

ORIGINAL FILED

JUL 11 2018

LOS ANGELES, COUNTY CLERK



NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Office of Planning/Research
1400 Tenth St., Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

From: Long Beach Development Services Dept.
333 W. Ocean Blvd., Planning Bureau, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Office of the County Clerk
Environmental Filings
12400 E. Imperial Hwy. Room 1201
Norwalk, CA 90650

Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

Negative Declaration (ND 13-17) for the Long Beach Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations

Project Title

State Clearinghouse Number (If submitted to Clearinghouse)	Lead Agency Contact Person	Area Code/Telephone
	Craig Chalfant	(562) 570-6368

The City of Long Beach

Project Applicant


Project Location: Citywide

Project Description: The proposed Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations (Project) would pertain to the zoning (siting and location), definitions, operational conditions, appearance, product regulation, and the application and review process of Adult-Use (non-medicinal) Cannabis in the City of Long Beach. The proposed Project involves additions and revisions to Title 5 and Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code to regulate Adult Use Cannabis. Currently, Adult-Use Cannabis is not a defined or permitted use in the City's Municipal Code. The Project would designate whether Adult Use Cannabis uses are permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited within specific zones in the City and also govern their review process and operation.

This is to advise that the Long Beach City Council has carried out the above-described project on July 10, 2018 and has made the following determinations regarding the above-described project:

1. The project [___ will will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. ___ An Environmental Impact Report was prepared pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
Adopted by the Long Beach City Council on June 19, 2018.
3. Mitigation Measures [___ were were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program [___ was was not] adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations [___ was was not] adopted for this project.
6. Findings [were ___ were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the Mitigated Negative Declaration record is available for review to the General Public at:
Department of Development Services, 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor, Long Beach, CA 90802


Secretary

7/10/18
Date



City of Long Beach Adult Use Cannabis Regulations

Initial Study and Negative Declaration

ND 13-17

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:

City of Long Beach Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations

Lead agency name and address:

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

Contact person and phone number:

Carrie Tai, AICP, Current Planning Officer
(562) 570-6411

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 Carrie Tai, AICP
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6411

Background:

The Control, Regulate and Tax Adult Use of Cannabis Act ("AUMA" or "Proposition 64") was approved by the voters of the State of California, and became effective November 9, 2016, to legalize the recreational adult-use of cannabis for individuals twenty-one (21) years of age and older. Subsequently, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 94 in June 2017, which was signed by the Governor and went into effect immediately, and which merged certain portions of existing regulations governing medicinal cannabis with AUMA to create a more comprehensive regulatory structure for both medical and adult-use cannabis.

These State laws do not prevent a city from using its constitutional authority to enact nuisance, health, and safety, and land use regulations regarding commercial cannabis activities and personal adult-use or medical cannabis uses. Therefore, the City Council desires to regulate all Adult-Use Cannabis Businesses operating in the City of Long Beach, as well as the personal adult-use and medical cultivation of cannabis at residentially zoned properties in a manner that mitigates potential negative impacts, prevents cannabis from reaching minors or the illicit market, preserves public health and safety, protects the environment, drives diverse economic opportunities, and implements the City's General Plan.

The proposed Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations (Project) would pertain to the zoning (siting and location), definitions, operational conditions, appearance, product regulation, and the application and review process of Adult-Use (non-medicinal) Cannabis in the City of Long Beach.

Project Description:

The Project involves additions and revisions to Title 5 and Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code to regulate Adult-Use Cannabis. Currently, Adult-Use Cannabis is not a defined or permitted use in the City's Municipal Code. The Project would designate whether Adult Use Cannabis uses are permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited within specific zones in the City and also govern their review process and operation. These project components are further discussed below.

Chapter 5.92 of the Long Beach Municipal Code would be added to provide regulations pertaining to the following:

- At-Home Cultivation Regulations
- Requirement for Professionally-Prepared Project Plans
- Locational Requirements / Separation Buffers from sensitive uses
- Noncompliant Locations
- Signage, Lighting, Advertising
- Cannabis Handling Storage / Employee Health
- Product Regulation
 - Testing / Quality Assurance
 - Adulterated / Misbranded Products
 - Packaging
- Facilities Regulation
 - Building Appearance
 - Fire Prevention
 - Visibility / Safety / Nuisance provisions
 - Building Code Compliance
- Operating Conditions
- Process / Penalties / Violations / Suspensions

Portions of Title 21 would be amended to provide regulations for the locating of Cannabis facilities within the City:

- Add definitions of cannabis facilities

- Amend of use tables to indicate whether Adult -Use Cannabis is permitted, conditionally permitted, or prohibited in zoning districts.
- Add references to permitting of Adult-Use Cannabis in Planned Developments.
- Add references to Chapter 5.92 for ease of use

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. The City of Long Beach and surroundings is a developed and urbanized environment.

Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach Planning Commission (recommend City Council adopt Negative Declaration 13-17 and approve the Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations)

Long Beach City Council (adopt Negative Declaration 13-17 and approve the Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations)

California Coastal Commission for certification of the City's Local Coastal Program, which incorporates zoning documents by reference, for areas within the Coastal Zone.

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:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

Carrie Tai, AICP
Current Planning Officer

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 Adult-Use Cannabis Regulations (Project) 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 Project involves addition of Chapter 5.92 and amendments to Title 21 (Zoning Ordinance) regarding the regulation of Adult-Use Cannabis land uses. Implementation of the proposed Project would allow for the orderly operations of Adult-Use Cannabis Uses in a manner providing greater public protection from potential adverse effects of such 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 is required.

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 Project 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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis operations, including provisions for lighting, advertising, signage measures to prevent alteration of visual character. Furthermore, the Project contains requirements for property maintenance and requires compliance with the City's Nuisance Code, which requires property upkeep and maintenance and deems visual degradation as a nuisance. Compliance with City regulations and the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to changes in visual character. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis operations, which include glare protection from adjacent uses. Furthermore, the Project requires all businesses to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 9.37 (Long Beach Nuisance Code). Compliance with City regulations and the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to light source. No further environmental 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 Project 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 Project consists of use regulations and 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

Since the Project consists of use regulations and does not propose any specific developments, project implementation would not significantly lower air quality standards or contribute to an air quality violation. Therefore, the Project 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 Project proposes minimum locational distances for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses from schools, beaches, playgrounds, and public parks. Furthermore, since the Project consists of use regulations and does not propose any specific developments, there would be no introduction of pollutant concentrations. 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. Project provisions in Chapter 5.92 provide regulations so land uses would not directly or indirectly result in any significant adverse odors or intensification of odors beyond those typically associated with urban uses. Compliance with the provisions would result in a less than significant impact; therefore, 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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to wildlife habitat protection. Wildlife habitats within the

City are generally limited to parks, nature preserves, and water body areas. The Project would not allow 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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to habitat protection. The Project would not allow activities allow activities 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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to wetlands protection. Future Project implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not allow 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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to wildlife corridor. Future Project implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not allow alteration or impacts to 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

Project 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 Project consists of regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which occur inside buildings, and therefore, 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 Project would not allow, 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 Project would establish regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis land uses. Project 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 Project does not allow or involve any projects that would 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 Project does not allow or involve 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 the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the most significant fault system in the City is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City.

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to 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. 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. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

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. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

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. Since the Project consists of use regulations and does not propose any specific development, there would be no impact; no further environmental analysis is required. Please see Section VI.a.i. above for further discussion.

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

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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to 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 proposed project would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable construction standards 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 Project would not result in direct or indirect GHG impacts, but rather would establish special development standards for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses. 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 Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to greenhouse gas emissions. The proposed project would not 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

Project provisions in Chapter 5.92 provides regulations regarding the distribution of Adult-Use Cannabis products. The proposed project would not be anticipated to involve any substantial transport, use or disposal of any hazardous materials beyond the typical urban uses. 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. Lastly, the California Bureau of Cannabis Control includes regulations for transport of Adult-Use Cannabis products. 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

Provisions in Chapter 5.92 require Adult-Use Cannabis Uses to comply with all applicable hazardous material regulations for hazardous waste generators and hazardous material handling requirements and shall maintain any applicable permits from the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) of Long Beach for said regulations and requirements. 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. Furthermore, all employees of the Manufacturing Business shall be trained on related hazardous waste safety measures on an annual basis. Given that Adult-Use Cannabis are regulated using existing regulations, regulations governing Adult-Use Cannabis Uses would not have hazards to the public or the environment involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

The proposed Project requires that Adult-Use Cannabis businesses that use and generate hazardous materials or hazardous waste comply with all applicable hazardous material regulations for hazardous waste generators, and hazardous materials handling requirements and shall maintain any applicable permits for these programs from the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) of Long Beach. All employees of the Laboratory shall be trained on related hazardous waste safety measures on an annual basis. Also, the proposed Project includes a provision that Adult-Use Cannabis Uses must be a minimum of 1,000 feet from the nearest property line of a public or private school (as defined in Health and Safety Code § 11362.768(h)). Also, the proposed project would not be anticipated to involve any substantial transport, use or disposal of any hazardous

materials beyond the typical urban uses. 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.

