3rd and Pacific Project

Downtown Plan EIR Addendum

Prepared for
City of Long Beach

September 2019

ESA

3rd and Pacific Project

Downtown Plan EIR Addendum

Prepared for
City of Long Beach

September 2019

626 Wilshire Boulevard
Suite 1100
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.599.4300
www.esassoc.com

ESA

Bend	Oakland	San Francisco
Camarillo	Orlando	Santa Monica
Delray Beach	Pasadena	Sarasota
Destin	Petaluma	Seattle
Irvine	Portland	Sunrise
Los Angeles	Sacramento	Tampa
Miami	San Diego	

150712.13

OUR COMMITMENT TO SUSTAINABILITY | ESA helps a variety of public and private sector clients plan and prepare for climate change and emerging regulations that limit GHG emissions. ESA is a registered assessor with the California Climate Action Registry, a Climate Leader, and founding reporter for the Climate Registry. ESA is also a corporate member of the U.S. Green Building Council and the Business Council on Climate Change (BC3). Internally, ESA has adopted a Sustainability Vision and Policy Statement and a plan to reduce waste and energy within our operations. This document was produced using recycled paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

3rd and Pacific Project – Downtown Plan EIR Addendum

Page

Introduction/Background 3

CEQA Authority for an Addendum 4

Project Details and Background 6

1. Project Title 6
2. Lead Agency Name and Address 6
3. Contact Person and Phone Number 6
4. Project Location and Existing Site Conditions 6
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address 6
6. General Plan Designation 6
7. Zoning 6
8. Project Description and Background 8
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting 47
10. Required Approvals 47

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected 48

Determination 48

Environmental Checklist 49

I. Aesthetics 49
II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources 58
III. Air Quality 59
IV. Biological Resources 68
V. Cultural Resources 69
VI. Geology and Soils 72
VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions 76
VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials 80
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality 84
X. Land Use and Planning 88
XI. Mineral Resources 90
XII. Noise 91
XIII. Population and Housing 100
XIV. Public Services 102
XV. Recreation 105
XVI. Transportation/Traffic 106
XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems 110
XVIV. Mandatory Findings of Significance 113

References 116

Appendices

A Shade and Shadow Study
B Air Quality Analysis
C Cultural Report
D Geotechnical Study
E Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations
F1 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
F2 Phase II Environmental Site Assessment
G Hydrology Technical Report
H Noise Study
I Traffic Study
J Utility Infrastructure Technical Report

Figures

Figure 1 Project Location 7
Figure 2a Floor Plans for Garage, Ground Level, and Level 2 31
Figure 2b Floor Plans for Levels 3 to 6 32
Figure 2c Floor Plans for Level 7, Level 8 (North) and Levels 8 to 20 (South) 33
Figure 2d Floor Plans North Roof Floor Plans for Levels 9 and 21 (South), Floor Plans for Level 22 (South) and Level 23 (South) - Roof Level Amenity 34
Figure 3 Roble Way Vacation Request 35
Figure 4 Reverse Dedication Request 36
Figure 5a North and South Building – Split View 41
Figure 5b North and South Building – Split View 42
Figure 6 Roble Way Landscape 43
Figure 7a Conceptual Site Plan Level 3, Level 6, and Level 8 44
Figure 7b Conceptual Site Plan Level 21, Level 22, and Level 23 45
Figure 8 Spring Equinox 54
Figure 9 Summer Solstice 55
Figure 10 Fall Equinox 56
Figure 11 Winter Solstice 57

Tables

Table 1 Certified PEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures 9
Table 2 Proposed Development 37
Table 3 FAR and Site Area 37
Table 3 Unmitigated Maximum Regional Construction Emissions 64
Table 4 Unmitigated Maximum Regional Operational Emissions 65
Table 5 Localized Construction Emissions 66
Table 7 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment 94
Table 8 Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment 95
Table 9 Construction Vibration Impacts – Human Annoyance 96

3RD AND PACIFIC PROJECT
EIR Addendum

Introduction/Background

This document is an addendum to the Certified City of Long Beach Downtown Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (Certified PEIR) (SCH #2009071006) prepared for the City of Long Beach (City), which was approved by City Council in November 2011 and formally adopted January 2012. The Certified PEIR analyzes the potential environmental impacts that may result from the implementation of the Downtown Plan, which covers an area of approximately 719 acres, including the project site for the proposed 3rd and Pacific Project (proposed project) located at 131 West 3rd Street in the City of Long Beach. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this Addendum analyzes the proposed project for the City of Long Beach to determine whether the project would result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the Certified PEIR.

The Certified PEIR analyzed the adoption and implementation of the Long Beach Downtown Plan that would replace the existing land use, zoning, and planned development districts as the land use and design document for all future development in the Downtown Plan Project area. The Certified PEIR assumed that full implementation of the Downtown Plan could increase the density and intensity of existing Downtown land uses by allowing up to (1) approximately 5,000 new residential units; (2) 1.5 million square feet (sf) of new office, civic, cultural, and similar uses; (3) 384,000 sf of new retail; (4) 96,000 sf of restaurants; and (5) 800 new hotel rooms. The additional development assumed in the Downtown Plan could occur over a 25-year time period, ending in 2035. The approved Downtown Plan and Certified PEIR are also referred to hereafter as the "Approved Project."

As described above and as provided in more detail below, the proposed project would be developed within the Downtown Plan area and would replace two existing surface parking lots on a 1.2-acre site, with two buildings, an 8-story building at the north end of the property (North Building) and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site (South Building). Both buildings would include ground floor retail, with residential units on the upper stories. A pedestrian-focused paseo would be constructed at the location of the existing alley between the two proposed buildings. The proposed project would include a total of 345 residential units and 14,481 sf of retail commercial space, 563 vehicle parking spaces, and 128 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project would also include 13,944 sf of residential common outdoor open space, 11,688 sf of residential indoor common open space, 11,340 sf of residential private open space, and 5,335 sf of public open space. Parking for the project site would be provided in two levels of subterranean parking below each building. In addition, the North Building would also provide ground-level parking and parking on level 2 and the South Building would also provide four levels of parking on levels 2 through 5.

CEQA Authority for an Addendum

The Certified PEIR includes all statutory sections required by CEQA, comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to comments on the Draft EIR, Errata in the Final EIR, and supporting technical appendices. CEQA establishes the type of environmental documentation required when changes to a project occur after an EIR is certified. Specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15164(a) states that:

> *The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.*

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 requires a Subsequent EIR when an MND has already been adopted or an EIR has been certified and one or more of the following circumstances exist:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
    a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
    b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
    c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
    d. Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Likewise, California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21166 states that unless one or more of the following events occur, no subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report shall be required by the lead agency or by any responsible agency:

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the environmental impact report;
2. Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is being undertaken which will require major revisions in the environmental impact report; or
3. New information, which was not known and could not have been known at the time the environmental impact report was certified as complete, becomes available.

