



Legislation Details (With Text)

File #:	21-0446	Version:	1	Name:	DS - Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan D57
Type:	Resolution	Status:		Status:	Adopted
File created:	4/29/2021	In control:		In control:	City Council
On agenda:	5/18/2021	Final action:		Final action:	5/18/2021

Title: Recommendation to adopt resolution certifying the Final Program EIR/EIS-03-17 (SCH No. 2018091021), making findings of fact, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and approving a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);

Sponsors:

Indexes:

Code sections:

Attachments: 1. 051821-H-21sr&att.pdf, 2. 051821-H-21-Attachment_A_Planning_Commission_Staff_Report.pdf, 3. 051821-H-21-Attachment_B_ALUC_Findings.pdf, 4. 051821-H-21-Attachment_C_2016_C-17_Transition_Master_Plan.pdf, 5. 051821-H-21-Attachment_D_2018_Update_to_C-17_Transition_Master_Plan.pdf, 6. 051821-H-21-Attachment_E_Existing_Conditions_Report.pdf, 7. 051821-H-21-Attachment_F_Globemaster_Corridor_Specific_Plan.pdf, 8. 051821-H-21-Attachment_G_Location_Map.pdf, 9. 051821-H-21-Attachment_H_Public_Comments.pdf, 10. 051821-H-21-Attachment_I_Findings.pdf, 11. 051821-H-21-Attachment_J_Public_Review_Draft_Program_EIR-EIS_03-17.pdf, 12. 051821-H-21-Attachment_K_Draft_PEIR_EIS_Appendix_A.pdf, 13. 051821-H-21-Attachment_L_Draft_PEIR_EIS_Appendix_B.pdf, 14. 051821-H-21-Attachment_M_Draft_PEIR_EIS_Appendix_C.pdf, 15. 051821-H-21-Attachment_N_Draft_PEIR_EIS_Appendix_D.pdf, 16. 051821-H-21-Attachment_O_Draft_PEIR_EIS_Appendix_E.pdf, 17. 051821-H-21-Attachment_P_Final_Program_EIR-EIS_03-17.pdf, 18. 051821-H-21-Attachment_Q_Findings_of_Fact_and_SOC_EIR_EIS-03-17.pdf, 19. 051821-H-21 PowerPoint.pdf, 20. RES-21-0049.pdf

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
5/18/2021	1	City Council	approve recommendation and adopt	Pass

Recommendation to adopt resolution certifying the Final Program EIR/EIS-03-17 (SCH No. 2018091021), making findings of fact, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and approving a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);

At its December 17, 2020 meeting, the Planning Commission held a duly-noticed public hearing on the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan and recommended that the City Council approve all requested actions (Attachment A - Planning Commission Staff Report). Following the Planning Commission hearing, this item was heard by the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on March 3, 2021, and the ALUC made positive findings (Attachment B - ALUC Findings) determining the project is consistent with the County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The item is now presented to the City Council for final approval and enactment.

Background

In September 2013, the United States Department of Defense (DoD) notified the Boeing Company (Boeing) that it would no longer place future orders for the C-17 Globemaster III military transport aircraft manufactured at the Boeing plant at 2400 E. Wardlow Road in Long Beach. In April 2014, Boeing announced it would close C-17 production plants by mid-2015 due primarily to the termination of the DoD contracts, which represented the single largest demand for the aircraft. In 2015, the DoD terminated its contract with Boeing for the manufacturing of the C-17 after receiving final deliveries of the aircraft. Boeing closed the C-17 plant in December 2015. At its peak, the C-17 site employed up to 5,000 people; however, since 2010, Boeing steadily downsized the C-17 workforce in anticipation of the closure. A study conducted by Economic Modeling Specialists International anticipated that the closure of the C-17 production facility would result in an overall loss of nearly 5,000 jobs, including a direct loss of approximately 1,158 Boeing jobs, plus an estimated 3,781 jobs in the related supply chain.

