



Notice of Preparation

TO: _____ **FROM:** City of Long Beach
Development Services, 5th Floor
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90802

Subject: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

Project Title: Downtown Community Plan

Lead Agency: The City of Long Beach is the lead agency in the preparation of a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Long Beach Downtown Community Plan. The PEIR will be prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

Project Description: The project is the adoption and implementation of the proposed Long Beach Downtown Community Plan (Downtown Community Plan), which would replace the existing PD-30 planned development ordinance for the Downtown Community Plan area. The proposed Downtown Community Plan would incorporate zoning, development standards, and design guidelines to establish design and development criteria to guide new development that would be consistent with the community vision for the Downtown. Attached is an Initial Study that more fully describes the proposed project and identifies its probable environmental effects.

Project Location: As shown in Figure 1, the proposed Downtown Community Plan would encompass an area of approximately 631 acres bounded by the Los Angeles River on the west and Ocean Boulevard on the south. The north boundary generally follows portions of 7th and 10th Streets; and the east boundary includes land on both sides of Alamitos Avenue, and may include the area South of 10th Street.

Community Meetings: The Proposed Project will be discussed at the following public meetings:

- Council Chambers, City Hall, 333 W. Ocean Blvd
July 16, 5:00 p.m. Presentation to the Planning Commission
July 20, 9:00 a.m. Presentation to the Redevelopment Agency Board
- Patterson Hall, First Congregational Church, 241 Cedar Ave.
July 22, 6:00 p.m. Downtown Community Plan Public Meeting

Thirty-Day Comment Period: Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your comments by regular mail, email, or fax to:

Steve Gerhardt, AICP
Senior Planner, Advance Planning
Long Beach Development Services
Phone: (562) 570-6288
Fax: (562) 570-6068
Email: Steve.Gerhardt@longbeach.gov

Date: 6/29/2009

Signature

Title

Steve Gerhardt
Senior Planner

This Page Intentionally Blank



Initial Study

1. Project title: **Long Beach Downtown Community Plan**

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach
Development Services
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

3. Contact person and phone number:

Steve Gerhardt, AICP
Senior Planner, Advance Planning
Long Beach Development Services
Phone: (562) 570-6288
Fax: (562) 570-6068
Email: Steve.Gerhardt@longbeach.gov

4. Project location:

As shown on Figure 1, the proposed Long Beach Downtown Community Plan (Downtown Community Plan) would encompass an area of approximately 631 acres bounded by the Los Angeles River on the west and Ocean Boulevard on the south. The north boundary generally follows portions of 7th and 10th Streets; and the east boundary includes land on both sides of Alamitos Avenue. During the planning process, the Community Plan boundary may be expanded to include the 33-acre hatched area south of 10th Street shown on Figure 1.

5. General Plan and Zoning designations:

The most common existing General Plan Land Use Designation (LUD) within the project site is LUD 7 Mixed-Use; and the most common zone is Planned Development (PD) 30. Following is a list of all of the general plan and zoning designations that currently occur within the boundaries of the proposed project. Land within the potential expansion area is within PD-29, and would be rezoned if included within the Community Plan project area.

Land Use Districts

LUD No. 4	High Density Residential (44 dua)
LUD No. 5	Urban High Density Residential (108 dua)
LUD No. 6	High-Rise Residential (249 dua)
LUD No. 7	Mixed-Use
LUD No. 8	Major Commercial Corridor
LUD No. 8M	Mixed Office/Residential Strip
LUD No. 8N	Shopping Nodes
LUD No. 8R	Mixed Retail/Residential Strip
LUD No. 10	Institutional and School District

Zoning Districts

PD-30	Planned Development
CO	Office Commercial
CT	Tourist and Entertainment Commercial
CCN	Community R-4-N Commercial
CCR	Community R-4-R Commercial
CCA	Community Commercial Automobile-Oriented
R-4-N	Medium-density Multiple Residential
R-4-R	Moderate-density Multiple Residential
I	Institutional
HR	High-Rise Overlay
HL	Height-Limit Overlay

FIGURE 1

Regional and Project Area Map



I-710



-  Potential Downtown Project Area Expansion
-  Downtown Project Boundary
-  Public Parks



0 750' 1500'

As part of *Long Beach 2030*, the City's General Plan Update project, the existing general plan and zoning designations would be replaced by a new Downtown District designation that would cover the majority of the proposed project area. A residential overlay will be designated for neighborhood areas that are to remain primarily residential. "Placetype" designations would replace the existing Land Use Districts and would be designed to support the Downtown District vision. Increased development activity would be encouraged by allowing a wider range and mix of permitted and conditionally permitted uses throughout the Greater Downtown area and not be restricted by standard zoning districts.