As demonstrated by the analysis herein, the proposed project would not result in any additional significant impacts, nor would it substantially increase the severity of previously anticipated significant impacts. Rather, all of the impacts associated with the proposed project would be within the envelope of impacts addressed in the Certified PEIR and would not constitute a new or substantially increased significant impact. Based on this determination, the proposed project does not meet the requirements for preparation of a Subsequent EIR pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162. [1]

[1] In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15164(a), this Addendum tiers off of the analysis and conclusions found in the Certified PEIR. Thus, this Addendum relies on the thresholds published at the time of the Certified PEIR's adoption in January 2012.

Project Details and Background

1. Project Title

3rd and Pacific Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

City of Long Beach
Development Services Department
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Christopher Koontz, Advance Planning Officer, 562.570.6288

4. Project Location and Existing Site Conditions

The 1.2-acre project site is located at 131 West 3rd Street in the City of Long Beach. As shown in Figure 1, *Project Location*, the project site is east of Pacific Avenue, south of West 4th Street, west of North Solano Court (existing alley), and north of West 3rd Street. Surrounding uses to the north include residential apartment buildings, mixed-uses, with ground floor retail and residential units above, and commercial uses, including a fast-food restaurant, cleaners, and transportation uses, including the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Blue Line Pacific Avenue Station. Land uses to the west, across Pacific Avenue, include residential apartment buildings and commercial uses, such as a bakery and a hotel. Land uses to the south, across West 3rd Street, are comprised of apartment buildings and commercial uses, such as a restaurant, a bank, and retail stores. Immediately east of the project site, across North Solano Court (existing alley), is a gym and retail stores, as well as more multi-family residential uses.

Regional access to the project site is provided by Interstate 710 (I-710), which travels north-south, approximately 0.75 mile to the west and Pacific Coast Highway [State Route (SR) 1], which travels east-west, approximately 1.25 miles north of the project site. Additional regional access is provided by the Metro Blue Line, which travels to and from downtown Los Angeles, with the Pacific Avenue Station on Pacific Avenue, between 4th and 5th Street, approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the project site. As shown in Figure 1, the project site is currently occupied by two surface parking lots.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address

Ensemble Real Estate Investments
444 W. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 1108
Long Beach, California 90802

6. General Plan Designation

Mixed Use (LUD No. 7)

7. Zoning

Downtown Plan Planned Development District (PD-30)



SOURCE: ESRI; ESA

3rd and Pacific

Figure 1

Project Location

ESA

8. Project Description and Background

Downtown Plan and Certified PEIR (Approved Project)

The Downtown Plan, was adopted in January 2012, and outlines the development and design standards for Downtown Long Beach. The Downtown Plan covers an area of approximately 719 acres and adopts zone reclassifications and design guidelines, replacing existing land use plans and zoning regulations for the Downtown Plan area. The Downtown Plan includes a series of guiding principles such as: developing a distinctive downtown skyline; promoting Downtown Long Beach as the heart of the City; encouraging infrastructure focused on walking, bicycling, and public transit; diversifying the economy, promoting job growth, and tourism; promoting bold architecture, planning, and construction that utilizes green building technology, sustainable energy, and quality building practices; and incorporating aspects of a global city.

The Downtown Plan is divided into six unique Character Areas: North Pine, Civic Center, Business and Entertainment Area, Willmore Historic District, West End, and East Village. The Downtown Plan's Figure 2-1, *Character Areas and Surrounding Neighborhoods*, identifies the project site within the Business and Entertainment Area. The Business and Entertainment Area is the commercial core of Downtown Long Beach generally located between Pacific Avenue and Elm Avenue, extending from Ocean Boulevard north to 10th Street, and contains modern office buildings, hotels, restaurants, shopping, and night spots, and includes Long Beach City Place, a mixed-use district of high-density residential, shopping, and entertainment venues. Downtown Long Beach is the business, retail, and tourism hub of the City, and also the home of many of the City's historic and cultural treasures. The Metro Blue Line fixed rail transit service loops through this area, as do several Long Beach Transit and Metro bus routes.

The Downtown Plan also includes specific development standards and guidelines required for all new developments in the Downtown Plan area, such as: zoning, permitted land uses, intensity and height standards, development incentives, parking standards, transportation management, and open space and design standards. As described above, full implementation of the Downtown Plan would increase the density and intensity of existing Downtown land uses by allowing up to (1) approximately 5,000 new residential units; (2) 1.5 million sf of new office, civic, cultural, and similar uses; (3) 384,000 sf of new retail; (4) 96,000 sf of restaurants; and (5) 800 new hotel rooms, over a 25-year time period.

The Certified PEIR analyzed the potential environmental impacts that may result from the adoption and implementation of the Downtown Plan. The Certified PEIR provides a programmatic level of environmental impact analysis for a broad array of environmental topics for the entire Downtown Plan area. The Certified PEIR analyzes the impacts of an estimated buildout scenario of residential units, offices, retail uses, restaurants, and hotel rooms. The Certified PEIR determined the Downtown Plan would cause significant and unavoidable impacts to the following resource areas: aesthetics (shadow impacts), air quality (construction and operation), cultural resources (historic), greenhouse gases, noise (construction vibration), population and housing, public services, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems (solid waste). All other resources areas were determined to have impacts that were either less than significant or less than significant with mitigation. Table 1, *Certified PEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, includes a column summarizing the impacts identified in the Certified PEIR and a column noting the corresponding required mitigation identified to avoid, minimize, or reduce potential impacts.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Aesthetics	
Impact AES-2 Development of future projects within the Downtown Plan Project area would result in new sources of light and glare due to the increased height and scale of future development, as well as from the increased proportion of glazing on building façades and potential use of reflective materials such as aluminum and glass typical of contemporary design in comparison to existing styles of development from previous eras. This is, in part, a desired outcome in creating a vibrant urban environment, a key objective of the proposed project. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact. The mitigation comes in the form of existing Site Plan review and design review procedures.	**Mitigation Measure AES-2(a) Lighting Plans and Specifications.** Prior to the issuance of building permits for new large development projects, the applicant shall submit lighting plans and specifications for all exterior lighting fixtures and light standards to the Development Services Department for review and approval. The plans shall include a photometric design study demonstrating that all outdoor light fixtures to be installed are designed or located in a manner as to contain the direct rays from the lights onsite and to minimize spillover of light onto surrounding properties or roadways. All parking structure lighting shall be shielded and directed away from residential uses. Rooftop decks and other similar amenities are encouraged in the Plan. Lighting for such features shall be designed so that light is directed so as to provide adequate security and minimal spill-over or nuisance lighting. **Mitigation Measure AES-2(b) Building Material Specifications.** Prior to the issuance of any building permits for development projects, applicants shall submit plans and specifications for all building materials to the Development Services Department for review and approval. The Plan provides measures to ensure that the highest quality materials are used for new development projects. This is an important consideration, since high-quality materials last longer. Quality development provides an impression of permanence and can encourage additional private investment in Downtown Long Beach. **Mitigation Measure AES-2(c) Light Fixture Shielding.** Prior to the issuance of building permits for development projects within the Downtown Plan Project area, applicants shall demonstrate to the Development Services Department that all night lighting installed on private property within the project site shall be shielded, directed away from residential and other light-sensitive uses, and confined to the project site. Rooftop lighting, including rooftop decks, security lighting, or aviation warning lights, shall be in accordance with Airport/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements. Additionally, all lighting shall comply with all applicable Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) Safety Policies and FAA regulations. **Mitigation Measure AES-2(d) Window Tinting.** Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall submit plans and specifications showing that building windows are manufactured or tinted to minimize glare from interior lighting and to minimize heat gain in accordance with energy conservation measures.
Impact AES-3 Development projects that include high-rise structures as encouraged by the Downtown Plan would cast shadows onto adjacent properties, particularly in the wintertime when shadows extend the farthest from a tall structure and are the most extreme. Because shadows from these development projects would fall on sensitive residential, public gathering, and school uses within the Downtown Plan Project area for more than 3 hours during the winter months, shadow impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure AES-3 Shadow Impacts.** Prior to the issuance of building permits for any structure exceeding 75 feet in height or any structure that is adjacent to a light sensitive use and exceeds 45 feet in height, the applicant shall submit a shading study that includes calculations of the extent of shadowing arches for winter and equinox conditions. If feasible, projects shall be designed to avoid shading of light sensitive uses in excess of the significance thresholds outlined in this EIR. If avoidance of shadows exceeding significance thresholds is determined to be infeasible, the shadow impact will be disclosed as part of a project environmental impact report (EIR).
Air Quality	
Impact AQ-1 Construction activities associated with development envisioned under the proposed Downtown Plan would generate emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone	**Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a)** To reduce short-term construction emissions, the City shall require that all construction projects that would require use of heavy-duty (50 horsepower [hp] or more), off-road vehicles to be used during construction shall require their contractors to implement the Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices (listed below) or whatever mitigation measures are recommended by SCAQMD at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction, including those specified in the

