, historic architect, and/or other professional to ensure the protection of Jergins Trust Tunnel during construction from damage due to underground excavation, pile driving, and general construction processes as well as settlement or earth movement from the removal of adjacent soil and features. Prior to issuance of an earthwork or demolition permit, the Construction Monitoring Plan and protection measures shall be reviewed by a qualified professional historic architect or historic preservation consultant that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to ensure the measures would adequately protect the Jergins Trust Tunnel. The historic architect or historic preservation professional shall participate in monitoring of the tunnel during construction to completion, per the procedures set forth in the Construction Monitoring Plan. The Construction Monitoring Plan shall include the following procedures to:

- Document the baseline conditions of the Jergins Trust Tunnel prior to any ground disturbing activity in a Preconstruction Survey Report;

- Reduce potential impacts from construction activities on the physical features of the tunnel, such as shoring, maximum vibration levels, or other methods;
- Monitor vibration and settlement throughout construction using survey markers or other monitoring devices;
- Determine when construction impacts are occurring, and actions needed to halt, mitigate, repair, and/or avoid these impacts;
- Monitor the Jergins Trust Tunnel with periodic site visits during construction (such as monthly or at specific milestones that have the potential to cause damage), producing field reports with photo and illustrative documentation for each monitoring session;
- Conduct a post-construction survey prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, taking into account any conservation or stabilization work of the tunnel to ensure that significant adverse impacts have not occurred to the tunnel from construction-related activities.

4.4.3 Noise

Per CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would result in significant impacts if it would result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. Additional thresholds of significance related to noise impacts are addressed in Sections 4.3.4 and 4.5.1.

As discussed above in Section 4.3.4, impacts relative to ground-borne vibration associated with potential building damage to historic buildings would be considered significant if Project construction activities cause ground-borne vibration levels to exceed 0.12 PPV at buildings extremely susceptible to vibration damage.

Project Design Features

As detailed in Section 4.3.4, Project Design Features NOI-1 through NOI-5 are proposed as part of the Project and will be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to reduce the Project's noise and vibration impacts.

4.4.3.1 Ground-Borne Vibration or Ground-Borne Noise Levels

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to ground-borne vibration affecting a historic resource would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure HIS-2.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. As part of Project development, the Jergins Trust Tunnel would be reopened by connecting the proposed building to it at the lower level. A new entry lobby would be constructed adjacent to the tunnel, and the tunnel would be cleaned, stabilized, and improved to allow public access. Vibration from these construction activities would have the potential to damage the tunnel. Mitigation Measure HIS-2 would require active vibration monitoring within the tunnel throughout Project construction. Furthermore, all work within the Jergins Trust Tunnel would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 states: "Generally, a project that follows the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior's Standards…shall be considered as mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historical resource." Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure HIS-2 and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, construction-related vibration impacts affecting the Jergins Trust Tunnel would be reduced to a less than significant level.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Since the Project could result in significant impacts related to ground-borne vibration, Mitigation Measure HIS-2 will be required. As discussed above, Mitigation Measure HIS-2 calls for active vibration monitoring within the Jergins Tunnel throughout Project construction and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which is considered to mitigate impacts to historic resources to a less than significant level. With implementation of this measure, the ground-borne vibration impact will be sufficiently reduced, and the Project's impacts to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Section 4.4.2 for the full text of Mitigation Measure HIS-2.

4.4.4 Traffic/Transportation

4.4.4.1 Queuing Analysis

A. *Finding—Less Than Significant Impact with Implementation of Mitigation Measures.* The Project's impacts related to queuing would be less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measure TRA-1.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. The Traffic Study conservatively assumed 378 A.M. peak-hour trips and 430 P.M. peak-hour trips for the queueing analysis, not adjusting to reflect employees who would be required to park off-site and any

visitors who do not to use the on-site valet service.[54] The Project would provide 350 feet of queuing capacity within the two lanes of the driveway loop, excluding the pedestrian crossing. The 95th percentile queue was measured as 530 feet under P.M. peak-hour conditions, which could not be accommodated by the proposed driveway under unrestricted operations. Given breaks that occur between waves of vehicles due to the metering of traffic from upstream traffic signals, vehicles exiting the Project's main driveway could have lower driveway delays and shorter queues when departing the Project Site, which the queuing calculations do not reflect.

As for the possibility of inbound Project traffic spilling back onto Ocean Boulevard, as shown in Table 9 of the Traffic Study, the average number of vehicles per 120-second cycle length is estimated to be 4.1 vehicles per cycle from eastbound Ocean Boulevard. Roughly four vehicles per cycle entering the driveway would not negatively affect operations at Intersection No. 2, Ocean Boulevard and Pine Avenue. In addition, the existing 19-foot-wide lane adjacent to the Project Site provides sufficient width to accommodate a right-turn and through movement at the inbound driveway without impeding traffic on Ocean Boulevard.

Nonetheless, the queuing analysis indicates that peak hours and peak events may pose a capacity shortage at the Project's Ocean Boulevard driveway loop. Therefore, it is recommended that a queuing plan be implemented to ensure efficient valet operations and manage queuing within the driveway loop. More specifically, it is recommended that the hotel provide enough valet staff to facilitate the movement of vehicles after loading and unloading, keep the driveway loop free of obstructions, and respond to queuing issues as they arise. During peak hours and peak events, queuing at the inbound driveway would be monitored, and a second valet staging area in the garage by the Seaside Way driveway would be used to prevent any queue spillback. In situations where the inbound driveway is near capacity, the driveway would be closed to incoming vehicles, and arriving guests would be rerouted to the secondary valet staging area. Additionally, during peak hours outbound guests who valeted their vehicles would be directed to the secondary valet staging area to pick up their vehicles. With such plan in place, adequate queuing capacity would be available to accommodate the 95th percentile queue during peak hours and peak events. Therefore, Mitigation Measure TRA-1 is required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Furthermore, the City has indicated it will impose a condition of

[54] *These trip counts reflect all vehicles potentially entering the main driveway and thus include pass-by trips, but do not include internal capture.*

approval requiring a second valet staging area at one of the other Project entrances along either Pine Avenue or Seaside Way during peak hours/peak events to prevent any queue spillback onto Ocean Boulevard.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Although the City has not adopted a threshold of significance pertaining to vehicle queuing, given the potential for queuing capacity issues at the Ocean Boulevard driveway loop during peak hours and peak events, the Project could result in significant impacts related to queuing, and Mitigation Measure TRA-1 will be required. The queuing plan to be implemented under Mitigation Measure TRA-1 would require use of a secondary valet staging area during peak hours and peak events to prevent any queue spillback onto the public right-of-way. Specifically, as detailed in the Traffic Study, by adding a secondary valet staging area when needed, the number of vehicles using the driveway loop during the P.M. peak hour would be reduced from 430 vehicles per hour to 280 vehicles per hour. The number of vehicles turning right on Ocean Boulevard from Pine Avenue to access the main driveway would be reduced from 207 vehicles per hour to 57 vehicles per hour, or just under two vehicles per signal cycle. This would reduce the outbound queues at the driveway from 530 feet to 206 feet, which could be accommodated by the proposed driveway loop. Thus, with implementation of this measure, the Project's queuing impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: During A.M. and P.M. peak hours and peak events, queuing at the inbound Ocean Boulevard driveway shall be monitored by the hotel's valet staff. When the inbound driveway is observed to be near capacity, a queuing plan shall be implemented to create a secondary valet staging area and prevent any queue spillback onto the public right-of-way. The queuing plan shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau and the Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau for review prior to building permit issuance and approval prior to Certificate of Occupancy.

4.5 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The following impact will remain significant and unavoidable following implementation of all feasible mitigation measures described in the EIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), the City finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible additional mitigation measures or alternatives beyond those identified in the EIR. Consequently, in accordance

with Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared for the Project (see Section 9.0 below).

4.5.1 Noise

As previously discussed, based on CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, a project would result in impacts with regard to noise if it would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. More specifically, a project would have a significant construction noise impact if construction activities produce noise exceeding existing ambient exterior sound levels by 5 dBA or more at a noise-sensitive use.

Refer to Sections 4.3.4 and 4.4.3 for discussion of additional noise and vibration impacts that would be less than significant, either before or after mitigation.

4.5.1.1 Cumulative Construction Noise

A. *Finding—Significant and Unavoidable*. The Project's impacts related to cumulative on-site construction noise would remain significant and unavoidable with implementation of all feasible project design features and mitigation measures.

B. *Facts in Support of Finding*. Noise from construction of development projects is typically localized and has the potential to affect noise-sensitive uses within 500 feet from the construction site. Thus, noise from construction activities for two projects within 1,000 feet of each other can contribute to a cumulative noise impact for receptors located midway between the two construction sites. While the majority of the related projects are located a substantial distance (greater than 1,000 feet) from the Project Site, eight related projects (Related Project Nos. 4, 7, 8, 25, 42, 45, and 48) are within 1,000 feet of the Project Site.

