



City of Long Beach
Tattoo Parlor Ordinance

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND 04-17

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:

City of Long Beach Tattoo Parlor Ordinance

Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:

Craig Chalfant, Senior Planner
(562) 570-6368

Project Location:

City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California.

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:

City of Long Beach, Long Beach Development Services
c/o Christopher Koontz
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6288

General Plan:

The proposed Tattoo Parlor Ordinance would cover all General Plan Land Use Districts that apply to any commercial zoning district or Planned Development (PD) district in the City of Long Beach.

Zoning:

The proposed Ordinance applies to all commercial zoning districts, except the CS Commercial Storage district, and all Planned Development districts that permit commercial land uses in the City of Long Beach.

Project Description:

The proposed project involves a revision to the City of Long Beach Zoning Code definition of tattoo parlor, amendment of the Zoning Code to allow tattoo parlors as a permitted use by-right in all commercial zoning districts allowing commercial land uses (except the CS Commercial Storage district), establishment of new special development standards for tattoo parlors, removal of tattoo parlor land use specific conditions from the City of Long Beach Zoning Code Chapter 21.52 Conditional Uses, and establishment of a new Zoning Clearance Process for land uses that are permitted by-right. These project components are further discussed below.

The City of Long Beach Zoning Code Section 21.15.2990, Tattoo Parlor, would be amended to specifically exclude land uses involving the application of permanent cosmetics, when applied by a licensed dermatologist on premises licensed as a dermatological office, from this land use definition.

Tattoo parlors are currently a prohibited land use in all commercial zoning districts, except the CHW Regional Highway District, CH High Commercial District, and CT Tourist and Entertainment Commercial District. The CHW, CH and CT currently require approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the establishment of any new tattoo parlor land uses. This project would allow tattoo parlors as a permitted land use by-right in all commercial zoning districts, except the CS Commercial Storage district, subject to special development standards. The CS district would continue to classify tattoo parlors as a prohibited land use. In addition, tattoo parlors would be allowed as a permitted land use by-right in all Planned Development (PD) districts that allow commercial land uses, subject to special development standards.

As part of this project proposal, the City of Long Beach Zoning Code would be amended to establish special development standards for the operation of tattoo parlor land uses. These special development standards would be set forth in a new Zoning Code Chapter.

This project proposal also includes removal of all reference to tattoo parlors from Zoning Code Section 21.52.273. This Zoning Code Section would thereafter only apply to fortunetelling services. Finally, this project would include a new Section to Zoning Code Chapter 21.25 for a new zoning clearance process.

Surrounding land uses and settings:

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

Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach Planning Commission (recommend City Council adopt Negative Declaration 04-17 and approve the Tattoo Parlor Ordinance)

Long Beach City Council (adopt Negative Declaration 04-17 and approve the Tattoo Parlor Ordinance)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population and Housing
☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities and Service Systems
☐ Geology and Soils	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Craig Chalfant
Senior Planner

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are supported adequately by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration; Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (per Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effect were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Supporting information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold. If any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS

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

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

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

The TPO involves amendments to the City's Zoning Code regarding the regulation of tattoo parlor land uses and the processing of non-residential land uses that are permitted by-right. Implementation of the proposed TPO would allow for the orderly operations of tattoo parlors in a manner providing greater public protection from potential adverse effects of such land use operations (i.e., noise, loitering). This proposed project would not result in any negative impacts to the City's visual environment. Therefore, no further analysis of this environmental issue is necessary.

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

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

There are no State scenic highways located within the City. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged as a result of TPO implementation. There would therefore be no impact to any natural scenic resource and no further analysis is required.

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

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

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

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

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

All future tattoo parlor land use operations and other permitted by-right non-residential land uses would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 9.37 (Long Beach Nuisance Code). Since TPO implementation would not directly or indirectly create any adverse light or glare impacts, no further analysis is required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

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

a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. AIR QUALITY

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

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

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

The majority of pollutants found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are produced mostly by sources other than automobile exhaust.

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

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

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which

it is located, it is consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP. Since the TPO does not propose any specific developments or growth inducing projects that would conflict with the SCAG growth forecasts, it would be consistent with the AQMP and therefore no further analysis is required.