In 2015, in anticipation of the C-17 facility closure and the potential impact on the City and its surroundings, the City applied for and was awarded a grant from the DoD Office of Economic Adjustments to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Master Plan (Attachment C - 2016 C-17 Transition Master Plan and Attachment D - 2018 Update to C-17 Transition Master Plan). The C-17 Transition Master Plan provides three separate activity tracks: (1) to provide economic development planning; (2) land use and infrastructure planning; and, (3) assistance to impacted defense firms and workers. In 2016, the first phase of the C-17 Transition Master Plan resulted in a detailed analysis of existing economic, land use, and infrastructure conditions in the plan area; alternative land use scenarios; and, a planning and urban design framework (Attachment E - Existing Conditions Report). The second phase, which is the current phase, consists of the development of a Specific Plan for the Boeing facility site and surrounding corridors. This has been named the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP) and builds upon the work completed in phase one and represents the next step in the overall transition of the former Boeing C-17 facility and surrounding area. The third phase, yet to come, will be carried out by the Economic Development Department with affected firms and workers, and the residents and business community of Long Beach.

The GCSP is the result of the second phase of the C-17 Transition Master Plan and is the matter currently before the City Council (Attachment F - Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan). The GCSP, a proposed 437-acre Specific Plan, is located in the central portion of Long Beach, bordering the Long Beach Airport and the cities of Lakewood and Signal Hill to the north and south, respectively. The plan area is approximately three miles northeast of Downtown Long Beach (Attachment G - Location Map). The proposed GCSP is a commercial - and industrial-only Specific Plan that will allow the reuse, development, and enhancement of the former C-17 facility property and the surrounding industrial and commercial areas in the Airport vicinity, as well as the streetscape on the two major arterials in the plan area, Cherry Avenue and Spring Street. The GCSP does not contain or permit any residential uses, given its proximity to the Airport and the noise sensitivity of residential uses.

In 1941, Douglas Aircraft Company first established a manufacturing plant near the Airport, on Lakewood Boulevard. In 1967, McDonnell Aircraft Corporation merged with Douglas

Aircraft Company to form McDonnell Douglas. After the merger, McDonnell Douglas built a new plant just east of Cherry Avenue at Wardlow Road. In 1996, rival manufacturer Boeing purchased the Long Beach McDonnell Douglas plants. Boeing manufactured commercial airliners at the Lakewood Boulevard location until 2006 and manufactured military transport aircraft at the Cherry Avenue and Wardlow Road plant until the plant was closed in 2015. For over 80 years, Douglas Aircraft, McDonnell Douglas, and then Boeing manufactured iconic aircraft such as the B-17 Flying Fortress, the C-74 Globemaster, the C-124 Globemaster II, the DC-10 airliner, the MD-80 and MD-90 series airliners (later re-designated the Boeing 717), and the C-17 Globemaster III.

Today, the area that is proposed to become the GCSP consists of variety of low- to mid-rise commercial and industrial uses. The GCSP divides the plan area into four geographic areas: Northern, Central Core, Southern, and Southeastern.

- The **Northern Area** is characterized by primarily single-story auto-oriented commercial uses, including auto service shops, car dealerships, and strip commercial centers. The Long Beach Town Square shopping center at Cherry Avenue and Carson Street is the largest shopping center in this area.
- The **Central Core Area** is home to primarily industrial uses, including the former Boeing C-17 site comprised of approximately 1.1 million square feet (approximately 25 acres) of enclosed aerospace manufacturing production space and associated buildings.
- The **Southern Area** is commercial and industrial in nature and includes primarily large-scale industrial operations and warehouses west of Cherry Avenue. East of Cherry Avenue, uses transition to more commercial/office related businesses, including a new multistory office building, motorcycle dealership and a new retail center.
- The **Southeastern Area**, primarily industrial, is located between the San Diego Freeway (I-405) and the Long Beach Airport (Airport). North of Spring Street, the land is Airport-owned and comprised of aviation-oriented land uses and buildings, including the Pilot Shop, Long Beach Flying Club, the Daugherty Sky Harbor building, and ATP Flight School. South of Spring Street consists of warehouses, construction yards, and general industrial buildings.

Purpose of the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan

The purpose of the GCSP is to establish a long-term vision and framework for the development of the area into a 21st Century employment district. All land within the plan area is commercial or industrial in nature, and no existing or planned residential uses are included in the GCSP. Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the plan will attract and optimize new employment opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise, and competitive economies of the Airport, the City, and the Southern California region. In addition to becoming a flexible commercial-industrial district, incremental and strategic investments will foster pedestrian, bicycle, and transit mobility, improve connectivity, provide open space and amenities, and enhance the design and functionality of the workforce environment. The plan area will become a destination where leading-edge firms come to leverage their locational advantage adjacent to

the Airport, Port of Long Beach, I-405, California State University, Long Beach, and a thriving residential and business community. The GCSP is built around the following five overarching Specific Plan goals:

- Goal No. 1: Create a 21st Century employment district that fosters innovation.
- Goal No. 2: Stimulate Economic Development and Job Growth.
- Goal No. 3: Cultivate the Existing Human Capital of Long Beach.
- Goal No. 4: Establish Cherry Avenue as a Multimodal Unifying Corridor.
- Goal No. 5: Increase Mobility Choices with an Emphasis on Active Transportation.