   Out of these projects, cumulative noise impacts at the sensitive uses located between the Project Site and Related Project No. 42 (110 Pine Avenue, approximately 550 feet north of the Project Site) and No. 45 (210 E. Ocean Boulevard, approximately 475 feet west of the Project Site) could occur if construction of these related projects overlaps with Project construction. Construction-related noise levels from the related projects would be intermittent and temporary, and it is anticipated that, as with the Project, the related projects would comply with the construction hours and other relevant provisions set forth in the LBMC. Noise associated with cumulative construction activities would be reduced to the degree reasonably and technically feasible through proposed

mitigation measures for each individual related project and compliance with locally adopted and enforced noise ordinances. Nonetheless, if nearby Related Project No. 42 and 45 were to be constructed concurrently with the Project, significant cumulative construction noise impacts could result. As discussed below, despite Project mitigation, cumulative on-site construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

C. *Mitigation Measures*. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would reduce the Project's on-site construction noise levels to the extent feasible. In particular, implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 (listed in Section 4.3.4.1) would reduce potential cumulative impacts at Receptors R1 and R2. The estimated construction-related noise reductions attributable to Mitigation Measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, although not easily quantifiable, also would reduce noise impacts associated with on-site construction activities to the extent feasible. The minimum 5 dBA noise reduction provided by these mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impacts at the nearest off-site noise-sensitive receptors to a less than significant level. Regardless, the feasible project design features and mitigation measures would not substantially lessen or avoid cumulative impacts related to on-site construction noise. Therefore, the cumulative on-site construction noise impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

Refer to Section 4.3.4.1 for the full text of Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3. Although these Project mitigation measures are not required for Project-specific impacts, they would be implemented in accordance with the MMRP to reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative on-site construction noise impacts. Nonetheless, the cumulative on-site construction noise impact would not be reduced to a less than significant level, and this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.0 Project Alternatives

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, alternatives to the Project were considered that could mitigate or avoid the significant environmental impacts associated with the Project while still achieving the Project's primary objectives. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e) also requires the analysis of a "no project" alternative, and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f) requires an evaluation of alternative location(s) for the project, if feasible. Based on the alternatives analysis, an environmentally superior alternative is to be designated. If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, then the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The Project would result in a significant cumulative impact with respect to construction noise that cannot be feasibly mitigated below significance. The City evaluated five alternatives to the Project based on the Project's significant environmental impacts, the objectives established for the Project, the feasibility of the possible alternatives that were considered, and public input received during the Draft EIR scoping process.

Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), the range of potential alternatives to a project shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Factors that may be taken into account when addressing feasibility and infeasibility are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, social factors, and technical feasibility. The five alternatives considered for the Project include: (i) Alternative 1: No Project/No Build; (ii) Alternative 2: Mixed-Use Alternative; (iii) Alternative 3: Reduced Mixed-Use Alternative; (iv) Alternative 4: PD-6 Zoning Residential Alternative; and (v) Alternative 5: PD-6 Zoning Compliance Office Alternative.

5.1 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) states that a lead agency should identify any alternatives that were considered for analysis but rejected as infeasible and briefly explain the reasons for their rejection. Under the CEQA Guidelines, the factors that may be used to eliminate an alternative from detailed consideration include: (i) the alternative's failure to meet most of the basic project objectives; (ii) the alternative's infeasibility; (iii) or the alternative's inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

The City considered the following alternatives to the Project that were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process:

- **Alternative Project Site:** Under this alternative, the Project would be constructed on the "elephant lot," located at the corner of E. Seaside Way and E. Shoreline Drive, which serves as a surface parking lot for the Long Beach Convention Center. This alternative would interfere with existing leases at this parking lot, result in inadequate parking for special events including the Long Beach Grand Prix, result in a height exceeding the City's General Plan Land Use Element update, and would be inconsistent with the Successor Agency Long Range Property Management Plan. For these reasons, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

- **Full Size Office Alternative:** An alternative was considered to construct 510,000 square feet of office uses along with 17,113 square feet of restaurant uses and 9,887 square feet of retail uses. However, this alternative would have required 2,158 parking spaces which would have necessitated approximately 18

levels of on-site parking which was determined to be infeasible. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration, and a scaled down office alternative (Alternative 5) is instead included below.

- **Medical Office Tower Alternative:** An alternative was considered to construct 510,000 square feet of medical office uses with physical therapy, outpatient surgical, and other medical services, along with 27,000 square feet of retail and restaurant space. However, a preliminary investigation of traffic indicated this alternative would exacerbate the Project's traffic impacts, which would in turn exacerbate operational air quality impacts from mobile emissions and off-site operational noise. Therefore, this alternative was rejected from further consideration.

5.2 Alternative 1: No Project/No Build

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project Alternative for a development project on an identifiable property consists of the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3)(B) states "in certain instances, the No Project Alternative means 'no build' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained." Accordingly, for purposes of this analysis, Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, assumes that the Project would not be approved, and no new development would occur within the Project Site. Thus, the physical conditions of the Project Site would generally remain as they are today. The Project Site is currently developed with a surface parking lot consisting of 80 vehicular parking spaces and an automated pay station, as well as portions of Victory Park. No access to the Jergins Trust Tunnel or improvements to Victory Park would be provided. No new construction would occur.

Impact Comparison

Alternative 1 would have the following environmental impacts in comparison to the Project's impacts:

Air Quality: The No Project/No Build Alternative would not alter the existing uses or require any construction activities on the Project Site. As such, Alternative 1 would not result in any construction emissions. Therefore, no construction-related air quality impacts associated with regional and localized emissions would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less than the less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts of the Project. Since construction activities would not occur on the Project Site, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not generate substantial toxic air contaminants. Therefore, no impacts associated with the release of TACs would occur under Alternative 1, and such impacts would be reduced compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

The No Project/No Build Alternative would not result in new development or increased operations that could generate additional operational emissions related to vehicular traffic or the consumption of electricity and natural gas on the Project Site. Therefore, no operational air quality impacts associated with regional and localized emissions would occur under Alternative 1. Thus, such operational impacts associated with regional and localized emissions under Alternative 1 would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. Additionally, no increase in mobile source emissions and their associated TACs would occur. No operational impacts associated with mobile emissions would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative, and such impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of Project.

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources: Portions of the Jergins Trust Tunnel, which is a City of Long Beach Historic Landmark, are located on the Project Site. No demolition, grading, or other earthwork activities that could potentially affect this or nearby historical resources would occur under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, impacts to historical resources would not occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be less when compared to the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation. However, under Alternative 1, the Jergins Trust Tunnel would not be rehabilitated and reopened as it would be under the Project, which is considered a Project benefit.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions—The No Project/No Build Alternative would not develop new uses on the Project Site. Therefore, no new GHG emissions would be generated under Alternative 1, and new impacts associated with global climate change would not occur. As such, impacts associated with GHG emissions under the No Project/No Build would be less when compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Noise: Construction activities would not occur on the Project Site under the No Project/No Build Alternative. Therefore, no construction-related noise or vibration would be generated on-site or off-site. No impacts associated with construction noise and vibration would occur under Alternative 1, and the Project's significant and unavoidable cumulative on-site construction noise impact would be avoided. The No Project/No Build Alternative would not develop new uses on the Project Site, and no changes to the existing uses would occur. Therefore, no new stationary or mobile noise sources would be introduced to the Project Site or the Project vicinity. As such, no impacts associated with on-site or off-site operational noise would occur under Alternative 1, and impacts would be reduced compared to the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Transportation/Traffic: Alternative 1 would not result in new physical development and would not generate vehicle trips related to construction, including construction truck trips or construction worker trips. Therefore, no construction-related traffic impacts would occur, which would be less in comparison to the Project's less-than-significant construction traffic

impacts. Since the No Project/No Build Alternative would not develop new or additional land uses on the Project Site, Alternative 1 would not generate any additional vehicle trips or alter existing access or circulation within the Project Site during operation. In addition, no potential for queuing on Ocean Boulevard would occur. Therefore, queuing impacts under the No Project/No Build Alternative would be less compared to the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation.

Impact Summary and Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would avoid the Project's significant environmental impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. Alternative 1 would also reduce or avoid most of the Project's less than significant impacts. This alternative would not result in new environmental impacts and would not require mitigation measures to reduce impacts related to construction air quality, nesting birds, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, human remains, historic resources, construction noise, tribal cultural resources, or queuing. However, Alternative 1 would not meet the underlying purpose of the Project or the Project objectives. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not meet the following Project objectives:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;

- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

Overall, the No Project/No Build Alternative would not meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site.

5.3 Alternative 2: Mixed-Use Alternative

Alternative 2, the Mixed-Use Alternative, would develop residential, office, restaurant, retail, and hotel uses on the Project Site. Specifically, Alternative 2 would develop 28 restricted-income artist-in-residence live/work lofts; 87 market-rate apartments; 23,000 square-feet of co-working office space; 47,000 square feet of traditional office space; 26,000 square feet of restaurant use (inclusive of a 17,000-square-foot "food hall"); 45,000 square feet of retail uses; and a 200-room, 93,000 square-foot hotel, compared to the 429-room hotel, 23,512 square feet of restaurant space, and 26,847 square feet of meeting and ballroom space proposed under the Project. The total amount of development would be similar to the 537,075 square feet proposed by the Project. The 28 live-work units would consist of 1-bedroom units and the 87 market rate apartments would consist of 13 studio units, 35 1-bedroom units, 35 2-bedroom units, and four 3-bedroom units. The proposed uses would be located in two towers ranging in height from 11 to 20 stories, and 138 to 250 feet in height, compared to the 30-story, 375.5-foot-tall building with the Project. A total of 775 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in an 8-level parking garage, with primary access from Seaside Way and secondary access from Pine Avenue (both with driveways on Level 1, connecting to subterranean level P1).