6. Description of project:

The project is the adoption and implementation of the Downtown Community Plan, which would replace the existing PD-30 planned development ordinance for the Downtown Community Plan area. Including the potential expansion area within the Downtown Community Plan area boundary, would necessitate revisions to PD-29, in addition to PD-30/existing zoning within the area. The Long Beach Downtown Community Plan would incorporate zoning, development standards, and design guidelines to establish design and development criteria to guide new development that would be consistent with the community vision for the Downtown. Full implementation of the Downtown Community Plan would increase the density and intensity of existing Downtown land uses by allowing up to approximately 9,200 new residential units, 1.5 million square feet of new office, civic, cultural, and similar uses, 480,000 square feet of new retail, and 3,200 new hotel rooms. The Downtown Community Plan would provide flexibility in achieving these land use goals by allowing adjustments between planned land uses based on market demand, so long as the alternative land uses are consistent with the traffic and other impacts addressed in the Program EIR. The overall development assumed in the Downtown Community Plan would occur over a 25 year time period.

The intent of the proposed land use designations within Downtown would be to provide additional housing, employment, shopping, and entertainment opportunities within a very vibrant mixed-use environment. At the same time, intact residential neighborhoods that provide a wide mix of historic and more recent housing types, including single-family homes, duplexes, and a range of apartment and condominium buildings, would be preserved. This wide variety of existing and planned uses, along with bus and rail service, walking, and biking, would contribute to more active Downtown streets.

Landscape design guidelines will place an emphasis on achieving high quality landscape and public realm improvements in terms of streetscape, setback planting, private courtyards, pedestrian connections, and public open space. Development standards will include regulations for height, floor-area ratio, setbacks, open space, ground-floor retail space, and parking. Building design standards will address architecture and the design and massing of mixed-use buildings and high-rise towers. The Downtown Community Plan will provide policies and programs for the preservation of neighborhood character and historic properties.

A Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) will be prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines to analyze overall changes in land use in the project area that would occur in compliance with the development standards and design guidelines of the Downtown Community Plan.

In addition to analyzing impacts of the proposed project, the PEIR will include an analysis of alternatives to the project. Potential alternatives to be analyzed include: 1) No Project/No Build, 2) Existing Plans, 3) Lower Profile/Less Intensity, and 4) Increased Residential Land Use Mix.

Following certification of the PEIR, the PEIR would be used in the review of subsequent development projects proposed within the Downtown Community Plan in accordance with the procedure for "tiering" of environmental documents allowed in Section 15152 of the CEQA Guidelines. To facilitate tiering, an Initial Study would be performed on subsequent projects proposed within the Downtown Community Plan area. No additional environmental documentation would be required for subsequent projects if the Initial Study determines that the potential environmental effects have been adequately addressed in the PEIR and/or individual developments would implement appropriate mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) accompanying the PEIR.

6. Project area land uses:

The Downtown Community Plan project area is intensively developed with urban land uses and community facilities. Commercial uses constitute the predominant land uses, including retail centers, storefront shops and restaurants, mid- and high-rise office buildings and financial institutions, low-rise motels and high-rise hotels, and automotive service facilities. Residential uses primarily consist of two- to six-story apartment buildings and modern high-rises, and also include a few areas of single- and two-family residences and neighborhood clusters. Governmental offices, schools, parks, and churches are also located within the project area.

7. Surrounding land uses:

South: Ocean Boulevard marks the south boundary of the Downtown Community Plan project area and is also the north boundary of the California Coastal Zone and PD-6. Land uses located along the south side of Ocean Boulevard are high-density residential, mixed-use retail and residential, and financial institutions. South of these uses are visitor-serving facilities including the Aquarium of the Pacific, convention center, shopping and dining areas, hotel, recreational facilities, parks, beaches, and marinas.

West: The Los Angeles River channel borders project area on the west.

Northwest: The Willmore City/Drake Park Historic District (PD-10) primarily contains restored historic single-family homes and older multi-family residences.

North: Land uses to the north, generally between Pine and Atlantic avenues, are primarily commercial, hospital and medical services, multi-family residential, schools, and churches. Northeast of 10th Street and Atlantic Avenue, land uses are primarily a mix of single-family and low-rise multi-family.

East: Land uses to the east are primarily a mix of single-family and low-rise multi-family and also include retail and restaurant uses along the main commercial corridors of 7th and 4th streets and Broadway.