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
precursors. Because of the large size of the Plan area, construction-generated emissions of VOCs and NO_X, both ozone precursors, and PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ would exceed SCAQMD-recommended thresholds and would substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS and CAAQS. Thus, construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors could violate or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and/or conflict with air quality planning efforts. This would result in a significant adverse impact on air quality. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	mitigation recommendations in the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook or SCAQMD's Mitigation Measures and Control Efficiencies recommendations located at the following url: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html. **Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices** • The project applicant shall provide a plan for approval by the City, demonstrating that the heavy-duty (50 hp or more) off-road vehicles to be used in the construction project, including owned, leased, and subcontractor vehicles, will achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_X reduction, 20 percent VOC reduction, and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the 2011 ARB fleet average, as contained in the URBEMIS output sheets in Appendix C. Acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. SCAQMD, which is the resource agency for air quality in the project area, can be used in an advisory role to demonstrate fleet-wide reductions. SCAQMD's mitigation measures for off-road engines can be used to identify an equipment fleet that achieves this reduction (SCAQMD 2007b). • The project applicant shall submit to the City a comprehensive inventory of all off-road construction equipment, equal to or greater than 50 hp, that would be used an aggregate of 40 or more hours during any portion of the construction project. The inventory shall include the hp rating, engine production year, and projected hours of use for each piece of equipment. The inventory shall be updated and submitted monthly throughout the duration of the project, except that an inventory shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. At least 48 hours prior to the use of heavy-duty off-road equipment, the project representative shall provide the City with the anticipated construction timeline including start date and name and phone number of the project manager and onsite foreman. A visual survey of all in-operation equipment shall be made at least weekly, and a monthly summary of the visual survey results shall be submitted throughout the duration of the project, except that the monthly summary shall not be required for any 30-day period in which no construction activity occurs. The monthly summary shall include the quantity and type of vehicles surveyed and the dates of each survey. SCAQMD staff and/or other officials may conduct periodic site inspections to determine compliance. • If, at the time of construction, SCAQMD, CARB, or the EPA has adopted a regulation or new guidance applicable to construction emissions, compliance with the regulation or new guidance may completely or partially replace this mitigation if it is equal to or more effective than the mitigation contained herein, and if the City so permits. Such a determination must be supported by a project-level analysis and be approved by the City. **Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b)** Prior to construction of each development phase of onsite land uses that are proposed within 1,500 feet of sensitive receptors, each project applicant shall perform a project-level CEQA analysis that includes a detailed LST analysis of construction-generated emissions of NO_2, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ to assess the impact at nearby sensitive receptors. The LST analysis shall be performed in accordance with applicable SCAQMD guidance that is in place at the time the analysis is performed. The project-level analysis shall incorporate detailed parameters of the construction equipment and activities, including the year during which construction would be performed, as well as the proximity of potentially affected receptors, including receptors proposed by the project that exist at the time the construction activity would occur. **Mitigation Measure AQ-1(c)** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the project plans shall include the following provisions to reduce construction-related air quality impacts: • Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow; • Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site; • Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas;

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	• Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning onsite construction activity including resolution of issues related to PM_{10} generation; • Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization, and ensure that all vehicles and equipment will be properly tuned and maintained according to manufacturers' specifications; • Use coatings and solvents with a VOC content lower than that required under AQMD Rule 1113; • Construct or build with materials that do not require painting; • Require the use of pre-painted construction materials if available; • Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export); • During project construction, all internal combustion engines/construction equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 2 emissions standards, or higher according to the following: o Project Start, to December 31, 2011: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 2 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with the BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 2 or Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. o January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 offroad emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. o Post-January 1, 2015: All offroad diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. • A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. • Encourage construction contractors to apply for AQMD "SOON" funds. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for AQMD "SOON" funds. The "SOON" program provides funds to accelerate clean up of off-road diesel vehicles, such as heavy duty construction equipment. More information on this program can be found at the following website: http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/Implementation/SOONProgram.htm