Organization of the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan

Within the GCSP document, eight chapters provide the basis for the plan and the regulations that will govern future development in the plan area. These chapters include: (1) Summary; (2) Context; (3) Vision, Goals, and Policies; (4) Land Use and Mobility; (5) Land Use and Development Regulations; (6) Urban Design Guidelines; (7) Infrastructure Systems; and, (8) Implementation and Administration. References and appendices provide additional supporting information at the end of the plan. The GCSP is intended to be read holistically, for example, a hypothetical business park development proposal would be primarily regulated through Chapter 5 (Land Use and Development Regulations), but would refer to Chapter 2 for information on existing conditions, Chapter 3 for big-picture goals and policies that would inform any significant development in the plan area, and Chapter 4 for off-site transportation and mobility improvements such as street improvements, sidewalks, and bike lanes that the development may be required to provide. Chapter 6 would inform the project's architectural design as well as its design to interface with the urban fabric of the surrounding community. Chapter 7 describes the infrastructure improvements that a significant project would be responsible to provide, such as storm drain upgrades, water and sewer line repairs or replacements, and gas and electricity considerations. Chapter 8 describes the GCSP's discretionary and permitting processes, the various approval authorities that would review the proposed development, and implementation strategy and relationship to other plans and regulations that could affect the development. All these chapters work together to ensure that a significant development will accomplish the broad goals set forth in the GCSP.

Public Outreach, Engagement, and Vision

The GCSP was initiated as the second phase of the Boeing C-17 Transition Master Plan. The first phase, which consisted of economic development planning, began after the City received a grant from the DoD Economic Adjustments to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Master Plan in 2015. During this first phase of the master plan, a public opinion survey was carried out to gauge Long Beach area residents' views on how the closing C-17 facility should be used and to understand the public's vision for the area in addition to market demands. The City also held a series of public meetings in July, August, and September of 2016 to discuss the master plan and refine the goals and policies that would be included in the second phase.

After the beginning of the second phase, a series of planning workshops were held to further refine residents' and the business community's opinions and needs for the land use plan for the reuse of the C-17 site and surrounding areas. These workshops, held in February, June, and September of 2018, provided local residents and the business community additional opportunities to learn about and comment on the proposed reuse of the C-17 facility, and the draft of the Specific Plan that was under development at the time. While varying views were voiced, the workshop groups largely expressed support for the development of a business park-type campus at the former C-17 site, streetscape enhancements to Cherry Avenue and Spring Street, and traffic and mobility improvements throughout the Cherry Avenue and Spring Street corridors, all of which are major goals of the GCSP. Participants also expressed concern about traffic levels on Cherry Avenue, and a desire for future businesses at the development site to have a reduced vehicular traffic intensity compared to traditional business park-style development. Residents of the nearby California Heights and Bixby Knolls neighborhoods were particularly concerned with the possibility of increased truck traffic on Cherry Avenue that may result from poorly implemented distribution or fulfillment center land uses. One of the plan's main goals is to implement any large-scale industrial and commercial uses in a way that reduces personal automobile trips and manages truck traffic to ensure community compatibility.

In June 2019, the Boeing Company finalized the sale of the property containing the C-17 manufacturing facilities to the Goodman Group (Goodman), a property development company. The City consulted with Boeing on the sale; however, the ultimate decision was Boeing's to make based on market conditions and demands. Following the sale, the City held multiple meetings with Goodman regarding their vision for the C-17 facility property and surrounding properties. The City took the input from those meetings into consideration within the wider frame of broader business, resident, and other stakeholder input that went into the development of GCSP, to ensure the plan is both responsive to market needs and demands, and sensitive to community needs and concerns.