Similar to the Project, an additional 280 parking spaces would be provided off-site at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage, approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the Project Site. Alternative 2 would also provide 11 bicycle parking spaces located in the parking garage. Alternative 2 would include 17,250 square feet of open space consisting of landscaped courtyards and terraces, a sky deck, a pool deck, gym and yoga studio, library/music room, business center, trellised barbeque area, and dog run deck. Vehicular access to the on-site parking would be provided via driveways accessible from Seaside Way and Pine Avenue. The commercial loading dock and loading area are located immediately adjacent to the parking entrance off of Seaside Way. The proposed hotel use would include valet drop-off area would be located near the main entrance to the hotel on Level 3, accessible via Ocean Boulevard. Like the Project, primary pedestrian access to the proposed uses would be provided via the main entrance facing Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park on Level 3. Secondary pedestrian access would be provided via a small lobby located at the corner of Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would include access to and restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel and improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries totaling 13,158 square feet.

Impact Comparison

Alternative 2 would have the following environmental impacts in comparison to the Project's impacts:

Air Quality: Alternative 2 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading/ excavation as the Project, and the same amount of construction because of the similar building size. As with the Project, construction of this Alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. With a similar amount of demolition, excavation, and development, the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Therefore, regional and localized impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project and therefore less than significant. Similarly, the amount of site grading and excavation on maximum activity days would be similar to levels proposed under the Project. Impacts would be similar to the Project's and less than significant with mitigation. With respect to TAC emissions, diesel particulate emissions represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As Alternative 2 would be similar in scale compared to the Project, impacts due to TAC emissions and the corresponding individual cancer risk would be similar to the Project's less than significant impacts.

Also like the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. As discussed further below, when accounting for pass-by trips and

internal capture reductions, Alternative 2 would generate 5,003 daily trips compared to 4,905 daily trips with the Project, an increase of approximately 2 percent.[55] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a slightly greater increase in air emissions compared to the Project. However, this increase in mobile source emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD daily significance thresholds. Although the overall square footage would be similar to the Project, the demand for electricity and natural gas would be greater than under the Project due to the inclusion of residential uses. However, operational energy use emissions would remain below significance thresholds. Therefore, impacts with respect to regional operational emissions would be greater than the Project's, but remain less than significant.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Alternative 2 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the Project's due to the similar building size. Localized mobile source operational impacts are determined mainly by peak-hour intersection traffic volumes. The number of net new peak-hour trips generated with Alternative 2 would be greater than under the Project. Specifically, A.M. peak-hour traffic would be 7 percent greater than the Project and P.M. peak-hour traffic would be 17 percent greater than the Project.[56] Therefore, impacts would be greater than under the Project but would remain less than significant. Also similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would not release substantial amounts of TACs. Thus, like the Project, this Alternative would result in a less than significant air quality impact related to TACs. In addition, as with the Project, development of Alternative 2 would be consistent with the air quality policies set forth in the SCAQMD's AQMP and the City of Long Beach General Plan Air Quality Element, resulting in a less than significant impact.

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources: Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would reconnect the Project Site with the Jergins Trust Tunnel, a subterranean walkway previously associated with the Jergins Trust Building that extends from the Project Site to the north side of Ocean Boulevard near a sub-grade level of the Renaissance hotel north of Ocean Boulevard (the north end of the tunnel would not be reopened as part of Alternative 2). The tunnel would be used for educational tours, and interpretive signage and images would be introduced to describe the tunnel's history. Alternative 2 would therefore have the same potential as the Project to materially alter historic aspects of the tunnel, and ground

[55] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[56] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

movement and vibration from construction of Alternative 2 may have the potential to damage the tunnel. However, similar to the Project, these impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures HIS-1 and HIS-2. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions—Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would incorporate sustainability features to reduce GHG emissions and comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance, as applicable, as well as to achieve LEED Silver® Certification. Also like the Project, Alternative 2 would incorporate features and comply with regulatory measures consistent with the goals of AB 32. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would promote implementation of SB 375 and support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state regulatory requirements for 2020 and 2035. Although Alternative 2 would have a similar amount of floor area as the Project, the amount of natural gas, electricity, water consumption, and wastewater generation would be slightly greater than under the Project due to the inclusion of residential uses. While Alternative 2 would result in more daily trips than the Project (5,003 vs. 4,905 when accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture), the increase in mobile emissions would not result in a significant impact. Overall, GHG impacts would be greater than the Project's, but remain less than significant.

Noise: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. The overall amount of building construction would be similar to the Project, and construction noise impacts would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Because maximum daily conditions are used for measuring significance, Alternative-level on-site noise impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation. However, like the Project, due to the location of related projects in the area, cumulative on-site noise impacts associated with construction would be significant and unavoidable. With respect to off-site noise impacts from haul trucks, because the total amount of development would be similar to the Project, the same number and frequency of haul trucks is anticipated. Impacts would be similar to the Project's and less than significant.

Also like the Project, vibration would be generated during the construction of Alternative 2 from the use heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck trips. Maximum daily activities during the demolition and excavation phases, which typically generate the highest vibration levels, would be similar to levels expected under the Project. Therefore, similar to the Project, vibration levels from on-site construction activities associated with Alternative 2 are anticipated to be well below the significance thresholds for building damage (for most buildings) and human annoyance, and implementation of similar mitigation as the Project would reduce potential vibration impacts to the Jergins Tunnel to a less than significant

level. Haul truck trips on maximum activity days also would be similar to levels under the Project. As such, vibration impacts from off-site sources would be less than significant and similar to those of the Project. Overall, impacts related to construction vibration levels would be less than significant and similar to the Project.

Alternative 2 would include the same sources of operational noise. Given the similar building size and design, noise from outdoor mechanical equipment would be similar to the Project. Alternative 2 would include less open space than the Project (30,408 square feet including improvements to Victory Park compared to 37,404 square feet with the Project), so noise from outdoor spaces would be less than under the Project. However, noise from parking facilities would be greater than under the Project due to the increased number of vehicle parking spaces. Specifically, Alternative 2 would include 775 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces compared to 151 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces with the Project. However, noise from on- and off-site parking lots would be regulated by LBMC Chapter 8.80, which limits noise generated by motor vehicles within parking facilities; and because the number of off-site parking spaces would be the same as the Project, noise levels along Ocean Boulevard and Seaside Way would be similar to the Project. Based on the above, on-site noise impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant, but greater than the Project due to additional noise from on-site parking.

Alternative 2 would result in 7,481 daily trips compared to 6,224 daily trips with the Project, without accounting for pass-by trips or internal capture.[57,58] As discussed in Section IV.D, Noise, of the Draft EIR, the maximum increase associated with the Project is 2.2 dBA CNEL along Seaside Way, east of Pine Avenue. While the number of daily trips associated with Alternative 2 would increase by approximately 20 percent, roadway noise would still be below the 3 dBA significance threshold. Accordingly, off-site noise impacts associated with traffic would be greater than the Project's but remain less than significant.

Transportation/Traffic: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 2 would generate additional trips from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker trips and the overall amount of demolition, excavation, and construction would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community including impacts to traffic, access, and public transit. As shown in

[57] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[58] *The Noise analysis presented in Section IV.D of the Draft EIR evaluated Project trip generation without reductions for pass-by trips and internal capture to present a conservative scenario.*

Table 8 of the Traffic Study included as Appendix E.1 of the Draft EIR, with the addition of truck trips during construction, all study intersections along the haul route would still operate at LOS A. Therefore, since the amount of construction anticipated with Alternative 2 is similar to the Project, construction traffic impacts would also be similar to the Project and remain less than significant.

Accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 2 would generate 5,003 daily trips including 342 A.M. peak-hour trips and 434 P.M. peak-hour trips compared to 4,905 daily trips including 319 A.M. peak-hour trips and 372 P.M. peak-hour trips with the Project, which represents a 7- and 17-percent increase in A.M. and P.M. peak-hour trips, respectively.[59] Therefore, impacts to the local roadway network would be greater than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. This increase in peak-hour traffic would result in significant impacts at Intersection No. 10, Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive & Ocean Boulevard and Intersection No. 13, Alamitos Avenue & 4th Street during the P.M. peak hour.[60] The impact at Intersection No. 10 could be mitigated by adding a northbound right-turn overlap phase with the westbound left-turn, but the impact at Intersection No. 13 would require intersection geometry improvements, such as a dedicated northbound right-turn lane. Given the right-of-way constraints at the intersection, this impact would be considered significant and unavoidable, which would be greater than the Project's less-than-significant impacts. With the increased number of trips, impacts to the regional transportation system, access and circulation, and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be greater than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project, but would remain less than significant.

With respect to vehicle queuing, Alternative 2 would include a 200-room hotel compared to a 429-room hotel with the Project. Accordingly, vehicle queuing associated with the valet staging area would be less than under the Project. Alternative 2 would implement a similar mitigation measure as the Project, but impacts would be reduced compared to the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts because fewer hotel rooms would be developed.