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact AQ-2 Operational area- and mobile-source emissions from implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan would exceed all applicable SCAQMD-recommended thresholds, and would result in or substantially contribute to emissions concentrations that exceed the NAAQS or CAAQS. This would result in a significant adverse impact on air quality. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure AQ-2** Mitigation to reduce mobile source emissions due to implementation of the Plan addresses reducing the number of motor vehicle trips and reducing the emissions of individual vehicles under the control of the project applicant(s). The following measures shall be implemented by project applicant(s) unless it can be demonstrated to the City that the measures would not be feasible. • The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall require the commercial development operator(s) to operate, maintain, and promote a ride-share program for employees of the various businesses. • The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall include one or more secure bicycle parking areas within the property and encourage bicycle riding for both employees and customers. • The proposed structures shall be designed to meet current Title 24 + 20 percent energy efficiency standards and shall include such measures as photovoltaic cells on the rooftops to achieve an additional 25 percent reduction in electricity use on an average sunny day. • The City shall ensure that all new commercial developments include or have access to convenient shower and locker facilities for employees to encourage bicycle, walking, and jogging as options for commuting. • The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall require that all equipment operated by the businesses within the facility be electric or use non-diesel engines. • All truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208-volt power outlet for every two-dock door. Diesel trucks shall be prohibited from idling more than 5 minutes and must be required to connect to the 110/208-volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. Signs outlining the idling restrictions shall be provided. If, at the time of construction, SCAQMD, CARB, or EPA has adopted a regulation or new guidance applicable to mobile- and area-source emissions, compliance with the regulation or new guidance may completely or partially replace this mitigation if it is equal to or more effective than the mitigation contained herein, and if the City so permits. Such a determination shall be supported by a project-level analysis that is approved by the City.
Impact AQ-4 Implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan would result in exposure of receptors to short- and long-term emissions of TACs from onsite and offsite stationary and mobile sources. Impacts from short-term construction, long-term onsite stationary sources, and offsite mobile-sources would be Class III, less than significant. Impacts from Port of Long Beach and offsite stationary sources, and onsite mobile sources would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure AQ-4(a)** The following measures shall be implemented to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to operational emissions of TACs: • Proposed commercial land uses that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity (e.g., loading docks) shall be located away from existing and proposed onsite sensitive receptors such that they do not expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that exceed an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0. • Where necessary to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0, proposed commercial and industrial land uses that would host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle-reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for TRUs to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off. • Signs shall be posted in at all loading docks and truck loading areas to indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises. This measure is consistent with the ATCM to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by the California Office of Administrative Law in January 2005. • Proposed facilities that would require the long-term use of diesel equipment and heavy-duty trucks shall develop a plan to reduce emissions, which may include such measures as scheduling activities when the residential uses are the least occupied, requiring equipment to be shut off when not in use, and prohibiting heavy trucks from idling.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	• When determining the exact type of facility that would occupy the proposed commercial space, the City shall take into consideration its toxic-producing potential. • Commercial land uses that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, or 40 trucks equipped with TRUs, within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors (e.g., residences or schools) shall perform a site-specific project-level HRA in accordance with SCAQMD guidance for projects generating or attracting vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles (SCAQMD 2003b). If the incremental increase in cancer risk determined by the HRA exceeds the threshold of significance recommended by SCAQMD or ARB at the time (if any), then all feasible mitigation measures shall be employed to minimize the impact. **Mitigation Measure AQ-4(b)** The City shall verify that the following measures are implemented by new developments to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to emissions of TACs from POLB and stationary sources in the vicinity of the Downtown Plan Project area: • All proposed residences in the Downtown Plan Project area shall be equipped with filter systems with high Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) for removal of small particles (such as 0.3 micron) at all air intake points to the home. All proposed residences shall be constructed with mechanical ventilation systems that would allow occupants to keep windows and doors closed and allow for the introduction of fresh outside air without the requirement of open windows. • The heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems shall be used to maintain all residential units under positive pressure at all times. • An ongoing education and maintenance plan about the filtration systems associated with HVAC shall be developed and implemented for residences. • To the extent feasible, sensitive receptors shall be located as far away from the POLB as possible. **Mitigation Measure AQ-5** The following additional guidelines, which are recommended in ARB's Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective (ARB 2005) shall be implemented. The guidelines are considered to be advisory and not regulatory: Sensitive receptors, such as residential units and daycare centers, shall not be located in the same building as drycleaning operations that use perchloroethylene. Drycleaning operations that use perchloroethylene shall not be located within 300 feet of any sensitive receptor. A setback of 500 feet shall be provided for operations with two or more machines.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact AQ-6 Temporary, short-term construction and long-term operation of the Project could result in the frequent exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial objectionable odor emissions. Impacts from short-term construction would be Class III, less than significant. Impacts from long-term operation would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure AQ-6** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to control exposure of sensitive receptors to operational odorous emissions. The City shall ensure that all project applicant(s) implement the following measures: • The City shall consider the odor-producing potential of land uses when reviewing future development proposals and when the exact type of facility that would occupy areas zoned for commercial, industrial, or mixed-use land uses is determined. Facilities that have the potential to emit objectionable odors shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors. • Before the approval of building permits, odor-control devices shall be identified to mitigate the exposure of receptors to objectionable odors if a potential odor producing source is to occupy an area zoned for commercial land use. The identified odor-control devices shall be installed before the issuance of certificates of occupancy for the potentially odor-producing use. The odor-producing potential of a source and control devices shall be determined in coordination with SCAQMD and based on the number of complaints associated with existing sources of the same nature. • Truck loading docks and delivery areas shall be located as far away as feasible from existing and proposed sensitive receptors. • Signs shall be posted at all loading docks and truck loading areas to indicate that diesel-powered delivery trucks must be shut off when not in use for longer than 5 minutes on the premises in order to reduce idling emissions. This measure is consistent with the ATCM to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, which was approved by California's Office of Administrative Law in January 2005. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure AQ-4 to limit TAC emissions.) • Proposed commercial and industrial land uses that have the potential to host diesel trucks shall incorporate idle-reduction strategies that reduce the main propulsion engine idling time through alternative technologies such as, IdleAire, electrification of truck parking, and alternative energy sources for TRUs to allow diesel engines to be completely turned off. (This measure is also required by Mitigation Measure AQ-4 to limit TAC emissions.) In addition, mitigation measures identified under AQ-4(b) to reduce indoor exposure to TACs would also result in a reduction in the intensity of offensive odors from the surrounding odor sources.
Cultural Resources	
Impact CR-1 Adoption of the proposed Downtown Plan may result in redevelopment of properties considered to be eligible for listing on the National Register or the California Register, or that is determined eligible for listing as a City Landmark or Landmark District. Compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would provide an opportunity to avoid or reduce impacts to historic properties. However, it may not be feasible to fully implement the Downtown Plan without impacting historic resources. Therefore, the impact would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure CR-1(a)** The City shall encourage the designation as local landmarks of 20 properties identified in Table 4.3-3 with the "Desired Outcome" of "Pursue Local Designation." The City will encourage the on-going maintenance and appropriate adaptive reuse of all properties in Table 4.3-2 (existing landmarks), and Table 4.3-3 as historic resources. **Mitigation Measure CR-1(b)** The following procedures shall be followed prior to issuance of a demolition permit or a building permit for alteration of any property listed in the Historic Survey Report (ICF Jones & Stokes 2009) by Status Code 3S, 3CS, 5S1, or 5S3; designated as a Historic Landmark (City of Long Beach 2010a); listed in Tables 4.3-2 and 4.3-3 of this PEIR, or other property 45 years of age or older that was not previously determined by the Historic Survey Report to be ineligible for National Register, California Register, or Local Landmark (Status Code 6L and 6Z): <u>Notification of Historic Preservation Staff</u> Historic Preservation staff in the City Development Services Department shall be notified upon receipt of any demolition permit or building permit for alteration of any property listed in the Historic Survey Report or other property 45 years of age or older that was not previously determined by the Historic Survey Report to be ineligible for National Register, California Register, or Local Landmark (Status Code 6L and 6Z) <u>Determination of Need for Historic Property Survey</u>