On December 17, 2020, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the GCSP. This hearing received significant public participation from surrounding residents, property owners within the plan area, and developers and other stakeholders, despite the virtual meeting format due to the pandemic. Various views were expressed, but comments by the public and stakeholders were largely supportive. Comments centered on the following areas of concern: open space connections within the plan area; the nature of the proposed Airport district; the design of Wardlow Road cross-sections, parking requirements, and the office parking requirement reduction process; level of service impacts at the Wardlow Road and Cherry Avenue intersection; height districts; and, permitted light industrial uses. Staff from the City of Signal Hill also gave testimony, expressing general support for Long Beach's long-range planning efforts, but criticizing a specific response to Signal Hill's comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Response to Comment 6-10). City of Long Beach staff committed to a dialogue and revision to this response and has since worked with Signal Hill staff to resolve the issue. Written comments submitted by the public are attached to this report (Attachment H - Public Comments). The Planning Commission did not request any changes to the GCSP and voted 7-0 to forward the plan to the City Council with a

recommendation to approve.

Development Regulations

The GCSP divides the plan area into six land use districts, with two overlay zones, which are intended to regulate land functionally by “subareas,” as well as harmonize uses across subareas and integrate them into the larger fabric of the area, as follows:

- The **Business Park (BP)** district covers the former C-17 facility and nearby Airport-adjacent properties, comprising the heart of the plan area. The BP district is intended as a campus-style district that supports a range of employment uses, including professional offices, research and development, light industrial, high cube warehousing, and aviation-related uses. Warehousing uses will need to be high-turnover and employment-generating warehousing, subject to the authority of the Zoning Administrator to determine what constitutes a “high-turnover and employment-generating warehouse.” Development regulations are designed to achieve high-quality midrise structures served by a system of pedestrian pathways, passive and active open space areas, and amenities in a campus-style environment. The BP district requires primary uses, consisting of large-scale commercial or industrial uses, to be established for any secondary uses of supporting retail, restaurant, or personal services to be established on the same site. Permitted uses for the BP district are itemized in the GCSP.
- The **Community Commercial (CC)** district supports medium-scale retail, hotel, and service uses intended to serve the entire community, including convenience and comparison-shopping goods and associated services. Permitted land uses for the CC district correspond to the Community Automobile-Oriented (CCA) zoning district in Title 21 (Zoning) of the Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC). Development regulations are designed to achieve a pedestrian-friendly environment where buildings face the sidewalk at the immediate intersections, and where mid-corridor streetscape enhancements provide a more inviting walking environment.
- The **Industrial Commercial (IC)** district supports a mix of auto-oriented commercial and light industrial uses, including research and development, flex space, warehousing, and small-scale incubator industries, as well as community-serving commercial uses. Permitted uses for the IC district combine the permitted uses of the Light Industrial (IL) and Regional Highway District (CHW) zoning districts in Title 21 (Zoning) of the LBMC. Land uses are designed to operate entirely within enclosed structures, which limit the potential for environmental impacts on neighboring uses. It is anticipated that buildings housing these uses will be within low-scale, adaptively reused structures or part of modern industrial complexes in campus-like settings. Development regulations are designed to address the streetscape to achieve a more inviting walking environment.
- The **General Industrial (IG)** district is preserved for traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses such as large construction yards with heavy equipment, chemical manufacturing plants, and food processing plants. Permitted land uses for the IG district

correspond to the General Industrial (IG) zoning district in Title 21 (Zoning) of the LBMC. The buildings that house these operations may be older industrial buildings retrofitted to accommodate the use or new state-of-the-art manufacturing plants. The focus of the IG district is on the operating characteristics of the use, rather than the product created. Development regulations are designed to provide adequate parking and address the streetscape to achieve a more inviting walking environment.

· The **Airport (AP)** district is reserved for property that is part of the designated airfield of the Airport and adjacent properties under Airport control. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires these areas to remain available for aviation operations and aviation-related uses. The property in the AP district is managed by the Airport Department of the City of Long Beach. Land use and development standards reflect this aviation focus and are intended to accommodate any aviation-related uses approved by the Airport. The AP district in the GCSP is created to unify the land use regulations for the western and southern areas of the Airport and is intended to serve as a model for the future adoption of an Airport zoning district or specific plan for the Airport, either of which will cover the entire airport. At the time of the creation of GCSP, land use at the Airport was regulated through a mix of the IG zoning district, and several Planned Development (PD) districts, including PDs for the Long Beach Airport Terminal (PD-12), the Atlantic Aviation Center (PD-13), and Douglas Aircraft (PD-19). The GCSP replaces the western area of PD-19 (leaving the eastern area, which is east of Lakewood Boulevard, as-is) and absorbs all of PD-13, as well as the IG zone on the Airport property within the extent of the plan area. Permitted uses for the AP district are itemized in the GCSP.