Impact Summary and Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Alternative 2 generally reflects an alternative proposal in response to the City's original Request for Proposals (RFP) to develop the Project Site and is analyzed herein to compare

---

[59] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[60] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

the Project to an actual proposed alternative submitted to the City and considered as part of the RFP process. As described above, Alternative 2 would result in greater impacts related to operational air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and operational noise than the Project, but these impacts would remain less than significant. However, Alternative 2 would result in new significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to operational traffic and would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. All other impacts would be similar to or less than the Project's impacts. Accordingly, in addition to failing to sufficiently meet key objectives of the Project as discussed below, Alternative 2 fails to meet the requirements of CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

Given Alternative 2's mix of land uses, restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel, and improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries, Alternative 2 would meet many of the Project's objectives to the same extent as the Project, including the following:

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

Alternative 2 would meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community, as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage

pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site, as well as the following Project objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Project since fewer hotel rooms would be provided:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

Alternative 2 would not meet the following Project objective because the alternative would result in more vehicle trips than the Project:

- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

Overall, Alternative 2 would not fully meet the objectives that support the Project's underlying purpose to the same extent as the Project.

5.4 Alternative 3: Reduced Mixed-Use Alternative

Alternative 3 would develop the same mix of uses as Alternative 2, but all square footages would be reduced. Specifically, Alternative 3 would develop a mixed-use project with 23 restricted-income, artist-in-residence, live-work lofts; 69 market rate apartments; 18,400 square feet of co-working office space; 37,600 square feet of traditional office space; 20,800 square feet of restaurant uses, including a 13,600-square-foot "food hall;" 36,000 square feet of retail uses; and a 160-room hotel (compared to a 429-room hotel with 23,512 square feet of restaurant space and 26,847 square feet of meeting and ballroom space proposed under the Project). The total amount of development would be 429,660 square feet compared to 537,075 square feet with the Project. The 23 live-work units would consist of one-bedroom units and the 69 market rate apartments would consist of 10 studio units, 28 one-bedroom units, 28 two-bedroom units, and three three-bedroom units. The proposed uses would be located in two towers ranging in height from 9 to 16 stories and 113 to 200 feet in height, compared to the 30-story, 375.5-foot-tall building

with the Project. A total of 564 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in a six-level parking garage, with primary access from Seaside Way and secondary access from Pine Avenue (both with driveways on Level 1, connecting to subterranean level P1). Similar to the Project, an additional 280 parking spaces would be provided off-site at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage, approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the Project Site. Alternative 3 would also provide nine bicycle parking spaces located in the parking garage. Alternative 3 would include 13,800 square feet of open space consisting of landscaped courtyards and terraces, a sky deck, a pool deck, gym and yoga studio, library/music room, business center, trellised barbeque area, and dog run deck. Vehicular access to the on-site parking would be provided via driveways accessible from Seaside Way and Pine Avenue. The commercial loading dock and loading area would be located immediately adjacent to the parking entrance along Seaside Way. The proposed hotel use would include valet drop-off area located near the main entrance to the hotel on Level 3, accessible via Ocean Boulevard. Like the Project, primary pedestrian access to the proposed uses would be provided via the main entrance facing Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park on Level 3. Secondary pedestrian access would be provided via a small lobby located at the corner of Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would include access to and restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel and improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries totaling 13,158 square feet.

Impact Comparison

Alternative 3 would have the following environmental impacts in comparison to the Project's impacts:

Air Quality: Alternative 3 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading/excavation as the Project but less construction because of the reduced building size. As with the Project, construction of this Alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. The duration of the construction period and the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust associated with site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Because maximum daily conditions are used for measuring significance, regional and localized impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project and therefore less than significant. Further, the amount of site grading and excavation on maximum activity days would be similar to levels proposed under the Project. Thus, on an overall comparative basis, since Alternative 3 would emit a similar amount of pollutants over a similar construction duration, and impacts would be similar to the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts. With respect to TAC emissions, diesel particulate emissions represent the greatest potential for TAC emissions. As Alternative 3 would be smaller in scale than the Project, impacts due to TAC emissions

and the corresponding individual cancer risk would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. As discussed further below, when accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 4 would generate 4,002 daily trips compared to 4,905 daily trips with the Project.[61] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be less than under the Project, the demand for electricity and natural gas would be less than under the Project. Therefore, impacts with respect to regional operational emissions would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Alternative 3 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Alternative 3 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less than the Project's due to the reduced building size. As discussed further below, the number of net new peak-hour trips generated with Alternative 3 would be less than under the Project.[62] Therefore, impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources: Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would reconnect the Project Site with the Jergins Trust Tunnel (the north end of the tunnel would not be reopened as part of Alternative 3). The tunnel would be used for educational tours, and interpretive signage and images would be introduced to describe the tunnel's history. Alternative 3 would therefore have the same potential as the Project to materially alter historic aspects of the tunnel, and ground movement and vibration from construction of Alternative 3 may have the potential to damage the tunnel. However, similar to the Project, these impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures HIS-1 and HIS-2. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the Project's impacts.

---

[61] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[62] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would incorporate sustainability features to reduce GHG emissions and comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance, as applicable, as well as to achieve LEED Silver® Certification. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would incorporate features and comply with regulatory measures consistent with the goals of AB 32. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would promote implementation of SB 375 and support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state regulatory requirements for 2020 and 2035. Furthermore, Alternative 3 would include less overall development than the Project, which would result in a reduction in the amount of water consumption and wastewater generation, as well as a reduction in the number of daily trips. Overall, GHG impacts would be less than significant and less than the Project's less than significant impacts.

Noise: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of building construction would be less than under the Project, construction noise impacts would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Because maximum daily conditions are used for measuring significance, Alternative 3's noise impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation. However, like the Project, due to the location of related projects in the area, cumulative noise impacts associated with on-site construction activities would be significant and unavoidable. With respect to off-site noise impacts from haul trucks, while the overall amount of development would be less than the Project, haul truck trips on maximum activity days would be similar to levels under the Project. Impacts would be similar to the Project's and less than significant.

Similar to the Project, vibration would be generated during the construction of Alternative 3 from the use heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck trips. Maximum daily activities during the demolition and excavation phases, which typically generate the highest vibration levels, would be similar to levels expected under the Project. Therefore, similar to the Project, vibration levels from on-site construction activities associated with Alternative 3 are anticipated to be well below the significance thresholds for building damage (for most buildings) and human annoyance, and implementation of similar mitigation as the Project would reduce potential vibration impacts to the Jergins Tunnel to a less than significant level. Haul truck trips on maximum activity days would be similar to levels under the Project. As such, vibration impacts from off-site sources would be less than significant and similar to those of the Project. Overall, impacts related to construction vibration levels would be less than significant and similar to the Project.

Alternative 3 would include the same sources of operational noise. Given a reduced building size, noise from outdoor mechanical equipment would be less than the Project. Alternative 3 would include less open space than the Project (26,958 square feet including

improvements to Victory Park compared to 37,404 square feet with the Project), so noise from outdoor spaces would be less than under the Project. Noise from parking facilities would be greater than under the Project due to the increased number of vehicle parking spaces. Specifically, Alternative 3 would include 564 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces compared to 151 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces with the Project. However, noise from on- and off-site parking lots would be regulated by LBMC Chapter 8.80, which limits noise generated by motor vehicles within parking facilities; and because the number of off-site parking spaces would be the same as the Project, noise levels along Ocean Boulevard and Seaside Way would be similar to the Project. Based on the above, on-site noise impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than significant, but greater than under the Project due to additional noise from on-site parking.

Alternative 3 would result in 5,985 daily trips compared to 6,224 daily trips with the Project, without accounting for pass-by trips or internal capture.[63,64] Accordingly, off-site noise impacts associated with traffic would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

Transportation/Traffic: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 3 would generate additional trips from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker trips. However, the total amount of development would be reduced by 107,415 square feet compared to the Project, so the overall amount of demolition, excavation, and construction would be reduced. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community including impacts to traffic, access, and public transit. As shown in Table 8 of the Traffic Study included as Appendix E.1 of the Draft EIR, with the addition of truck trips during construction, all study intersections along the haul route would still operate at LOS A. Therefore, since the amount of construction anticipated with Alternative 3 would be reduced in comparison to the Project, construction traffic impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 3 would generate 4,002 daily trips including 272 A.M. peak-hour trips and 347 P.M. peak-hour trips compared to 4,905 daily trips including 319 A.M. peak-hour trips and 372 P.M. peak-hour trips with the

---

[63] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[64] *The Noise analysis presented in Section IV.D of the Draft EIR evaluated Project trip generation without reductions for pass-by trips and internal capture to present a conservative scenario.*

Project.[65] Therefore, impacts to the local roadway network would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. Additionally, with the reduced number of trips, impacts related to the regional transportation system, access and circulation, and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. With respect to vehicle queuing, Alternative 3 would include a 160-room hotel compared to a 429-room hotel with the Project. Accordingly, vehicle queuing associated with the valet staging area would be less than that of the Project. Alternative 3 would implement a similar mitigation measure as the Project, but queuing impacts would be less than the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts because fewer hotel rooms would be developed.

Impact Summary and Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

As described above, Alternative 3 would result in greater impacts related to operational noise than the Project, but this impact would remain less than significant. However, Alternative 3 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. All other impacts would be similar to or less than the Project's impacts.