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

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

TPO implementation would not significantly lower air quality standards or contribute to an air quality violation. Therefore, the TPO impact on air quality would be less than significant and no further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

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

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

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

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, elderly and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including, schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City. The TPO proposes special development standards for tattoo parlors that include minimum locational distances from schools and public parks. Please see Sections III.a. and b. above for further discussion.

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

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

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

The TPO would not allow land uses that could directly or indirectly result in any significant adverse odors or intensification of odors beyond those typically associated with construction activities. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

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

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Land uses subject to this proposed project would occur in established urbanized areas and would not remove or impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

Future TPO implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not promote or involve alteration of any protected wetland areas. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

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

Future TPO implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not alter or adversely impact any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors or nursery sites. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

TPO implementation would be consistent with the General Plan and in conformity with all local policies and regulations. It would not alter or

eliminate any existing or future policy or ordinance protecting biological resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

The TPO would not have any adverse effects on any existing or future habitat conservation plans. Please see Sections IV.a. through e. above for further discussion.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

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

The City of Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties within the City (with the exception of areas such as protected park lands) have been previously disturbed and/or developed. The TPO would not promote, encourage or enable projects or activities that could remove, degrade or in any way adversely impact local historic resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

The TPO would establish special development standards for tattoo parlor land uses and a zoning clearance process for certain land uses permitted by-right. TPO implementation would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore would not be anticipated to affect or

destroy any archaeological resources due its geographic location. Please see Section V.a. above for further discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

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

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

All land uses subject to the provisions of this project would be required to comply with applicable building codes that account for the possibility of seismic events. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

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

The Newport-Inglewood fault zone could create substantial ground shaking if a seismic event occurred along that fault. Similarly, a strong seismic event on any other fault system in Southern California has the potential to create considerable levels of ground shaking throughout the City. However, numerous variables determine the level of damage to a specific location. Given these variables, it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. All land uses must conform to all applicable State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

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

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

iv) Landslides?

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

Per the Seismic Safety Element, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than

1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The State Seismic Hazard Zone map of the Long Beach Quadrangle indicates that the lack of steep terrain (except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill) results in only about 0.1 percent of the City lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for this quadrangle. Therefore, no impact would be expected and no further environmental analysis is required. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

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

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

All land uses subject to the regulations of this proposed project would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best management practices to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

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

Please see Section VI.b. above for discussion. All land uses subject to the regulations of this project would be constructed in compliance with all applicable building code requirements regarding soil stability.

d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?

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

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

e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

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

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

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

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

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide per year. Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit over the next century. Methane is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The TPO would not result in direct or indirect GHG impacts, but rather would establish special development standards for tattoo parlors and processing requirements for certain land uses permitted by-right. No further environmental analysis is needed.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

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

Please see Section VII.a. above for discussion. The proposed project would not permit any land use operations that would conflict with any plans, policies or

regulations related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. No further environmental analysis is needed.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

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

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

The types of land uses which would be subject to the provisions of this proposed project would not be anticipated to involve any substantial transport, use or disposal of any hazardous materials. In addition, any future handling and disposal of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be in full compliance with Long Beach Municipal Code Sections 8.86 through 8.88 as well as all existing State safety regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

Please see Section VIII.a. above for discussion.

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

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

Please see Section VIII.a. above for discussion.

d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code

Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. All future land uses that would be regulated by the provisions of this proposed project would be subject to separate CEQA review that would include analysis of information from the Cortese List. Please see Section VIII.a. above for further discussion.

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

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

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City, just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The TPO would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future projects that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. Please see Section VIII.a. above for further discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

The TPO would not encourage or otherwise set forth any policies or recommendations that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

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

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

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

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

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

The TPO would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the Conservation Element. All land uses subject to the TPO provisions would be required to be in full compliance with all applicable federal, State and local water quality standards and regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Please see Sections IX.a. and c. above for discussion. The City's existing storm water drainage system is adequate to accommodate runoff from any future land uses subject to the TPO provisions. The TPO would not adversely affect provisions for retention and infiltration of stormwater consistent with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) policies.

f. Would the project otherwise degrade water quality?