· The **Open Space (OS)** district is established to preserve the designated open space area at the southeast corner of Spring Street and California Avenue within the plan area. This district is intended to be used for active and passive public use, including for recreational, cultural, and community service activities that provide physical and psychological relief from the urban development of the plan area. Permitted land uses for the OS district correspond to the P (Park) zoning district in Title 21 (Zoning), LBMC.

· The **Cherry Avenue Overlay Zone (CAOZ)** is intended to allow complementary retail and restaurant amenities supportive of the underlying BP district and adjacent neighborhoods. Development standards are designed to ensure that new uses are pedestrian-oriented and address Cherry Avenue either as stand-alone buildings or integrated with new business-park or modern industrial complexes in a campus-style setting. The CAOZ is only applied to the areas of the BP district that front Cherry Avenue. Permitted uses for the CAOZ are those secondary uses specified for the BP district, which may be established in the CAOZ without the presence of the primary uses of the BP district.

· The **Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ)** encompasses the entire GCSP area. It is intended to ensure that future land uses within the plan area are compatible with Airport operations with respect to noise, safety, and airspace protection. The AEOZ includes the areas within (1) the Airport's 65 and 70 decibels (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours; (2) the six safety compatibility zones applicable to each Airport runway

where heightened risk levels may warrant restrictions on land use development; and, (3) the airspace protection surfaces that define the Airport's airspace, including FAA Part 77 and Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) surfaces. The AEOZ in the GCSP is a prototype for a potential wider AEOZ around the entire Airport.

Parking

Parking within the GCSP largely follows the requirements of Chapter 21.41 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) of the Zoning Regulations (Title 21, LBMC), except that the parking requirement for office uses within the BP district are reduced from four stalls per 1,000 sq. ft. to two stalls per 1,000 sq. ft., to reflect the flexibility that office employers can provide to their employees with regards to alternate mobility arrangements. This is consistent with the Land Use Element's citywide implementation strategy LU-M-25, to include flexible standards targeted for infill development. Additionally, within the BP district, the Planning Commission has the ability to approve a potential 35 percent reduction of the parking requirements specified in Chapter 21.41 of the LBMC. This is allowed due to the size of the development site and the potential scale of development at this location. This reflects the fact that large business-campus-style employment centers benefit from economies of scale in parking and mobility and can implement micro-mobility solutions such as bike sharing and electric scooters within the site, and carpool and other transportation demand management (TDM) strategies for workers coming to and from the site. To request this 35 percent reduction by the Planning Commission, a developer must prepare a traffic impact analysis and parking management study demonstrating that such an arrangement would be feasible without creating any significant negative impacts to traffic flow, circulation, and on-street parking. The developer will also be required to implement a permanent TDM plan.

Implementation

Implementation of the GCSP will take place over time through public and private sector investments. Private development, in the form of reuse of major buildings, construction of new employment centers, and recycling of existing small and outdated properties, will drive the overall development of the plan. Public improvements immediately adjacent to or necessary for each private development will be phased in with each development on a project-specific basis, including street improvements, bike lanes, parkway landscaping, intersection upgrades, and other public improvements. Additional improvements to the public right-of-way and streetscape may be pursued through special assessment districts, business improvement districts or property-based business improvement districts, a community facilities district, or an enhanced infrastructure financing district.

General Plan Consistency

The GCSP conforms to the general goals, policies, and designations of the City's General Plan Land Use Element (LUE), adopted by the City Council in 2019. The following is a description of how each of the specific plan districts are consistent with the LUE's land use districts, called "PlaceTypes," which specify what land uses are allowed in each of the

respective PlaceTypes.

- The Central Core of the Specific Plan area consists primarily of the Business Park (BP) and General Industrial (IG) districts, which allow uses that are consistent with the Regional-Serving Facility (RSF) and Industrial (I) PlaceType designations in the LUE. This area also consists of Airport (AP) district on the areas owned by the Long Beach Airport.
- The Northern Area of the Specific Plan consists primarily of the Community Commercial (CC) and the Industrial Commercial (IC) districts, which allow uses consistent with the Community Commercial (CC) PlaceType designation in the LUE.
- The Southern Area of the Specific Plan consists primarily of the General Industrial (IG) and Airport (AP) districts, which allow uses that are consistent with the RSF PlaceType designation in the LUE.
- The Southeastern Area of the Specific Plan consists primarily of the General Industrial (IG) district, and an area of Open Space (OS) district, which allow uses consistent with the Industrial (I), NeoIndustrial (NI), and Open Space (OS) PlaceType designations, respectively, in the LUE.