Alternative 3 would meet many of the Project's objectives to the same extent as the Project including the following:

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

[65] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

Alternative 3 would meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site, as well as the following Project objectives, but to a lesser extent than the Project because fewer hotel rooms would be provided:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

Overall, Alternative 3 would not fully meet the Project's underlying purpose and the objectives that support the Project's underlying purpose to the same extent as the Project, including meeting the City's broader objectives for the Project Site and the surrounding area under the City's Downtown Redevelopment Project, the Local Coastal Program, the Downtown Shoreline Planned Development District, and the Blueprint for Economic Development.

5.5 Alternative 4: PD-6 Zoning Residential Alternative

Alternative 4, the PD-6 Zoning Compliant Residential Alternative, would develop roughly the same building proposed under the Project, but would include 450 residential units,

5,493 square feet of ground floor retail uses, and 9,507 square feet of ground-floor restaurant uses, compared to the 429-room hotel with 23,512 square feet of restaurant uses and 26,847 square feet of meeting and ballroom space proposed under the Project. Like the Project, the proposed uses would be located in a single 537,075-square foot building of 30 stories and 375.5 feet in height, consisting of a tower over a podium, with new landscaping and outdoor amenity areas. The 450 residential units would consist of 67 studio units, 180 one-bedroom units, 180 two-bedroom units, and 23 three-bedroom units. A total of 731 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in a seven-level parking garage, with primary access from Seaside Way and secondary access from Pine Avenue (both with driveways on Level 1, connecting to subterranean level P1). Similar to the Project, an additional 280 parking spaces would be provided off-site at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage, approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the Project Site. Alternative 4 would also provide four bicycle parking spaces located in the parking garage. Alternative 4 would include 67,500 square feet of open space consisting of landscaped courtyards and terraces, a sky deck, a pool deck, gym and yoga studio, library/music room, business center, trellised barbeque area, and dog run deck. Vehicular access to the on-site parking would be provided via driveways accessible from Seaside Way and Pine Avenue. The commercial loading dock and loading area would be located adjacent to the parking entrance on Seaside Way. Like the Project, primary pedestrian access to the proposed uses would be provided via the main entrance facing Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park on Level 3. Secondary pedestrian access would be provided via a small lobby located at the corner of Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. Like the Project, Alternative 4 would include improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries totaling 13,158 square feet. However, Alternative 4 would not include access to and restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel.

Impact Comparison

Alternative 4 would have the following environmental impacts in comparison to the Project's impacts:

Air Quality: Alternative 4 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading/excavation as the Project, and the same amount of construction because of the similar building size. As with the Project, construction of this Alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. With a similar amount of demolition, excavation, and development, intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust from site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Therefore, regional and localized impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project and less than significant. Similarly, the amount of site grading and excavation on maximum activity days would be similar to levels proposed under the Project. Impacts would be similar to the Project's and less than significant with mitigation. With respect to

TAC emissions, as Alternative 4 would be similar in scale compared to the Project, impacts due to TAC emissions and the corresponding individual cancer risk would be similar to the Project's less than significant impacts.

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 4 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. As discussed further below, when accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 4 would generate 2,286 daily trips compared to 4,905 daily trips with the Project.[66] As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. Although the overall square footage would be similar to the Project's, the demand for electricity and natural gas would be slightly greater than under the Project due to the inclusion of residential uses. However, operational emissions would remain below significance thresholds. Therefore, impacts with respect to regional operational emissions would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Alternative 4 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Alternative 4 would be less than significant. As discussed further below, the number of net new peak-hour trips generated with Alternative 4 would be less than under the Project.[67] Therefore, impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources: Unlike the Project, Alternative 4 would not reconnect the Project Site with the Jergins Trust Tunnel. However, ground movement and vibration from construction of Alternative 4 may have the potential to damage the tunnel. Similar to the Project, these impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of mitigation equivalent to Mitigation Measure HIS-2. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, though less than under the Project because no work would take place in the tunnel itself.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Similar to the Project, Alternative 4 would incorporate sustainability features to reduce GHG emissions and comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance, as applicable, as well as to achieve LEED Silver® Certification.

---

[66] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[67] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would also incorporate features and comply with regulatory measures consistent with the goals of AB 32. Like the Project, Alternative 4 would promote implementation of SB 375 and support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state regulatory requirements for 2020 and 2035. Although Alternative 4 would have a similar amount of floor area compared to the Project, the amount of natural gas, electricity, water consumption, and wastewater generation would be slightly greater than under the Project due to the inclusion of residential uses. Furthermore, the mix of uses under Alternative 4 would result in a reduction in average daily trips as compared to the Project. Even with the increase in energy and water usage emissions, total GHG emissions generated by Alternative 4 would be less than those of the Project. Overall, GHG impacts would be less than significant and less than the Project's less than significant impacts.

Noise: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 4 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. The overall amount of building construction would be similar to the Project, and construction noise impacts would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Because maximum daily conditions are used for measuring significance, Alternative-level on-site noise impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation. However, like the Project, due to the location of related projects in the area, cumulative noise impacts associated with on-site construction activities would be significant and unavoidable.

With respect to off-site noise impacts from haul trucks, because the total amount of development would be similar to the Project, the same number and frequency of haul trucks is anticipated. Impacts would be similar to the Project's and less than significant.

Similar to the Project, vibration would be generated during the construction of Alternative 4 from the use heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck trips. Maximum daily activities during the demolition and excavation phases, which typically generate the highest vibration levels, would be similar to levels expected under the Project. Therefore, similar to the Project, vibration levels from on-site construction activities associated with Alternative 4 are anticipated to be well below the significance thresholds for building damage (for most buildings) and human annoyance, and implementation of similar mitigation as the Project would reduce potential vibration impacts to the Jergins Tunnel to a less than significant level. Haul truck trips on maximum activity days would be similar to levels under the Project. As such, vibration impacts from off-site sources would be less than significant and similar to those of the Project. Overall, impacts related to construction vibration levels would be less than significant and similar to the Project's.

Alternative 4 would include the same sources of operational noise as the Project. Given the similar building size and design, noise from outdoor mechanical equipment would be similar to the Project's. Alternative 4 would include more open space than the Project (80,658 square feet including improvements to Victory Park compared to 37,404 square feet with the Project), so noise from outdoor spaces would be greater than the Project. However, the estimated noise levels at all off-site receptors would be below the significance threshold of 5 dBA (L_{eq}) above ambient noise levels. Noise from parking facilities would be greater than under the Project due to the increased number of vehicle parking spaces. Specifically, Alternative 4 would include 731 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces compared to 151 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces with the Project. However, noise from on- and off-site parking lots would be regulated by LBMC Chapter 8.80, which limits noise generated by motor vehicles within parking facilities; and because the number of off-site parking spaces would be the same as the Project, noise levels along Ocean Boulevard and Seaside Way would be similar to the Project. Based on the above, on-site noise impacts under Alternative 4 would be less than significant, but greater than under the Project due to additional open space and noise from on-site parking.

Alternative 4 would result in 2,569 daily trips compared to 6,224 daily trips with the Project, without accounting for pass-by trips or internal capture.[68,69] Accordingly, off-site noise impacts associated with traffic would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

Transportation/Traffic: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 4 would generate additional trips from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker trips, and the overall amount of demolition, excavation, and construction would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, Alternative 4 would prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community including impacts to traffic, access, and public transit. As shown in Table 8 of the Traffic Study included as Appendix E.1 of the Draft EIR, with the addition of truck trips during construction, all study intersections along the haul route would still operate at LOS A. Therefore, since the amount of construction anticipated with Alternative 4 is similar to the Project, construction traffic impacts would also be similar to the Project and remain less than significant.

---

[68] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[69] *The Noise analysis presented in Section IV.D of the Draft EIR evaluated Project trip generation without reductions for pass-by trips and internal capture to present a conservative scenario.*

Accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 4 would generate 2,286 daily trips including 147 A.M. peak-hour trips and 191 P.M. peak-hour trips compared to 4,905 daily trips including 319 A.M. peak-hour trips and 372 P.M. peak-hour trips with the Project.[70] Therefore, impacts to the local roadway network would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. Additionally, with the reduced number of trips, impacts related to the regional transportation system, access and circulation, and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. With respect to vehicle queuing, Alternative 4 does not include hotel uses or a valet staging area. Accordingly, impacts associated with vehicle queuing would be less than significant and less than the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts.

Impact Summary and Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Alternative 4 is included in this alternatives analysis based on its potential to reduce the significant impacts of the Project. As described above, Alternative 4 would result in greater impacts related to operational noise than the Project, but this impact would remain less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 4 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. All other impacts would be similar to or less than the Project's impacts.

Given Alternative 4's land use mix and the fact that it would not include restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel, Alternative 4 would not meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community, as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site, or any of the Project objectives related to hotel uses:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;

- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

[70] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

Alternative 4 also would not meet the Project's objective to provide access to the Jergins Trust Tunnel:

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

Alternative 4 would provide short-term and long-term employment opportunities, but would not generate transient occupancy tax for the City:

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

Alternative 4 would, however, meet the following Project objectives to the same extent as the Project:

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

Overall, Alternative 4 would not meet the Project's underlying purpose or the objectives that support the Project's underlying purpose because no hotel use is proposed. Alternative 4

would, however, meet a number of the Project's other objectives to the same extent as the Project.