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	In consultation with Historic Preservation staff, the City Development Services Department shall determine whether a formal historic property survey is needed and may require that the owner or applicant provide photographs of the property, including each building façade, with details of windows, siding, eaves, and streetscape views, and copies of the County Assessor and City building records, in order to make this determination. Determination of Eligibility If City Development Services Department staff determines that the property may be eligible for designation, the property shall be referred to the Cultural Heritage Commission, whose determination of eligibility shall be considered as part of the environmental determination for the project in accordance with CEQA. Documentation Program If the Cultural Heritage Commission determines that the property is eligible for historic listing, the City Development Services Department shall, in lieu of preservation, require that prior to demolition or alteration a Documentation Program be prepared to the satisfaction of the City Development Services Department, which shall include the following: A. Photo Documentation Documentation shall include professional quality photographs of the structure prior to demolition with 35 mm black and white photographs, 4" x 6" standard format, taken of all four elevations and with close-ups of select architectural elements, such as but not limited to, roof/wall junctions, window treatments, decorative hardware, any other elements of the building's exterior or interior, or other property features identified by the City Development Services Department to be documented. Photographs shall be of archival quality and easily reproducible. B. Required Drawings Measured drawings of the building's exterior elevations depicting existing conditions or other relevant features shall be produced from recorded, accurate measurements. If portions of the building are not accessible for measurement or cannot be reproduced from historic sources, they should not be drawn, but clearly labeled as not accessible. Drawings shall be produced in ink on translucent material or archivally stable material (blueline drawings are acceptable). Standard drawing sizes are 19" x 24" or 24" x 36" and standard scale is ¼" = 1 foot. C. Archival Storage Xerox copies or CD of the photographs and one set of the measured drawings shall be submitted for archival storage with the City Development Services Department; and one set of original photographs, negatives, and measured drawings shall be submitted for archival storage with such other historical repository identified by the City Development Services Department.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact CR-2 Due to the lack of natural ground surfaces in the Project area, no surveys can be conducted prior to onset of demolition or other ground-disturbing activities. The potential exists for such activities to encounter and damage archaeological resources. This impact would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure CR-2(a)** A qualified project archaeologist or archaeological monitor approved by the City in advance of any ground-disturbing activities shall be present during excavation into native sediments and shall have the authority to halt excavation for inspection and protection of cultural resources. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities to allow the find to be evaluated. If the archaeological monitor determines the find to be significant, the project applicant and the City shall be notified and an appropriate treatment plan for the resources shall be prepared. The treatment plan shall include notification of a Native American representative and shall consider whether the resource should be preserved in place or removed to an appropriate repository as identified by the City. **Mitigation Measure CR-2(b)** The project archaeologist shall prepare a final report of the find for review and approval by the City and shall include a description of the resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. The report shall be filed with the California Historic Resources Information System South Central Coastal Information Center. If the resources are found to be significant, a separate report including the results of the recovery and evaluation process shall be prepared. **Mitigation Measure CR-2(c)** If human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the corner is to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. The NAHC will then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent, who will help determine what course of action should be taken in dealing with the remains. Preservation in place and project design alternatives shall be considered as possible courses of action by the project applicant, the City, and the Most Likely Descendent.
Impact CR-3 Due to the lack of natural ground surfaces in the Project area, no surveys can be conducted prior to onset of demolition or other ground-disturbing activities. The potential exists for such activities to encounter and damage paleontological resources. This impact would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure CR-3(a)** A qualified paleontologist approved by the City in advance of any ground-disturbing activities shall be present during excavation into native sediments and shall have the authority to halt excavation for inspection and protection of paleontological resources. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for fossil remains and, where appropriate, collection of sediment samples for further analysis. The frequency of inspections shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated, the depth of excavation, and, if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered. **Mitigation Measure CR-3(b)** If a potential fossil is found, the paleontologist shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect excavation and grading in the area of the exposed fossil to evaluate and, if necessary, salvage the find. All fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are donated to their final repository. Any fossils collected shall be donated to a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County and shall be accompanied by a report on the fossils collected and their significance, and notes, maps, and photographs of the salvage effort.
Geology and Seismicity	
Impact Geo-1 Seismically induced ground shaking could damage existing and proposed structures in the Plan area and could expose people or structures to potential substantial risk of loss, injury, or death. Compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to a Class II, significant and mitigable impact.	**Mitigation Measure Geo-1** New construction or structural remodeling of buildings proposed within the Project area shall be engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration that may occur at the project site. The calculated design base ground motion for each project site shall take into consideration the soil type, potential for liquefaction, and the most current and applicable seismic attenuation methods that are available. All onsite structures shall comply with applicable provisions of the most recent UBC adopted by the City of Long Beach.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact Geo-2 Seismic activity could induce ground shaking that results in liquefaction that could cause structural failure and potential substantial risk of loss, injury, or death. Compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to a Class II, significant and mitigable impact.	**Mitigation Measure Geo-2** Prior to issuance of a building permit for new structures, the City Department of Development Services shall determine, based on building height, depth, and location, whether a comprehensive geotechnical investigation and geo-engineering study shall be completed to adequately assess the liquefaction potential and compaction design of the soils underlying the proposed bottom grade of the structure. If a geotechnical investigation is required, borings shall be completed to at least 50 feet below the lowest proposed finished grade of the structure or 20 feet below the lowest caisson or footing (whichever is deeper). If these soils are confirmed to be prone to seismically induced liquefaction, appropriate techniques to minimize liquefaction potential shall be prescribed and implemented. All onsite structures shall comply with applicable methods of the UBC and California Building Code. Suitable measures to reduce liquefaction impacts could include specialized design of foundations by a structural engineer, removal or treatment of liquefiable soils to reduce the potential for liquefaction, drainage to lower the groundwater table to below the level of liquefiable soils, in-situ densification of soils, or other alterations to the sub-grade characteristics.
Impact Geo-3 The potential exists within the Plan area to encounter expansive soils or soils that are unstable or would become unstable as a result of new development. These conditions could result in onsite or offsite lateral spreading or subsidence. Compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to a Class II, significant and mitigable impact.	**Mitigation Measure Geo-3** Prior to issuance of a building permit for new structures, the City Department of Development Services shall determine the need for soil samples of final sub-grade areas and excavation sidewalls to be collected and analyzed for their expansion index. For areas where the expansion index is found to be greater than 20, grading and foundation designs shall be engineered to withstand the existing conditions. The expansion testing may be omitted if the grading and foundations are engineered to withstand the presence of highly expansive soils.
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Impact GHG-1 Construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan would result in increased generation of GHG emissions. These emissions would be temporary and short-term and would decline over time as new regulations are developed that address medium- and heavy-duty on-road vehicles and off-road equipment under the mandate of AB 32. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure GHG-1(a) Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1**. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, of this PEIR, which would reduce construction emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, would also act to reduce GHG emissions associated with implementation of the Project. The construction mitigation measures for exhaust emissions are relevant to the global climate change impact because both criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions are frequently associated with combustion byproducts. **Mitigation Measure GHG-1(b) Implement Additional Measures to Control Construction-Generated GHG Emissions.** To further reduce construction-generated GHG emissions, the project applicant(s) of all public and private developments shall implement all feasible measures for reducing GHG emissions associated with construction that are recommended by the City and/or SCAQMD at the time individual portions of the site undergo construction, including those specified in the mitigation recommendations in the SCAQMD CEQA Handbook or SCAQMD's Mitigation Measures and Control Efficiencies recommendations located at the following url: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html. Such measures may reduce GHG exhaust emissions from the use of onsite equipment, worker commute trips, and truck trips carrying materials and equipment to and from the project site, as well as GHG emissions embodied in the materials selected for construction (e.g., concrete). Other measures may pertain to the materials used in construction. Prior to the construction of each development phase, the project applicant(s) shall obtain the most current list of GHG-reduction measures that are recommended by the City and/or SCAQMD and stipulate that these measures be implemented during the appropriate construction phase. The project applicant(s) for any particular development phase may submit to the City a report that substantiates why specific measures are considered infeasible for construction of that particular development phase and/or at that point in time. The report, including the substantiation for not implementing particular GHG-reduction measures, shall be approved by the City. The City's recommended measures for reducing construction-related GHG emissions at the time of writing this PEIR are listed below and the project applicant(s) shall, at a minimum, be required to implement the following:

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures

	• Improve fuel efficiency from construction equipment:
	  ○ reduce unnecessary idling (modify work practices, install auxiliary power for driver comfort),
	  ○ perform equipment maintenance (inspections, detect failures early, corrections),
	  ○ train equipment operators in proper use of equipment,
	  ○ use the proper size of equipment for the job, and
	  ○ use equipment with new technologies (repowered engines, electric drive trains).
	• Use alternative fuels for electricity generators and welders at construction sites such as propane or solar, or use electrical power.
	• Use an ARB-approved low-carbon fuel, such as biodiesel or renewable diesel for construction equipment (emissions of NO_X from the use of low carbon fuel must be reviewed and increases mitigated). Additional information about low-carbon fuels is available from ARB's Low Carbon Fuel Standard Program (ARB 2010a).
	• Encourage and provide carpools, shuttle vans, transit passes and/or secure bicycle parking for construction worker commutes.
	• Reduce electricity use in the construction office by using compact fluorescent bulbs, powering off computers every day, and replacing heating and cooling units with more efficient ones.
	• Recycle or salvage non-hazardous construction and demolition debris (goal of at least 75 percent by weight).
	• Use locally sourced or recycled materials for construction materials (goal of at least 20 percent based on costs for building materials, and based on volume for roadway, parking lot, sidewalk, and curb materials).
	• Minimize the amount of concrete used for paved surfaces or use a low carbon concrete option.
	• Produce concrete onsite if determined to be less emissive than transporting ready mix.
	• Use EPA-certified SmartWay trucks for deliveries and equipment transport. Additional information about the SmartWay Transport Partnership Program is available from ARB's Heavy-Duty Vehicle GHG Measure (ARB 2010b) and EPA (EPA 2010).
	• Develop a plan to efficiently use water for adequate dust control. This may consist of the use of non-potable water from a local source.

Impact GHG-2 Implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan over the long term would result in increased generation of GHGs, which would contribute considerably to cumulative GHG emissions. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure GHG-2(a) Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-3**. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.2, which would reduce operational emissions of criteria air pollutants and precursors, would also act to reduce GHG emissions associated with implementation of the Project. The operational mitigation measures for exhaust emissions are relevant to the global climate change impact because both criteria air pollutant and GHG emissions are frequently associated with combustion byproducts. **Mitigation Measure GHG-2(b) Implement Additional Measures to Reduce Operational GHG Emissions**. For each increment of new development within the Project area requiring a discretionary approval (e.g., tentative subdivision map, conditional use permit, improvement plan), measures that reduce GHG emissions to the extent feasible and to the extent appropriate with respect to the state's progress at the time toward meeting GHG emissions reductions required by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32) shall be imposed, as follows: • The project applicant shall incorporate feasible GHG reduction measures that, in combination with existing and future regulatory measures developed under AB 32, will reduce GHG emissions associated with the operation of future project development phases and supporting roadway and infrastructure improvements by an amount sufficient to achieve the

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	goal of 6.6 CO_2e/SP/year, if it is feasible to do so. The feasibility of potential GHG reduction measures shall be evaluated by the City at the time each phase of development is proposed to allow for ongoing innovations in GHG reduction technologies and incentives created in the regulatory environment. • For each increment of new development, the project applicant shall obtain a list of potentially feasible GHG reduction measures to be considered in the development design from the City. The City's list of potentially feasible GHG reduction measures shall reflect the current state of the regulatory environment, which will continuously evolve under the mandate of AB 32. The project applicant(s) shall then submit to the City a mitigation report that contains an analysis demonstrating which GHG reduction measures are feasible for the associated reduction in GHG emissions, and the resulting CO_2e/SP/year metric. The report shall also demonstrate why measures not selected are considered infeasible. The mitigation report must be reviewed and approved by the City for the project applicant(s) to receive the City's discretionary approval for the applicable increment of development. In determining what measures should appropriately be imposed by a local government under the circumstances, the following factors shall be considered: o The extent to which rates of GHG emissions generated by motor vehicles traveling to, from, and within the Project site are projected to decrease over time as a result of regulations, policies, and/or plans that have already been adopted or may be adopted in the future by ARB or other public agency pursuant to AB 32, or by EPA; o The extent to which mobile-source GHG emissions, which at the time of writing this PEIR comprise a substantial portion of the state's GHG inventory, can also be reduced through design measures that result in trip reductions and reductions in trip length; o The extent to which GHG emissions emitted by the mix of power generation operated by SCE, the electrical utility that will serve the Project site, are projected to decrease pursuant to the Renewables Portfolio Standard required by SB 1078 and SB 107, as well as any future regulations, policies, and/or plans adopted by the federal and state governments that reduce GHG emissions from power generation; o The extent to which replacement of CCR Title 24 with the California Green Building Standards Code or other similar requirements will result in new buildings being more energy efficient and consequently more GHG efficient; o The extent to which any stationary sources of GHG emissions that would be operated on a proposed land use (e.g., industrial) are already subject to regulations, policies, and/or plans that reduce GHG emissions, particularly any future regulations that will be developed as part of ARB's implementation of AB 32, or other pertinent regulations on stationary sources that have the indirect effect of reducing GHG emissions; o The extent to which the feasibility of existing GHG reduction technologies may change in the future, and to which innovation in GHG reduction technologies will continue, effecting cost-benefit analyses that determine economic feasibility; and o Whether the total costs of proposed mitigation for GHG emissions, together with other mitigation measures required for the proposed development, are so great that a reasonably prudent property owner would not proceed with the project in the face of such costs. • In considering how much, and what kind of, mitigation is necessary in light of these factors, the following list of options shall be considered, though the list is not intended to be exhaustive, as GHG-emission reduction strategies and their respective feasibility are likely to evolve over time. These measures are derived from multiple sources including the Mitigation Measure Summary in Appendix B of the California Air Pollution Control Officer's Association (CAPCOA) white paper, *CEQA & Climate Change* (CAPCOA 2008); CAPCOA's *Model Policies for Greenhouse Gases in General Plans* (CAPCOA 2009); and the California Attorney General's Office publication, The California Environmental Quality Act: Addressing Global Warming Impacts at the Local Agency Level (California Attorney General's Office 2010). <u>Energy Efficiency</u>