The Regional-Serving Facility (RSF) PlaceType is intended for land uses serving a regional need for large-scale employment, goods movement, and public-serving uses, with state-of-the-art transportation management programs. The Industrial (I) PlaceType includes all industrial activities and prohibits nonindustrial uses except commercial accessory uses needed to serve the Industrial PlaceType. The Community Commercial (CC) PlaceType serves auto-oriented needs for goods and services and promotes commerce; no residential uses are allowed in the CC PlaceType. The NeoIndustrial (NI) PlaceType allows restricted light industrial uses along with commercial office and information services, with a higher concentration of onsite employees than the Industrial PlaceType, while encouraging a hybrid industrial-commercial development model. Lastly, the Open Space (OS) PlaceType preserves and enhances open space and park space. Overall, the uses allowed by the GCSP districts are consistent with the uses allowed by the LUE.

The GCSP also advances LUE goals, including sustainable planning and development practices (Goal No. 1), stimulating continuous economic development and job growth (Goal No. 2), accommodating strategic growth and change (Goal No. 3), and providing reliable public facilities and infrastructure to encourage investment (Goal No. 7). Additionally, the inclusion of the previously described reduced parking standard for office space in the BP district is consistent with the LUE's citywide implementation strategy LU-M-25, to include flexible standards targeted for infill development. The GCSP also furthers goals of the General Plan's Open Space Element, preserving a site and providing for a new park or open space development in the southwest area of the plan. Further, the GCSP conforms to and furthers the goals of the General Plan's Urban Design Element by requiring high-quality development, sustainable design, and serious architecture, as well as creating complete streets and a pedestrian- and bike-friendly mobility environment.

The GCSP also conforms to the General Plan's Mobility Element through its plan for, and implementation of, high-quality development that takes advantage of the economies of scale available to a large, centralized employment campus, and the enhancement of two major arterial corridors. The GCSP both promotes and requires high-quality transportation demand management (TDM) strategies and alternative mobility options for all major developments in the plan area. This will help reduce reliance on single-occupancy vehicles for commuting and consequently reduce traffic over the long term. The GCSP will also guide the enhancement of existing streets into "complete streets" that are friendly to all users, whether bike, bus, or pedestrians, in addition to automobile users. Goal No. 1 of the Mobility Element is to create an efficient, balanced, multimodal mobility network; this includes establishing a network of complete streets, reconfiguring existing streets to emphasize modal priorities, strategically improving congested intersections and corridors, reducing the environmental impacts of the transportation system, and managing the supply of parking, all of which are achieved through the GCSP's development standards and guidelines. Further, Goal No. 2 of the Mobility Element is to maintain and enhance air, water, and ground transportation capacity; this includes maintaining and enhancing general and commercial aviation at the Airport while mitigating impacts on residents and businesses, which is accomplished by the GCSP's land use regulations and preservation of aviation-related uses on Airport properties. Goal No. 3 of the Mobility Element is to lead the region by example with innovative and experimental practices; this includes bikeway connections and enhancements, new mobility strategies in TDM packages, and continual evaluation of transportation programs to determine their effectiveness; these items are achieved through the GCSP's TDM requirements and mobility improvements.

The proposed GCSP is also aligned with the Blueprint for Economic Development prepared by the City's Economic Development Department. The 20-page Blueprint document contains the City's 10-year strategies to strengthen the City's core economic engines, nurture and grow new industries, and foster economic inclusion. The goals of the Blueprint are to establish Long Beach as a leader in education and business expansion, retention, and growth; to ensure that the Long Beach economy provides at least a 1:1 jobs-to-residents ratio; to develop a civic and economic culture that provides access to resources and markets needed to startup businesses, and to ensure that Long Beach is recognized as a livable, inventive, and inclusive city. The GCSP furthers these goals by allowing the strategic reuse and redevelopment of the former Boeing manufacturing facility, while encouraging development of supporting businesses and industries in the peripheral areas of the plan and supporting the existing industrial base in the plan area.