5.6 Alternative 5: PD-6 Zoning Compliance Office Alternative

Alternative 5, the PD-6 Zoning Compliant Office Alternative, would develop roughly the same but slightly smaller building proposed with the Project, but would include 265,000 square feet of office uses, 9,887 square feet of ground floor retail uses, and 17,113 square feet of ground floor restaurant uses, compared to the 429-room hotel with 23,512 square feet of restaurant uses and 26,847 square feet of meeting and ballroom space proposed under the Project. Like the Project, the proposed uses would be located in a single building of 30 stories and 375.5 feet in height, consisting of a tower over a podium, with new landscaping and outdoor amenity areas. A total of 898 vehicle parking spaces would be provided in a nine-level parking garage, with primary access from Seaside Way and secondary access from Pine Avenue (both with driveways on Level 1, connecting to subterranean level P1). Similar to the Project, an additional 280 parking spaces would be provided off-site at the existing Terrace Theater Parking Garage, approximately 0.2 mile southeast of the Project Site. Alternative 5 would also provide 14 bicycle parking spaces located in the parking garage. Alternative 5 would include approximately 5,000 square feet of open space consisting of landscaped courtyards and terraces. Vehicular access to the on-site parking would be provided via driveways accessible from Seaside Way and Pine Avenue. The commercial loading dock and loading area would be located immediately adjacent to the parking entrance off of Seaside Way. Like the Project, primary pedestrian access to the proposed uses would be provided via the main entrance facing Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park on Level 3. Secondary pedestrian access would be provided via a small lobby located at the corner of Pine Avenue and Seaside Way. Like the Project, Alternative 5 would include access to and restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel and improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries totaling 13,158 square feet.

Impact Comparison

Alternative 5 would have the following environmental impacts in comparison to the Project's impacts:

Air Quality: Alternative 5 would involve the same amount of demolition and grading/ excavation as the Project, but less construction because of the reduced building size. As with the Project, construction of this Alternative would generate air emissions through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck and construction worker trips. The duration of the construction period and the intensity of air emissions and fugitive dust associated with site preparation and construction activities would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Regional and localized impacts on these days would be

similar to those of the Project and therefore less than significant. Similarly, the amount of site grading and excavation on maximum activity days would be similar to levels proposed under the Project. Thus, on an overall comparative basis, since Alternative 5 would emit a similar amount of pollutants over a similar construction duration, impacts would be similar to the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts. With respect to TAC emissions, since Alternative 5 would be smaller in scale than the Project, impacts due to TAC emissions and the corresponding individual cancer risk would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

Similar to the Project, operational regional air pollutant emissions associated with Alternative 5 would be generated by vehicle trips to the Project Site and the consumption of electricity and natural gas. As discussed further below, when accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 5 would generate 2,445 daily trips compared to 4,905 daily trips with the Project. As vehicular emissions depend on the number of trips, vehicular sources would result in a smaller increase in air emissions compared to the Project. In addition, because the overall square footage would be less than under the Project, the demand for electricity and natural gas would also be similar to the Project. Therefore, impacts with respect to regional operational emissions would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

With regard to on-site localized area source and stationary source emissions, as with the Project, Alternative 5 would not introduce any major new sources of air pollution within the Project Site. Therefore, similar to the Project, localized impacts from on-site emission sources associated with Alternative 5 would also be less than significant. Such impacts would be less than the Project's due to the reduced building size. As discussed further below, the number of net new peak-hour trips generated with Alternative 5 would be less than under the Project.[71] Therefore, impacts would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project.

Also similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would not release substantial amounts of TACs. Thus, like the Project, this Alternative would result in a less than significant air quality impact related to TACs. In addition, as with the Project, development of Alternative 5 would be consistent with the air quality policies set forth in the SCAQMD's AQMP and the City of Long Beach General Plan Air Quality Element, resulting in a less than significant impact.

[71] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources: Similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would reconnect the Project Site with the Jergins Trust Tunnel (the north end of the tunnel would not be reopened as part of Alternative 5). The tunnel would be used for educational tours, and interpretive signage and images would be introduced to describe the tunnel's history. Alternative 5 would therefore have the same potential as the Project to materially alter historic aspects of the tunnel, and ground movement and vibration from construction of Alternative 5 may have the potential to damage the tunnel. However, similar to the Project, these impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures HIS-1 and HIS-2. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation, similar to the Project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions: Similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would incorporate sustainability features to reduce GHG emissions and comply with the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance, as applicable, as well as to achieve LEED Silver® Certification. Similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would also incorporate features and comply with regulatory measures consistent with the goals of AB 32. Like the Project, Alternative 5 would promote implementation of SB 375 and support regional land use and transportation GHG reductions consistent with state regulatory requirements for 2020 and 2035. Furthermore, Alternative 5 would include less overall development than the Project, which would result in a reduction in the amount of water consumption and wastewater generation, as well as a reduction in the number of daily trips. Overall, GHG impacts would be less than significant and less than the Project's less than significant impacts.

Noise: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 5 would generate noise from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, as well as from haul truck and construction worker trips. While the overall amount of building construction would be less than Project, construction noise impacts would be similar on days with maximum construction activities. Alternative-level noise impacts on these days would be similar to those of the Project, which would be less than significant with mitigation. However, like the Project, due to the location of related projects in the area, cumulative noise impacts associated with on-site construction activities would be significant and unavoidable. With respect to off-site noise impacts from haul trucks, haul trips on maximum activity days would be similar to levels under the Project. Impacts would be similar to the Project and less than significant.

Similar to the Project, vibration would be generated during the construction of Alternative 5 from the use heavy-duty construction equipment and haul truck trips. Maximum daily activities during the demolition and excavation phases, which typically generate the highest vibration levels, would be similar to levels expected under the Project. Therefore, similar to the Project, vibration levels from on-site construction activities associated with Alternative 3 are anticipated to be well below the significance thresholds for building damage (for most buildings) and human annoyance, and implementation of similar mitigation as the Project

would reduce potential vibration impacts to the Jergins Tunnel to a less than significant level. Haul truck trips on maximum activity days would be similar to levels under the Project. As such, vibration impacts from off-site sources would be less than significant and similar to those of the Project. Overall, impacts related to construction vibration levels would be less than significant and similar to the Project.

Alternative 5 would include the same sources of operational noise. Given a similar building size and design, noise from outdoor mechanical equipment would be similar to the Project. Alternative 5 would include less open space than the Project (18,158 square feet including improvements to Victory Park compared to 37,404 square feet with the Project), so noise from outdoor spaces would be less than under the Project. Noise from parking facilities would be greater than the Project due to the increased number of vehicle parking spaces. Specifically, Alternative 5 would include 898 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces compared to 151 on-site parking spaces and 280 off-site parking spaces with the Project. However, noise from on- and off-site parking lots would be regulated by LBMC Chapter 8.80, which limits noise generated by motor vehicles within parking facilities; and because the number of off-site parking spaces would be the same as the Project, noise levels along Ocean Boulevard and Seaside Way would be similar to the Project. Based on the above, on-site noise impacts under Alternative 5 would be less than significant, but greater than under the Project due to additional noise from on-site parking.

Alternative 5 would result in 3,600 daily trips compared to 6,224 daily trips with the Project, without accounting for pass-by trips or internal capture.[72,73] Accordingly, off-site noise impacts associated with traffic would be less than the Project's less-than-significant impacts.

Transportation/Traffic: As with the Project, construction of Alternative 5 would generate additional trips from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and construction worker trips and the overall amount of demolition, excavation, and construction would be similar to the Project. Also similar to the Project, Alternative 5 would prepare and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community including impacts related to traffic, access, and public transit. As shown in Table 8 of the Traffic Study included as Appendix E.1 of the Draft EIR, with the addition of truck trips during construction, all study intersections along the haul route would still operate at LOS A. Therefore, since the amount of construction anticipated with

[72] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

[73] *The Noise analysis presented in Section IV.D of the Draft EIR evaluated Project trip generation without reductions for pass-by trips and internal capture to present a conservative scenario.*

Alternative 5 is similar to the Project, construction traffic impacts would also be similar to the Project and remain less than significant.

Accounting for pass-by trips and internal capture reductions, Alternative 5 would generate 2,445 daily trips including 243 A.M. peak-hour trips and 280 P.M. peak-hour trips compared to 4,905 daily trips including 319 A.M. peak-hour trips and 372 P.M. peak-hour trips with the Project.[74] Therefore, impacts to the local roadway network would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. Additionally, with the reduced number of trips, impacts related to the regional transportation system, access and circulation, and bicycle, pedestrian, and vehicular safety would be less than the less-than-significant impacts of the Project. With respect to vehicle queuing, Alternative 5 does not include hotel uses or a valet staging area. Accordingly, impacts associated with vehicle queuing would be less than significant and less than the Project's less-than-significant-with-mitigation impacts.

Impact Summary and Relationship of the Alternative to Project Objectives

Alternative 5 is included in this alternatives analysis based on its potential to reduce the significant impacts of the Project. As described above, Alternative 5 would result in greater impacts related to operational noise than the Project, but this impact would remain less than significant. Additionally, Alternative 5 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. All other impacts would be similar to or less than the Project's impacts.