8. Public agencies whose approval will be required:

Certification of the Program EIR and approval of the Downtown Community Plan will require a public hearing and recommendation from the Long Beach Planning Commission and a public hearing and adoption by the Long Beach City Council.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | | |

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.


 Steve Gerhardt, Senior Planner

6/29/2009
 Date

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) The primary scenic resource in the project area is the view south toward the harbor and ocean, which includes views of the Queen Mary ocean liner and the Downtown skyline, visible from the water and from points of higher

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
elevation to the North. The project area is densely urbanized and includes existing high-rise development along both sides of Ocean Boulevard. View corridors that exist along Magnolia, Pacific, Pine, Elm, and Linden avenues, The Promenade, and Long Beach Boulevard would not be impacted by development that maintains views to the south along the existing street grid. The proposed project includes provisions to maintain existing view corridors. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.				
b) Ocean Boulevard is designated as a local scenic route in the Long Beach General Plan. No state scenic highway exists within the project area or within any area where development within the project area would affect views from a state scenic highway. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.				
c) While substantial high-rise development exists in the project area, the visual character of some neighborhoods could be impacted by additional development of buildings of substantially greater height than presently exists in these neighborhoods, or could include the removal or reuse of historic buildings within the project area. Therefore, the potential for new development to impact existing visual character or quality will be further analyzed in the EIR.				
d) New development that increases the density or intensity of land uses in an area may create new sources of light and glare from architectural, safety, and parking lot lighting. This potential impact will be further analyzed in the EIR.				

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) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a) – c) The project area is currently fully urbanized and no agricultural uses, Williamson Act contract lands, or farmland would be affected by the project and **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	□	□	□
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	■	□	□	□

a) – e) The proposed project would enable development that could generate a substantial increase in traffic and worsen operations at existing intersections within and near the project area. Air pollutant emissions from this additional traffic and longer idling times at project area intersections could conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality plans for the South Coast Air Basin, increase pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment of applicable ambient air quality standards, and impact sensitive receptors including residents, children at local schools, and patients at project area hospitals and medical facilities. Construction activity could also result in temporary air quality and odor impacts due to fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from diesel-powered construction equipment. Therefore, **the potential for new development to impact local and regional air quality will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	□	□	□	■
b) 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	□	□	□	■
c) 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?	□	□	□	■
d) 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?	□	□	□	■
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	□	□	□	■
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	□	□	□	■

a) – f) The project site is in an urbanized area and no sensitive habitat or animal species are present. In addition, the project does not propose to alter existing parks or open space where native or migratory bird species could be present. No conflicts with local biological resource policies, ordinances, or habitat conservation programs would be relevant to planned development within the project area. Therefore, **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a) Historical structures and districts have been designated within the project area and many other buildings greater than 50 years old are also present. Designated historic resources and others not currently designated by the City as historic landmarks could be affected by demolition or remodeling. Therefore, the potential for new development to impact historical resources will be further analyzed in the EIR.</p> <p>b) – d) The project area is fully urbanized and has been subject to extensive disturbance from construction of existing buildings and associated underground infrastructure and, therefore, surficial archaeological resources, unique paleontological resources, unique geologic features, or human remains have likely been previously disturbed. Future construction of new land uses allowed by the project will, however, result in additional surface and subsurface disturbance that may result in damage to previously unknown resources or remains. Therefore, the potential for new development to impact historical resources will be further analyzed in the EIR.</p>				
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■

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

not available for the disposal of waste water?

a-i) – a-iii), c), d) The City is relatively level without significant slopes and is located on a broad, slightly elevated coastal terrace flanked by flood plains on the east and west. Faults associated with the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, which is mapped as an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, is located within approximately 2 miles of the project area. The 1920 Inglewood earthquake (estimated magnitude 4.9) and the 1933 Long Beach earthquake (estimated magnitude 6.3) are thought to be the result of movement of this fault. Several other fault zones located within approximately 5 to 30 miles have the potential to impact the project area. The project area is located at an elevation of approximately 30 feet above mean sea level with essentially flat topography. Groundwater associated with sea level has been encountered at between 29 and 35 feet below ground level (MACTEC Engineering and Consulting Inc., for Proposed Press-Telegram Mixed Development Project, July 7, 2006). These conditions create the potential for substantial adverse effects associated with seismic activity. Therefore, **the potential for the project area to be impacted by seismic activity will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

a-iv), b) The relatively level site conditions and extent of developed lands in the project area would avoid potential impacts associated with landslides, soil erosion, or loss of topsoil and, therefore, **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

e) All development in the project area would be served by the City's sewage disposal system and, therefore, **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant effect on the environment? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |

a) In California, the transportation sector is the largest emitter of greenhouse gases (GHGs), followed by electricity generation. Emission of carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a byproduct of fossil-fuel combustion. The proposed project would enable development that could generate a substantial increase in traffic and worsen operations at existing intersections within and near the project area. It would also increase the demand for electrical energy, which is also a substantial contributor to GHGs. Therefore, **the potential for new development to contribute to emissions of GHGs will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

b) In September 2006, Governor Schwarzenegger signed AB 32 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006), the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which enacted Sections 38500–38599 of the California Health and Safety Code. AB 32 specifies that regulations adopted in response to AB 1493 should be used to address GHG emissions from vehicles and directs the state Air Resources Board (ARB) to also develop and implement regulations to reduce statewide GHG emissions from stationary sources. Therefore, **the potential for new development to conflict with statewide policies and regulations to reduce emissions of GHGs will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| c) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| d) 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? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| e) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of | ■ | □ | □ | □ |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
an existing or proposed school?				
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	■	□	□	□
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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?	□	□	□	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	□	□	□	■
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	□	□	□	■
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	□	□	□	■

-
- a) – c) The types of commercial and residential land uses envisioned for the project area would not typically contain businesses involved in the transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials. However, construction activities would involve full or partial demolition of existing structures, which, due to their age, may contain asbestos and lead-based paints and materials. Compliance with existing rules and regulations, including South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities), California Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations regarding lead-based materials, and California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1 requiring testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials, should avoid significant hazardous materials impacts. Nevertheless, in order to more fully evaluate the potential for significant impacts, **this issue will be analyzed in an EIR.**
- d) The project area is highly urbanized and contains a wide variety of commercial activities, including businesses that use, store, and dispose of hazardous materials. Thus the potential exists for hazardous materials to be present on sites that may be proposed for redevelopment. **This impact will be analyzed in an EIR.**
- e), f) The nearest boundary of the project area is located approximately 3 miles from the nearest airport/airstrip, the Long Beach Municipal Airport. **No impacts are anticipated and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**
- g) The project may propose to alter existing street patterns, but would maintain accessibility required by any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **No impacts are anticipated and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**
- h) The project area does not contain wildlands nor is it adjacent to wildlands and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	■	□	□	□
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or	■	□	□	□

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	■	□	□	□
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	■	□	□	□
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	■	□	□	□
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	■	□	□	□
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	□	□	□	■
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	□	□	□	■
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	□	□	□	■
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	□	□	□	■

a), c) – f) Although the project area is substantially urbanized and improved with impervious surfaces, the proposed project would continue recent trends of converting vacant property or low-intensity developed areas containing landscaped areas and other pervious surfaces, into more intensely developed land uses such that potentially increased quantities of runoff would be directed to the City’s stormwater collection system. This runoff also has the potential to carry pollutants and sediment. However, construction and operation of future development sites would be required to comply with all local, state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality and reduction of runoff, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and the implementation of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Provisions of the City’s regulations that protect water quality, including Chapter 18.95 of the Municipal Code, would apply. In addition, earthwork for construction projects that would involve greater than one acre of land would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. While existing regulatory procedures are in place to reduce impacts from increased stormwater runoff, **further analysis in an EIR is warranted.**

b) Future development within the project area would result in a net increase in water demand due to the intensification of development on the site. Although the majority of the City’s water supply consists of imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a significant portion is extracted from the local groundwater basin. **The EIR will assess the project’s impacts to groundwater resources as part of the analysis of utilities and service systems impacts (see also Section XVI.d. below).**

g), h) According to the City of Long Beach and the Federal Emergency Management Administration Flood Insurance Rate Maps (2002), the project area is located outside the 100-year flood zone. Therefore, no significant flood impacts are anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

i), j) There are no dams or levees located within the vicinity of the project area and, therefore, there is no potential for flooding due to dam failure. The project site is also not located near any landlocked water and impacts from seiches would not occur. The project area is substantially protected from inundation from a tsunami by its elevation approximately 30 feet above mean sea level, as well as by the Long Beach Harbor breakwater and existing