Required Approvals and Recommendation

The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council certify the Program EIR/EIS and adopt the accompanying Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Findings of Fact, and Statement of Overriding Considerations; enact the GCSP; approve the Zone Change; approve the Zoning Code Amendment to repeal PD-13; and accept the decision/action of the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission. The Planning Commission has made

positive findings as required by the Zoning Regulations (Attachment I - Findings).

This matter was reviewed by Assistant City Attorney Michael J. Mais on April 20, 2021 and by Budget Management Officer Rhutu Amin Gharib on April 27, 2021.

Public Hearing Notice

A notice of public hearing was published in the Long Beach Press-Telegram on April 22, 2021, in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 21.21 of the LBMC. Additionally, a total of 491 notices of public hearing were distributed on April 22, 2021, to all properties within the GCSP area. Due to the declared state of emergency for the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, notices were not posted at City libraries (as they are closed). A notice of public hearing also was distributed through the City's LinkLB e-mail system, and to individual stakeholders who have requested notification on this item. Any comments received following the preparation and publication of this report will be forwarded to the City Council as they are received.

Environmental Review

In understanding the environmental review of the project, it is important to consider the baseline for analysis. To be conservative, the baseline, or basis of comparison used was the existing conditions in 2018 when the environmental review began. This approach provides the City with a legally-correct environmental review document but also somewhat exaggerates the impacts of the GCSP. In reality, the buildout of the GCSP area will result in reuse of some buildings, construction of some new buildings, and a mix of uses with fewer total vehicle and truck trips than during the peak-year of Boeing's operations onsite. The City Council should consider both basis of comparison in making their evaluation of the GCSP.

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines, and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), a joint Program Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS) (SCH No. 2018091021) (Attachment J - Public Review Draft Program EIR/EIS-03-17, and Attachments K through O, Appendices) was prepared for the proposed project. The City is the Lead Agency under CEQA. The City was awarded a grant from the DoD Office of Economic Adjustments to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Program. Federally-funded projects must follow the procedural requirements of NEPA (Title 42 of the United States Code [U.S.C.] § 4321 et seq: "NEPA"). As such, this Program EIS has been prepared in conformance with NEPA.

An Initial Study/Environmental Assessment (IS/EA) prepared in September 2018 determined that a Program EIR/EIS would be the appropriate level of CEQA/NEPA environmental review pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. Although the legally required contents of a Program EIR/EIS are the same as for a Project EIR/EIS, a Program EIR/EIS is more conceptual and may contain a more general discussion of impacts, alternatives, and mitigation measures than a Project EIR/EIS. Use of a Program EIR/EIS allows the City, as Lead Agency under CEQA, the opportunity to consider broad policy alternatives and program

-wide mitigation measures. A Program EIR/EIS is commonly used for long-range planning policy documents, such as the GCSP.

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and IS/EA were circulated for a 30-day public review period from September 12, 2018 to October 11, 2018. A public scoping meeting for the EIR/EIS was held on September 26, 2018, from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. in the cafeteria of Howard Hughes Middle School at 3846 California Avenue, Long Beach. Twelve comment letters/emails were received during the NOP public review period, and four written scoping meeting comments were received during the scoping meeting. These comments expressed concern about potential historic impacts, noise impacts, and traffic impacts. During this NOP comment period, the City received written comments from the State Clearinghouse, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC), Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) - District 7, Walk Bike Long Beach, California Heights Neighborhood Association, and other interested parties. The purpose of this comment period was to allow the public and responsible agencies the opportunity to provide suggestions on the scope of analysis and environmental issues to be addressed in the EIR/EIS.

The Notice of Availability (NOA) and Draft Program EIR/EIS were made available for public comment during a 45-day public review and comment period that started on August 3, 2020 and ended on September 17, 2020. During this Draft Program EIR/EIS comment period, the City received eight written comments from LACSD, MWDSC, County of Los Angeles Airport Land Use Commission, Caltrans - District 7, Long Beach Airport Department, City of Signal Hill, and Long Beach Water Department. Issues raised in these comment letters addressed minor corrections to average daily wastewater generation and treatment quantities (LACSD), potential impacts to MWDSC water pipelines in the plan area (MWDSC), requirements for the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) review (County of Los Angeles), potential traffic impacts to the regional transportation system (Caltrans), minor clarifications to the figures and analysis pertaining to airport-adjacent properties (Long Beach Airport Department), potential traffic and land use compatibility where the plan area is adjacent to the City of Signal Hill boundary (City of Signal Hill), and minor corrections to localized impacts to water mains and sewer infrastructure. All issues raised in the Draft Program EIR/EIS comment letters have been adequately addressed in the Final Program EIR/EIS (Attachment P - Final Program EIR/EIS-03-17), which determined that no new significant environmental impacts or issues were raised in the comment letters that would require a recirculation of the Draft Program EIR/EIS.