Given the land use mix under Alternative 5, restoration of the Jergins Trust Tunnel, and improvements to the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site boundaries totaling 13,158 square feet, Alternative 5 would not meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site, or any of the Project objectives related to hotel uses:

- Support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach to help meet the goals of the City's Blueprint for Economic Development and Local Coastal Program;
- Reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of

[74] *Fehr & Peers, 100 E. Ocean Traffic Study—Alternatives Analysis, July 9, 2019. Refer to Appendix F of the Draft EIR.*

alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

- Provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

Alternative 5 would provide short-term and long-term employment opportunities, but would not generate transient occupancy tax for the City:

- Provide short-and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenue for the City.

Alternative 5 would, however, meet the following Project objectives to the same extent as the Project:

- Redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- Create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- Enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- Provide public access to, enable the appreciation of and provide education regarding the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

- Provide high-quality, signature architectural design that will enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- Demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

Overall, Alternative 5 would not meet the Project's underlying purpose or the objectives that support the Project's underlying purpose because no hotel use is proposed. Alternative 5 would, however, meet a number of the Project's other objectives to the same extent as the Project.

5.7 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The Project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise. Alternative 1 would avoid this impact but would not meet any of the Project objectives or achieve the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site.

As stated above, the CEQA Guidelines require the identification of an Environmentally Superior Alternative other than a No Project Alternative. A comparative evaluation of the remaining alternatives indicates that Alternative 5, the PD-6 Zoning Compliant Office Alternative, would reduce the Project's less than significant impacts to the greatest extent. However, Alternative 5 would not avoid the Project's significant and unavoidable impact with respect to cumulative on-site construction noise, and impacts with respect to on-site operational noise would be greater than under the Project, although they would remain less than significant.

Specifically, because Alternative 5 would result in the fewest daily trips of the build alternatives, impacts with respect to operational air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, off-site operational noise, and traffic would be less than under the Project. Impacts with respect to construction air quality, historic resources, construction noise, and construction traffic would be similar to the Project's.

However, Alternative 5 would not meet the Project's underlying purpose to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site, nor would it meet any of the objectives related to hotel uses.

6.0 Other CEQA Considerations

6.1 Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b), the City finds that the Project will result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts with respect to cumulative on-site construction noise.

Cumulative On-Site Construction Noise

Although no Project-specific significant impacts related to on-site construction noise have been identified, Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 are proposed to reduce the Project's contribution to cumulative construction-related noise impacts. The minimum 5 dBA noise reduction provided by Mitigation Measures NOI-1 through NOI-3 would further reduce construction noise impacts at the nearest off-site noise-sensitive receptors to a less than significant level. Noise associated with cumulative construction activities would be reduced to the degree reasonably and technically feasible through proposed mitigation measures for each individual related project and compliance with locally adopted and enforced noise ordinances. Nonetheless, if nearby Related Project Nos. 42 and 45 were to be constructed concurrently with the Project, significant cumulative construction noise impacts could result. Therefore, cumulative construction noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

6.2 Reasons Why the Project is Being Proposed, Notwithstanding Significant Unavoidable Impacts

In addition to identification of a project's significant unavoidable impacts, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires an EIR to describe the reasons why a project is being proposed, notwithstanding the effects of the identified significant and unavoidable impacts.

The reasons why the Project has been proposed are grounded in the comprehensive list of Project objectives included in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and discussed herein. As previously indicated, the underlying purpose of the Project is to support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach. Under existing conditions, the Project Site is developed as a surface parking lot. The Project would replace the surface parking area with an economically productive development that would be compatible with the various urban uses in the surrounding vicinity. The Project would provide short- and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenues for the City. The Project would reduce typical hotel-related vehicular trips by developing a hotel

use with convenient access to pedestrian, biking, and public transit facilities in close proximity to popular tourist destinations. The Project would provide public access to and enable the appreciation of the historic Jergins Trust Tunnel. The Project would also provide high-quality, signature architectural design that would enhance the Downtown skyline. In addition, the Project would further the goals of the Downtown Shoreline Plan, Long Beach Strategic Plan, and the City's former Downtown Redevelopment Plan.

6.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

In accordance with Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA guidelines, the City evaluated significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by implementation of the Project. The Project would necessarily consume limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources, resulting in irreversible environmental changes. This consumption would occur during construction of the Project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. The development of the Project would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials and associated solid waste disposal effects on landfills; (2) water; and (3) energy resources (e.g., fossil fuels) for electricity, natural gas, and transportation; and the associated impacts related to air quality.

Based on the summary below, Project construction and operation would require the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and non-renewable resources, which would limit the availability of these resources and the Project Site for future generations or for other uses. Specifically, the Project will consume resources as building materials, water for construction and operation, and energy for construction and operation. However, the consumption of such resources would not be considered substantial and would be consistent with regional and local growth forecasts and development goals for the area. The loss of such resources would not be highly accelerated when compared to existing conditions and such resources would not be used in a wasteful manner. Further, mitigation measures and project design features will be implemented to minimize the Project's impacts related to those resources. Therefore, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the Project, such changes are concluded to be less than significant.

6.4 Growth Inducing Impacts

Section 15126.2(d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that lead agencies consider growth-inducing impacts of a project. Growth-inducing impacts are characteristic of a project that could directly or indirectly foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Growth can be induced or fostered as follows: (i) direct growth associated with a project; or (ii) indirect growth created by either the demand not satisfied by a project or the creation of surplus infrastructure not utilized by a project.

The Project involves the construction of a 537,075-square-foot hotel with 429 rooms, 23,512 square feet of restaurant uses, and 26,847 square feet of meeting rooms, ballrooms, and pre-function space. The Project would not introduce a new residential population to the area but would introduce a daytime population of employees and a transient visitor population to Project Site. Therefore, the Project would not directly contribute to population growth in the Project area. In addition, since most of the employment opportunities generated by the Project would be filled by people already residing in the general vicinity, the potential growth associated with Project employees who may relocate their place of residence would not be substantial. Accordingly, the Project would be well within SCAG's population projections for the Los Angeles Subregion.

With regard to employment, the Project would support tourism and business activity for residents and visitors to the area. The Project would not cause an exceedance of SCAG's employment projections, nor would it induce substantial indirect population or housing growth related to Project-generated employment opportunities.

Construction workers would not be expected to relocate their households' places of residence as a direct consequence of working on the Project as the work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized so that construction workers remain at a job site only for the time in which their specific skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process. Therefore, given the availability of construction workers, the Project would not be considered growth inducing from a short-term employment perspective, but rather the Project would provide a public benefit by providing new employment opportunities during the construction period.

The area surrounding the Project Site is already developed with primarily commercial land uses. The Project would not remove impediments to growth. While the Project may require local infrastructure upgrades to maintain and improve water, sewer, electricity, and natural gas lines on-site and in the immediate vicinity, such improvements would be intended primarily to meet Project-related demand and would not necessitate regional utility infrastructure improvements that have not otherwise been accounted for and planned for on a regional level. In addition, Project access improvements would be limited to driveways necessary to provide immediate access to the Project Site.

Overall, the Project would be consistent with the growth forecast for the Los Angeles Subregion and would be consistent with regional policies to reduce urban sprawl, efficiently utilize existing infrastructure, reduce regional congestion, and improve air quality. Therefore, growth-inducing impacts would be less than significant.

6.5 Potential Secondary Effects

Pursuant to Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) of the CEQA Guidelines, the City evaluated the potential impacts that could result with the implementation of each mitigation measure proposed for the Project.

Air Quality. Mitigation Measure AIR-1 requires that the Project utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds CARB and USEPA Tier 4 off-road emissions standards for excavators and loaders during Project excavation and grading activities. With implementation of the Project design features and Mitigation Measure AIR-1, maximum regional NO_X emissions would be reduced to a less than significant level. Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce construction emissions for all pollutants and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Biological Resources. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would require vegetation removal to be scheduled outside of nesting season for raptor and songbird species (typically February 15 through August 31). In the event any construction activities occur during nesting season, a survey shall be conducted, and a buffer zone established in the event nesting birds were identified. This mitigation measure would limit construction near nesting birds and would reduce impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level. As such, implementation of this mitigation measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Cultural Resources—Archaeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains. Mitigation Measure CUL-1 requires archeological monitoring during excavation and grading activities within native soils on the Project Site. Any finds would be evaluated and treated in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. Mitigation Measure CUL-2 requires construction to cease in the event evidence of subsurface paleontological resources is found during excavation and other ground disturbing activities. Any such finds would then be evaluated, and a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Program would be prepared. Mitigation Measure CUL-3 requires that if human remains are discovered during construction or excavation, work in the affected area and the immediate vicinity shall be halted immediately and the Native American Heritage Commission and the County Coroner shall be notified pursuant to procedures and requirements set forth in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5. Disposition of the human remains and any associated grave goods shall also be in accordance with this regulation and Public Resources Code Sections 5097.91 and 5097.98, as amended. These mitigation measures represent procedural actions and would be beneficial in protecting cultural resources that could potentially be encountered on-site. As such, the implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in physical changes to the environment and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Cultural Resources—Historic Resources. Mitigation Measure HIS-1 requires compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's standards with regard to work in and around the Jergins Trust Tunnel. Mitigation Measure HIS-2 requires a Construction Monitoring Plan prepared by a qualified structural engineer, historic architect, and/or other professional to ensure the protection of the Jergins Trust Tunnel during Project construction from damage due to underground excavation, pile driving, and general construction processes as well as settlement or earth movement from the removal of adjacent soil and features. These mitigation measures represent procedural actions and would be beneficial in protecting cultural resources that could potentially be encountered on-site. As such, the implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in physical changes to the environment and would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Noise. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 requires stationary source equipment to be located at the greatest distance from noise-sensitive land uses and prohibits unnecessary idling of such equipment. Mitigation Measure NOI-2 requires loading and unloading of heavy construction materials to be located on-site and away from noise-sensitive uses to the extent feasible. These mitigation measures pertain to construction planning and equipment functions and would reduce cumulative construction noise impacts. Mitigation Measure NOI-3 requires a temporary and impermeable sound barrier to be erected at various places along the Project Site boundary. The noise and vibration from installation of the temporary sound barrier would be short-term and would be required to comply with the City's noise thresholds. In addition, upon completion of construction, the temporary sound barrier would be removed. Furthermore, due to the temporary nature of Project construction, these mitigation measures would not result in adverse long-term secondary impacts.