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

Please see Sections IX.a. and c. above for discussion. All future land uses subject to the TPO provisions would be subject to all applicable water quality standards, regulations and best management practices.

g. Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

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

According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), most of Long Beach is located in Zone X, which is outside of the 100 year flood hazard area. The proposed project applies to certain permitted by-right land uses only and would not directly or indirectly result in placing any residential land uses in flood hazard areas.

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

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

Please see Section IX.g. above for discussion.

i. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

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

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

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

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

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

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

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

The TPO establishes processing procedures for certain types of land uses and special development standards for tattoo parlors. These proposed regulations would not directly or indirectly divide any established community, but rather would provide controls on tattoo parlor land use operations that would protect the surrounding community from potential adverse effects (i.e., noise, loitering). No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

See Section X.a. above for discussion. The TPO would not conflict the City's General Plan, the 2010 Strategic Plan, or any other applicable land use plans and policies. Impacts to existing local regulations would therefore be less than significant.

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

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

See Sections X.a. and b. above for discussion. The City is a highly urbanized environment characterized by in-fill development projects that recycle previously developed properties. No habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan would be impacted by project implementation.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

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

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

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

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

Please see Section XI.a. above for discussion.

XII. NOISE

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

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

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

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

Future construction activities related to land uses subject to the provisions of this project could involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, earth-moving equipment, and paving equipment. However, all construction activities and land use operations must be performed in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). TPO implementation would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or exempt any future land uses or improvement projects from local noise controls. The local Noise Ordinance would continue to regulate all future land use construction and operational noise levels. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

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

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

See Section XII.a. above for discussion. All future TPO implementation would occur in compliance with local noise and vibration controls.

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

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

See Section XII.a. above for discussion. TPO special development standards include a prohibition against loud noises around the subject site during and after the hours of business operation.

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

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

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

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

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

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The TPO would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

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

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

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

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

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

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

The TPO only sets forth processing procedures for permitted by-right land uses and special development standards for tattoo parlors. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

The TPO does not set forth or encourage any policies, projects or implementation measures that would directly or indirectly displace existing residential units in the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

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

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection would be provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 stations in the City. The Department is divided into bureaus of Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, the Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

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

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

Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

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

The TPO only sets forth processing procedures for permitted by-right land uses and special development standards for tattoo parlors. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for fire protection services or fire protection facilities. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Police protection?

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

Similar to Section XIV.a. above, the TPO would not significantly increase demands for police protection service, nor require provision of new police facilities.

c. Schools?

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

Similar to Section XIV.a. above, the TPO would not result in an increased demand for public school services or facilities.

d. Parks?

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

Similar to Section XIV.a. above, the TPO would not generate any additional demand for provision of park services or facilities by the City.

e. Other public facilities?

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

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

XV. RECREATION

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

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

The TPO only sets forth processing procedures for permitted by-right land uses and special development standards for tattoo parlors. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for recreational facilities. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

Please see Section XV.a. above. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

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

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

The TPO only sets forth processing procedures for permitted by-right land uses and special development standards for tattoo parlors. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population or employment growth that could result in increased number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratios, or traffic congestion. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

Please see Section XVI.a. for discussion. Since the TPO would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth, there would be no significant impacts on levels of service.

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

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

The TPO regulatory and procedural requirements for permitted by-right land uses would have no impact on air traffic patterns. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

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

The TPO would not create or encourage any hazardous transportation related design features or incompatible uses. No further environmental analysis is required.

e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

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

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

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

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

The TPO would not propose or encourage any specific land uses or development projects or transportation network modifications that would conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVI. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project 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, that is:

- a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?**

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

Please see Section V. above. TPO implementation would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore would not be anticipated to significantly affect or destroy any Native American tribal cultural resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

- 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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

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

See Section XVI.a. above. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

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

b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

For Sections XVIII.a. through g. The TPO regulatory and procedural requirements for permitted by-right land uses would not be expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system. The City of Long Beach is an urbanized setting with all utilities and services fully in place. Future demands for utilities and service systems have been anticipated in the General Plan goals, policies and programs for future growth. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

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

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

- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

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

The TPO land use regulatory and procedural requirements would not contribute to any cumulative growth effects beyond what is anticipated for the City’s future in the General Plan.

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

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

The land use requirements of this proposed project would not directly or indirectly cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings. For this reason, the City has concluded that the proposed TPO can be implemented without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.