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

development south of Ocean Boulevard. Therefore, no impacts from dam or levee failures, seiches, or tsunamis are anticipated and **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) The project area is currently urbanized with existing street and circulation patterns that are not proposed to be altered by the proposed project. The proposed community plan provides guidelines and standards for infill development that are intended to integrate future development into the existing land use character of four distinct planning districts. Thus, the project would not physically divide the established community and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

b) The proposed project would result in changes to existing General Plan land use and zoning designations and, therefore, the project has the potential to conflict with policies contained in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Land use compatibility and the project's consistency with applicable local and regional policies **will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

c) No habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan apply to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would occur and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a) Oil is the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach. No oil extraction land uses or other mineral resource recovery sites currently exist within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

b) No mineral resource sites are designated on any City land use plan within the Downtown Community Plan project area and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	■	□	□	□
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?	□	□	□	■
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	□	□	□	■

a) – d) The project would enable more intensive land uses to be located within the Downtown Community Plan area, which would result in increased ambient noise levels in the project area, primarily from additional traffic associated with residential and commercial growth. Operation of construction equipment associated with this growth would also create temporary noise level increases. The City’s Noise Control Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.80) establishes maximum permissible hourly daytime and nighttime noise levels for different districts throughout the City and also governs the time of day that construction work can be performed. **Noise associated with both temporary construction activity and long-term project operation will be analyzed in detail in an EIR.**

e), f) The project site is located over two miles from the Long Beach Airport. Significant impacts relating to aircraft noise are not anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	■	□	□	□
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	■	□	□	□
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	■	□	□	□

a) The project would allow additional residential development to occur in the Downtown Community Plan project area. Therefore, **the potential to induce substantial population growth will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

b), c) The project could result in removal of existing housing in older apartment buildings not suitable for rehabilitation. Therefore, **the potential to displace housing and people will be further analyzed in the EIR.**

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the 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:

Fire protection?	■	□	□	□
Police protection?	■	□	□	□

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Libraries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) The proposed Downtown Community Plan would increase the demand for public services due to the increase in residential population and commercial uses in the project area. **Therefore, potential impacts relating to fire and police protection, schools, parks, and libraries will be further evaluated in an EIR.**

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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a) The project will increase the residential population in the downtown area, which will place increased demands on neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities. **This issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.**

b) Residential and mixed-use development in the project area is expected to include private and public recreational space as part of most development projects. The potential impact of these facilities **will be further evaluated in an EIR.**

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a), b) The proposed project would generate an increase in vehicle trips throughout the project area. Project-generated trips would have the potential to adversely affect levels of service on City roadways and at area intersections. A traffic analysis will be prepared to evaluate the project's potential to create significant impacts relating to traffic, circulation, and access and this information will be evaluated in an EIR.				
c) The project would not necessitate any change in air traffic patterns. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.				
d) The project may propose to alter existing street patterns or create new pedestrian and bicycle pathways and street crossing locations. In order to more fully evaluate the potential for significant impacts, this issue will be analyzed in an EIR.				
e) The increased project area population and visitors would increase traffic on local streets and could impact emergency access, including from temporary street closures during construction.				
f) Parking for subsequent development projects will be further evaluated in the EIR based on any revisions to existing parking standards or provisions for shared parking, if these are included as part of the Downtown Community Plan.				
g) The project would support adopted policies for providing alternative transportation modes such as bus facilities and bicycle access/parking. Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.				

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a), b), e). The proposed Community Plan would allow more intense residential and commercial development in the Downtown area and would, therefore, increase the generation of wastewater. To determine whether the existing wastewater conveyance system and treatment plant have sufficient available capacity to accommodate wastewater from the planned development, **these issues will be further analyzed in an EIR.**
- c) The proposed project could increase the area covered by impervious surfaces, potentially increasing runoff quantities. New drainage infrastructure will be needed, potentially affecting off-site facilities. **This issue will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

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

d) The proposed project would potentially increase the demand for water in the City and a Water Supply Assessment will be prepared to determine whether or not water supplies and infrastructure are adequate to serve the proposed development. **This issue will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

f), g) The proposed project would potentially increase the amount of solid waste generated within the City. Compliance with State waste diversion requirements and the potential effects of the increase in solid waste generation on regional landfill capacity **will be further evaluated in an EIR.**

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?	■	□	□	□
--	---	---	---	---

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)?	■	□	□	□
--	---	---	---	---

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

a) As discussed above in Section IV, Biological Resources, the proposed Downtown Community Plan project area is completely within an urban area with sparsely located street trees. The project would not have the potential to substantially reduce habitats, wildlife populations, communities, or restrict the range of endangered plants or animals. However, future development pursuant to the Downtown Community Plan may include demolition of potentially historic structures. As discussed in Section V, Cultural Resources, an analysis of potential project impacts on historical resources located in the project area **will be included in an EIR.**

b) Cumulative impacts for each issue area identified as potentially significant **will be included in an EIR.**

c) As discussed in Section III, Air Quality, Section VII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Section XII, Population and Housing, and Section XV, Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project has the potential to create environmental effects that could significantly affect human health or safety. **These issues will be studied further in an EIR.**