Transportation/Traffic. Mitigation Measure TRA-1 requires hotel staff to monitor queuing at the inbound Ocean Boulevard driveway during peak hours and peak events. When the inbound driveway is observed to be near capacity, a queuing plan shall be implemented to create a secondary valet staging area and prevent any queue spillback onto the public right-of-way. The queuing plan shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau for review and approval. This mitigation measure would regulate valet operations and is intended to avoid unintended traffic impacts. Further, approval by the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau would ensure that no secondary traffic impacts result.

Tribal Cultural Resources. Mitigation Measure TCR-1 requires the construction contractor to provide access for Native American monitoring during ground-disturbing activities. Mitigation Measure TCR-2 requires a qualified archaeologist to evaluate any Native American resources that may be unearthed during Project construction activities. These mitigation measures were included to address concerns raised during consultation with the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation and pertain to construction monitoring

and the evaluation of any Native American resources unearthed during construction. These mitigation measures would not result in physical changes to the environment. As such, implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

7.0 Other CEQA Findings

1. The City, acting through the Department of Development Services, is the "Lead Agency" for the Project evaluated in the EIR. The City finds that the EIR was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the EIR, that the Draft EIR which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City.

2. The EIR evaluated the following potential project and cumulative environmental impacts: Air Quality; Cultural (Historic) Resources; Greenhouse Gas Emissions; Noise; and Transportation/Traffic. The EIR also considered Growth Inducing Impacts and Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes. The significant environmental impacts of the Project and the alternatives were identified in the EIR. All other issues required for analysis under CEQA were evaluated in the Initial Study, included as Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

3. The City finds that the EIR provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the Project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and adequately responds to comments made during the public review period.

4. Textual refinements and errata were compiled and presented to the decision-makers for review and consideration. The City staff has made every effort to notify the decision-makers and the interested public/agencies of each textual change in the various documents associated with Project review. These textual refinements merely correct minor errors and provide clarifications.

5. The City evaluated comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the Department of Development Services prepared written responses describing the disposition of significant environmental issues raised. The Final EIR provides adequate, good faith and reasoned responses to the comments. The City reviewed the comments received and responses thereto and has determined that neither the

comments received nor the responses to such comments add significant new information regarding environmental impacts to the Draft EIR as defined under CEQA. The Lead Agency has based its actions on full appraisal of all viewpoints, including all comments received up to the date of adoption of these findings, concerning the environmental impacts identified and analyzed in the EIR.

6. The mitigation measures which have been identified for the Project were identified in the Draft and Final EIRs. The final mitigation measures are described in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Each of the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and contained in the EIR, is incorporated into the Project. The City finds that the impacts of the Project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, contained in the EIR.

7. CEQA requires the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance with project implementation. The mitigation measures included in the EIR as certified by the City and included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program as adopted by the City serve that function. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program includes all the mitigation measures identified in the EIR and has been designed to ensure compliance during implementation of the Project. In accordance with CEQA, the Mitigation Monitoring Program provides the means to ensure that the mitigation measures are fully enforceable. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

8. In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City hereby adopts each of the mitigation measures expressly set forth herein as conditions of approval for the Project.

9. The custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City's decision is based is the Department of Development Services, City of Long Beach, located at 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 4th Floor, Long Beach, California.

10. The City finds and declares that substantial evidence for each and every finding made herein is contained in the EIR, which is incorporated herein by this reference, or is in the record of proceedings in the matter.

11. The citations provided as references in the Draft and Final EIRs for each impact area discussed in these Findings are for reference purposes only and are not intended to represent an exhaustive listing of all evidence that supports these Findings.

12. The City is certifying the EIR for, and is approving and adopting findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the EIR. It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other State and local agencies (who might be referred to as "responsible agencies" under CEQA). Because the City is the Lead Agency for the Project, the EIR is intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other State and local agencies to carry out the Project.

13. The EIR is a Project EIR for purposes of environmental analysis of the Project. A Project EIR examines the environmental effects of a specific project. The EIR serves as the primary environmental compliance document for entitlement decisions regarding the Project by the City and other regulatory jurisdictions.

14. The City finds that none of the public comments on the Draft EIR or subsequent public comments or other evidence in the record, including any changes in the Project in response to input from the community, include or constitute substantial evidence that would require recirculation of the Final EIR prior to its certification and that there is no substantial evidence elsewhere in the record of proceedings that would require substantial revision of the Final EIR prior to its certification, and that the Final EIR need not be recirculated prior to its certification.

8.0 Consideration and Approval of the Final EIR

Pursuant to Article 7 of the CEQA Guidelines, these Findings have been prepared for the consideration and approval of the Final EIR and the analysis contained herein. The Final EIR was completed in accordance with CEQA; and the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to the action. It is recommended that the Project, along with the above detailed mitigation measures to reduce identified significant environmental effect to below a level of significance, be adopted. Since the Project will result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise, a Statement of Overriding Considerations is required.

9.0 Statement of Overriding Considerations

The Final EIR for the Project has identified a significant and unavoidable impact that will result from implementation of the Project. Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the CEQA Guidelines provide that when a public agency's decision allows the occurrence of significant impacts identified in a Final EIR that are not substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or eliminated, the lead agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record. CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b) requires that the decision-maker adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations at the time of approval of a project if it finds that significant adverse environmental effects have been identified in the Final EIR that cannot be substantially mitigated to an insignificant level or be eliminated. These Findings and the Statement of Considerations are based on the record of proceedings, including, but not limited to, the EIR, and other documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings.

The following impact cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures:

Noise: The Project's impact related to cumulative on-site construction noise

Accordingly, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The City recognizes that a significant and unavoidable impact will result from implementation of the Project. Having: (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures; (ii) rejected as infeasible the alternatives to the Project as discussed above; (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts; and (iv) balanced the benefits of the Project against its significant and unmitigated impacts, the City hereby finds that the benefits, listed below, outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts of the Project for the reasons stated below.

Summarized below are the benefits, goals, and objectives of the Project and the rationale for the benefits of the Project. Any one of the overriding considerations of economic, social, aesthetic and environmental benefits individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental impacts of the Project and justify its approval, adoption or issuance of all of the required permits, approvals and other entitlements for the Project, and certification of the Final EIR. Despite the unavoidable impact caused by the construction of the Project, the City approves the Project based on the following Project benefits, which are grounded in the comprehensive list of Project objectives set forth in Section II, Project Description, of the Draft EIR and discussed herein:

- The underlying purpose of the Project is to revitalize the Project Site by developing a high-quality hotel that provides new lodging opportunities to serve

the Long Beach community as well as publicly accessible restaurant and bar uses that encourage pedestrian activity in the vicinity of the Project Site. Under existing conditions, the Project Site is developed as a surface parking lot. The Project would replace the surface parking area with an economically productive development that would be compatible with the various urban uses in the surrounding vicinity.

- The Project would support and expand tourism and business activity in the Downtown Shoreline area by developing new lodging opportunities that are easily accessible to entertainment and commercial destinations in Long Beach.

- The Project would reduce vehicular trips promoting local, regional, and state mobility objectives and policies by developing a hotel use with convenient access to a variety of alternative transportation options including walking, biking, and public transit, and in close proximity to popular tourist destinations.

- The Project would redevelop an underutilized vacant site by replacing an existing surface parking area with an economically viable and aesthetically attractive development that will be physically and programmatically compatible with the wide variety of urban uses in the vicinity in a manner that will help meet the goals of the City's Revised Long Range Property Management Plan.

- The Project would create a pedestrian-friendly project by improving the portion of Victory Park located within the Project Site to create publicly accessible open space, introducing a pedestrian walkway that connects to the existing Convention Center Walkway, and improved streetscapes around the Project Site.

- The Project would provide short- and long-term employment opportunities and generate transient occupancy tax and other revenues for the City.

- The Project would enhance access to and through Victory park while improving the programming and maintenance of the public park space.

- The Project would provide a mix of convention-serving hotel, hotel amenity, and commercial uses adjacent to the Convention Center that will enhance the convention visitor experience and attract convention guests and bookings to Long Beach.

- The Project would provide public access to and enable the appreciation of the historic Jergins Trust tunnel.

- The Project would provide high-quality, signature architectural design that would enhance the downtown skyline and provide views of the Long Beach coastline and downtown environs.

- The Project would demonstrate environmental leadership and reduce environmental impacts through the integration of sustainability features into building design and operation.

- In addition, the Project would further the goals of the Downtown Shoreline Plan, Long Beach Strategic Plan, and the City's former Downtown Redevelopment Plan.