The Program EIR/EIS Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)/Environmental Commitments Record (ECR), which is included in the Final EIR/EIS, is designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project buildout. While mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce the level of environmental impacts, the Final Program EIR/EIS identified certain impacts that would remain significant, unavoidable, and adverse even after all feasible mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project.

These environmental impacts involve conflict with an applicable air quality plan, short-term construction-related air quality, long-term operational-related air quality, construction-related air quality impacts to sensitive receptors, impacts on potential historic resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation impacts related to consistency with established Level-of-Service (LOS) metrics. Due to these significant unavoidable adverse impacts, certification of this Program EIR/EIS requires approval of a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) that determines the project's economic, legal, social, and/or technological benefits would outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, and the adverse impacts may be considered acceptable.

The Final Program EIR/EIS evaluated two alternatives to the proposed project to determine if the alternatives could feasibly meet most of the project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening significant project impacts. The alternatives considered were the No Project Alternative and Reduced Project Alternative. Based on the analysis provided in the Draft Program EIR/EIS, the No Project Alternative was determined not to meet project objectives. The Reduced Project Alternative was identified as the environmentally superior alternative, with several environmental issues at reduced impact levels compared with the proposed project. The Reduced Project Alternative would lessen the significant and unavoidable impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation; however, impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation would remain significant and unavoidable. The Reduced Project Alternative would help meet most of the objectives identified for the Proposed Project, but it would fail to meet those objectives as fully as the Proposed Project. The Reduced Project Alternative would only partially meet Objective 2: Stimulate Economic Development and Job Growth. For the reasons stated above and the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment Q - Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations for The GCSP Program EIR/EIS-03-17), the City has considered the information contained in the record of administrative proceedings on the Proposed Project, and has weighed the above-outlined benefits of the Proposed Project against the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in the Final Program EIR/EIS.

The City of Signal Hill provided additional comments on the Final EIR/EIS during the Planning Commission hearing on December 17, 2020. In response to these comments, the Response to Comment No. 6-10 was revised for clarity. Should the GCSP be adopted, the City is committed to working cooperatively with the City of Signal Hill through implementation and review of individual projects to address the City of Signal Hill's concerns regarding intersection traffic impacts while still addressing Long Beach needs for a balanced mobility approach and jobs-rich economic development. No additional changes to the EIR analysis or the proposed mitigation measures were made in response to this comment. The March 2021 Final EIR/EIS includes these revisions.

The preparation and public availability of this Program EIR/EIS has been carried out in compliance with the provisions of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, and NEPA, and the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council certify the Program EIR/EIS-03-17 and find that no further environmental analysis is required under CEQA and NEPA.

Section 21.25.103 of the Zoning Regulations requires that, for Zone Changes and Zoning Code Amendments, within sixty days following positive Planning Commission action, the Commission's recommendation be transmitted by the Department of Development Services to the City Clerk for presentation to the City Council. The Planning Commission acted on December 17, 2020, but due to the requirement for review of this project by the County ALUC between the Planning Commission and City Council hearings, the City, as applicant, requested an extension of this timeline until the current City Council date. However, several development projects that will be proposed under the new GCSP have been received by the Department of Development Services. These projects are dependent upon enactment of the GCSP by approximately the end of the second quarter of 2021 to move forward into entitlement proceedings.

While this recommendation provides the necessary City environmental and planning approvals to implement the proposed GCSP, it does not approve or commit the City to the approval of any actual development projects or physical improvements associated with the plan. As a result, this recommendation has no fiscal or local job impact. Any proposed development, projects, and or contracts will be brought to the City Council at a future date. This recommendation has no staffing impact beyond the normal budgeted scope of duties and is consistent with existing City Council priorities.

[Enter Body Here]

OSCAR W. ORCI
DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

APPROVED:

THOMAS B. MODICA
CITY MANAGER