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	○ Include clean alternative energy features to promote energy self-sufficiency (e.g., photovoltaic cells, solar thermal electricity systems, small wind turbines). ○ Design buildings to meet CEC Tier II requirements (e.g., exceeding the requirements of Title 24 [as of 2007] by 20 percent). ○ Site buildings to take advantage of shade and prevailing winds and design landscaping and sun screens to reduce energy use. ○ Install efficient lighting in all buildings (including residential). Also install lighting control systems, where practical. Use daylight as an integral part of lighting systems in all buildings. ○ Install light-colored "cool" pavements, and strategically located shade trees along all bicycle and pedestrian routes. <u>Water Conservation and Efficiency</u> ○ With the exception of ornamental shade trees, use water-efficient landscapes with native, drought-resistant species in all public area and commercial landscaping. Use water-efficient turf in parks and other turf-dependent spaces. ○ Install the infrastructure to use reclaimed water for landscape irrigation and/or washing cars. ○ Install water-efficient irrigation systems and devices, such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls. ○ Design buildings and lots to be water efficient. Only install water-efficient fixtures and appliances. ○ Restrict watering methods (e.g., prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces) and control runoff. Prohibit businesses from using pressure washers for cleaning driveways, parking lots, sidewalks, and street surfaces. These restrictions should be included in the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions of the community. ○ Provide education about water conservation and available programs and incentives. ○ To reduce storm water runoff, which typically bogs down wastewater treatment systems and increases their energy consumption, construct driveways to single-family detached residences and parking lots and driveways of multi-family residential uses, with pervious surfaces. Possible designs include Hollywood drives (two concrete strips with vegetation or aggregate in between) and/or the use of porous concrete, porous asphalt, turf blocks, or pervious pavers. <u>Solid Waste Measures</u> ○ Reuse and recycle construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard). ○ Provide interior and exterior storage areas for recyclables and green waste at all buildings. ○ Provide adequate recycling containers in public areas, including parks, school grounds, golf courses, and pedestrian zones in areas of mixed-use development. ○ Provide education and publicity about reducing waste and available recycling services. <u>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</u> ○ Promote ride-sharing programs and employment centers (e.g., by designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ride-sharing vehicles, designating adequate passenger loading zones and waiting areas for ride-share vehicles, and providing a website or message board for coordinating ride-sharing). ○ Provide the necessary facilities and infrastructure in all land use types to encourage the use of low- or zero-emission vehicles (e.g., electric vehicle charging facilities and conveniently located alternative fueling stations).