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 land uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building, the construction of which would be subject to CEQA, including analysis of information from the Cortese List. No further environmental analysis is required.

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 Project would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future projects that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to applicable local and FAA requirements. No further environmental analysis is required.

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 Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to the potential to 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 Project consists of regulations that are consistent with all chapters of the General Plan and requires that any waste or water discharged be in accordance with existing City regulations. Therefore, the Project provisions are 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. All Adult-Use Cannabis Uses would be required to be consistent with the zoning districts, which are consistent with the underlying General Plan. Furthermore, Adult-Use Cannabis Uses are similar in nature to other commercial and industrial businesses. Therefore, regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. No further environmental analysis is required.

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 Project consists of regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis businesses and does not 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 Project provisions. The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to provisions for retention and infiltration of stormwater consistent with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) policies. No further environmental review is necessary.

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 Project provisions would be subject to all applicable water quality standards, regulations and best management practices. No further environmental review is necessary.

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 Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to flood hazard areas. No further environmental review is necessary.

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. No further environmental review is necessary.

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. No further environmental review is necessary.

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. No further environmental review is necessary.

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 proposed Project establishes regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses. These proposed regulations would not directly or indirectly divide any established community, but rather would provide controls on Adult-Use Cannabis 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 Project 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. No further environmental review is required.

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 Project 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

All Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building or a building required to be built to current regulations. 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). Project 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 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 Project implementation would occur in compliance with local noise and vibration controls. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

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

All Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within buildings. All land use operations must be performed in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). Project 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 operational noise levels. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

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. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

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 Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building, which would have been in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The proposed Project 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 Project only sets forth processing procedures for permitted by-right land uses and special development standards for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses. 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 Project 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 Project does not involve residential zones or residential areas and therefore would not directly or indirectly displace people residing in the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

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

All Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for fire protection services or fire protection facilities. Additionally, Chapter 5.92 includes regulations for fire prevention to address any hazard materials that may be used as part of Adult-Use Cannabis Uses. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Police protection?

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

The Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings and would not directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for police protection. Additionally, Chapter 5.92 includes regulations for safety measures, such as lighting, security, nuisance prevention measures to ensure Adult-Use Cannabis Uses operate in a safe manner. No further environmental analysis is required.

c. Schools?

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

Adult-Use Cannabis Uses are non-residential uses, and will not directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for schools. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Parks?

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

The Project includes regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, are non-residential uses, and will not directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for parks. No further environmental analysis is required.

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 Project includes regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which are non-residential uses and will not directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased usage of neighborhood or regional parks. Furthermore, the Project requires that Adult-Use Cannabis Uses be a minimum distance of 600 feet from all public parks within the City. 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

The Project includes regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which are non-residential uses and does not include recreational facilities or the need to expand recreational facilities. 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 Project only sets forth processing procedures for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which are non-residential uses that will directly or indirectly induce population or employment growth that could result in increased number of vehicle trips, volume to capacity ratios, or traffic congestion above other currently permitted uses. 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 Project would not involve 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 Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to applicable local and FAA requirements. The proposed Project 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 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 Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within buildings that have been required to comply with all applicable standards with regard to applicable design features for roadways. Furthermore, transportation associated with Adult-Use Cannabis would be required to utilize vehicles in compliance with the California Vehicle Code for street usage. 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 proposed Project pertains to Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which does not include 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 proposed Project contains regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which do not involve 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. All Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building, the construction of which would have complied with CEQA, along with any necessary tribal consultation. 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 proposed Project pertains to Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which are similar to typical urban uses. As such, their operation would not place an undue burden on any utility (water, sewer, storm drain) or service system (solid waste). The City of Long Beach is an urbanized setting with all utilities and services fully in place. Furthermore, all Adult-Use Cannabis Uses subject to the regulations of the proposed Project would occur within an existing building, the construction of which would have been evaluated based on utilities requirements. Therefore, 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 proposed Project would have no significant adverse impacts on biological or cultural resources. The proposed project consists of regulations for Adult-Use Cannabis Uses, which would occur within existing buildings. As such, 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 proposed Project to regulate Adult-Use Cannabis Uses 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 locating and operation Adult-Use Cannabis Uses in existing buildings within an urbanized setting will not directly or indirectly cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings. For this reason, the City has concluded that the proposed Project can be implemented without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.