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	○ At industrial and commercial land uses, all forklifts, "yard trucks," or vehicles that are predominately used onsite at non-residential land uses shall be electric-powered or powered by biofuels (such as biodiesel [B100]) that are produced from waste products, or shall use other technologies that do not rely on direct fossil fuel consumption.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
Impact Haz-1 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. Therefore, hazardous materials impacts to residences, schools, or other properties would not be expected to result from transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials from businesses anticipated to locate within the Downtown Plan Project area. However, many future construction projects would involve full or partial demolition of existing structures, some of which, due to their age, may contain asbestos and lead-based paints and materials. Compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Haz-1(a)** Prior to issuance of a demolition or renovation permit, a lead-based paint and asbestos survey shall be performed by a licensed sampling company. The lead-based paint survey shall be prepared for any structures pre-dating 1982; an asbestos survey shall be performed for asbestos-containing insulation for any structure pre-dating 1986; and an asbestos survey shall be performed for asbestos-containing drywall for all structures for which drywall is to be removed. All testing procedures shall follow California and federal protocol. The lead-based paint and asbestos survey report shall quantify the areas of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing materials pursuant to California and federal standards. **Mitigation Measure Haz-1(b)** Prior to any demolition or renovation, onsite structures that contain asbestos must have the asbestos-containing material removed according to proper abatement procedures recommended by the asbestos consultant. All abatement activities shall be in compliance with California and federal OSHA and SCAQMD requirements. Only asbestos trained and certified abatement personnel shall be allowed to perform asbestos abatement. All asbestos-containing material removed from onsite structures shall be hauled to a licensed receiving facility and disposed of under proper manifest by a transportation company certified to handle asbestos. Following completion of the asbestos abatement, the asbestos consultant shall provide a report documenting the abatement procedures used, the volume of asbestos-containing material removed, where the material was moved to, and transportation and disposal manifests or dump tickets. The abatement report shall be prepared for the property owner or other responsible party and a copy shall be submitted to the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a demolition or construction permit. **Mitigation Measure Haz-1(c)** Prior to the issuance of a permit for the renovation or demolition of any structure, a licensed lead-based paint consultant shall be contracted to evaluate the structure for lead-based paint. If lead-based paint is discovered, it shall be removed according to proper abatement procedures recommended by the consultant. All abatement activities shall be in compliance with California and federal OSHA and SCAQMD requirements. Only lead-based paint trained and certified abatement personnel shall be allowed to perform abatement activities. All lead-based paint removed from these structures shall be hauled and disposed of by a transportation company licensed to transport this type of material. In addition, the material shall be taken to a landfill or receiving facility licensed to accept the waste. Following completion of the lead-based paint abatement, the lead-based paint consultant shall provide a report documenting the abatement procedures used, the volume of lead-based paint removed, where the material was moved to, and transportation and disposal manifests or dump tickets. The abatement report shall be prepared for the property owner or other responsible party, with a copy submitted to the City of Long Beach prior to issuance of a demolition or construction permit.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact Haz-3 Historic activity involving industrial uses and storage of hydrocarbons, heavy metals, and acids on properties within the Project area may have contaminated onsite soils and/or groundwater quality. Impacts relating to potential contamination are considered Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Haz-3(a)** All excavation and demolition projects conducted within the Project area shall be required to prepare a contingency plan to identify appropriate measures to be followed if contaminants are found or suspected or if structural features that could be associated with contaminants or hazardous materials are suspected or discovered. The contingency plan shall identify personnel to be notified, emergency contacts, and a sampling protocol to be implemented. The excavation and demolition contractors shall be made aware of the possibility of encountering unknown hazardous materials and shall be provided with appropriate contact and notification information. The contingency plan shall include a provision stating under what circumstances it would be safe to continue with the excavation or demolition, and shall identify the person authorized to make that determination. **Mitigation Measure Haz-3(b)** If contaminants are detected, the results of the soil sampling shall be forwarded to the appropriate local regulatory agency (Long Beach/Signal Hill Certified Unified Program Agency [CUPA], LARWQCB, or the state DTSC). Prior to any other ground disturbing activities at the site, the regulatory agency shall have reviewed the data and signed off on the property or such additional investigation or remedial activities that are deemed necessary have been completed and regulatory agency approval has been received. Groundwater is subject to pre-treatment during de-watering activities to meet National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Dewatering permit limits. The construction activities shall conform to the NPDES requirements. The RWQCB requires the water to be tested for possible pollutants. The developer shall collect groundwater samples from existing site wells to determine pre-treatment system requirements for extracted groundwater. A water treatment system shall be designed and installed for treatment of extracted groundwater removed during dewatering activities so that such water complies with the applicable RWQCB and NPDES permit standards before disposal. **Mitigation Measure Haz-3(c)** If concentrations of contaminants warrant site remediation, contaminated materials shall be remediated either prior to construction of structures or concurrent with construction. The contaminated materials shall be remediated under the supervision of an environmental consultant licensed to oversee such remediation. The remediation program shall also be approved by a regulatory oversight agency (Long Beach/Signal Hill CUPA, LARWQCB, or the state DTSC). All proper waste handling and disposal procedures shall be followed. Upon completion of the remediation, the environmental consultant shall prepare a report summarizing the project, the remediation approach implemented, the analytical results after completion of the remediation, and all waste disposal or treatment manifests. **Mitigation Measure Haz-3(d)** If during the soil sampling, groundwater contamination is suspected or soil contamination is detected at depths at which groundwater could be encountered during demolition or construction, a groundwater sampling assessment shall be performed. If contaminants are detected in groundwater at levels that exceed maximum contaminant levels for those constituents in drinking water, or if the contaminants exceed health risk standards such as Preliminary Remediation Goals, 1 in 1 million cancer risk, or a health risk index above 1, the results of the groundwater sampling shall be forwarded to the appropriate regulatory agency (Long Beach/Signal Hill CUPA, LARWQCB, or the State DTSC). Prior to any other ground-disturbing activities at the site, the regulatory agency shall have reviewed the data and signed off on the property or such additional investigation or remedial activities that are deemed necessary have been completed and regulatory agency approval has been received.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Hydrology and Water Quality	
Impact Hydro-1 Construction activities associated with future development of residential, hotels, offices, and other uses could result in discharges of urban pollutants into the City drainage system. This would include runoff from grading and excavation; fuel, lubricants, and solvents from construction vehicles and machinery; and trash and other debris. This would result in a significant adverse impact on water quality. Impacts would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Hydro-1** Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City Department of Development Services shall determine the need for the developer to prepare a SWPPP for the site. If required, the SWPPP shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Development Services prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits. The SWPPP shall fully comply with City and LARWQCB requirements and shall contain specific BMPs to be implemented during project construction to reduce erosion and sedimentation to the maximum extent practicable. The following BMPs or equivalent measures to control pollutant runoff shall be included within the project's grading and construction plans, if applicable: <u>Pollutant Escape: Deterrence</u> • Cover all storage areas, including soil piles, fuel and chemical depots. Protect from rain and wind with plastic sheets and temporary roofs. • Implement tracking controls to reduce the tracking of sediment and debris from the construction site. At a minimum, entrances and exits shall be inspected daily and controls implemented as needed. • Implement street sweeping and vacuuming as needed and as required. <u>Pollutant Containment Areas</u> • Locate all construction-related equipment and related processes that contain or generate pollutants (i.e., fuel, lubricants, solvents, cement dust, and slurry) in isolated areas with proper protection from escape. • Locate construction-related equipment and processes that contain or generate pollutants in secure areas, away from storm drains and gutters. • Place construction-related equipment and processes that contain or generate pollutants in bermed and plastic-lined depressions to contain all materials within that site in the event of accidental release or spill. • Park, fuel, and clean all vehicles and equipment in one designated, contained area. <u>Pollutant Detainment Methods</u> • Protect downstream drainages from escaping pollutants by capturing materials carried in runoff and preventing transport from the site. Examples of detainment methods that retard movement of water and separate sediment and other contaminants are silt fences, hay bales, sand bags, berms, and silt and debris basins. <u>Recycling/Disposal</u> • Develop a protocol for maintaining a clean site. This includes proper recycling of construction-related materials and equipment fluids (i.e., concrete dust, cutting slurry, motor oil, and lubricants). • Provide disposal facilities. Develop a protocol for cleanup and disposal of small construction wastes (i.e., dry concrete). <u>Hazardous Materials Identification and Response</u> • Develop a protocol for identifying risk operations and materials. Include protocol for identifying source and distribution of spilled materials. • Provide a protocol for proper clean-up of equipment and construction materials, and disposal of spilled substances and associated cleanup materials. • Provide an emergency response plan that includes contingencies for assembling response teams and immediately notifying appropriate agencies.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact Hydro-2 Future development would generate various urban pollutants such as soil, herbicides, and pesticides that could adversely affect surface water and groundwater quality in the Project area watershed. This would result in a significant adverse impact on water quality. Impacts would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Hydro-2** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Department of Development Services shall determine the need for the developer to prepare a SUSMP for the site. If required, the SUSMP shall be submitted for review and approval by the Department of Development Services prior to the issuance of any building permits. The City's review shall include a determination of whether installation of pollutant removal technology in existing or proposed storm drains adjacent to the project site should be required. The City's review is required to confirm that the SUSMP is consistent with the City's NPDES Permit No. CAS 004003 or a subsequently issued NPDES permit applicable at the time of project construction. A SUSMP consistent with the City's NPDES permit shall be incorporated into the project design plans prior to issuance of any building permits.
Impact Hydro-3 The increased land use intensity of future residential and commercial uses allowed by the proposed Downtown Plan could increase pervious surfaces and result in an increased volume of stormwater discharges into the existing storm drain infrastructure. This would result in a significant adverse impact on the local hydrologic system. Impacts would be Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Hydro-3** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the City Stormwater Management Division shall determine the need for the developer to conduct an analysis of the existing stormwater drainage system and to identify improvements needed to accommodate any projected increased runoff that would result from the proposed Project. The evaluation conducted by the developer shall include a determination of whether Low Impact Development (LID) practices and strategies should be incorporated into the project to reduce post-development peak stormwater runoff discharge rates to not exceed the estimated pre-development discharge rates.
Noise	
Impact Noise-1 Implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan would create noise from construction activities that would expose sensitive land uses to temporary or periodic substantial noise level increases. While there is a potential for a significant adverse noise impact, compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Noise-1(a)** The following measures shall be applied to proposed construction projects that are determined to have potential noise impacts from removal of existing pavement and structures, site grading and excavation, pile driving, building framing, and concrete pours and paving: • All internal combustion-engine-driven equipment shall be equipped with mufflers that are in good operating condition and appropriate for the equipment. • "Quiet" models of air compressors and other stationary construction equipment shall be employed where such technology exists. • Stationary noise-generating equipment shall be located as far as reasonable from sensitive receptors when sensitive receptors adjoin or are within 150 feet of a construction site. • Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (i.e., in excess of 5 minutes) shall be prohibited. • Foundation pile holes shall be predrilled, as feasible based on geologic conditions, to minimize the number of impacts required to seat the pile. • Construction-related traffic shall be routed along major roadways and away from noise-sensitive receptors. • Construction activities, including the loading and unloading of materials and truck movements, shall be limited to the hours specified in the City Noise Ordinance (Section 8.80.202). • Businesses, residences, and noise-sensitive land uses within 150 feet of construction sites shall be notified of the construction. The notification shall describe the activities anticipated, provide dates and hours, and provide contact information with a description of the complaint and response procedure. • Each project implemented as part of the Plan shall designate a "construction liaison" that would be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The liaison would determine the cause of the noise

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	complaints (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and institute reasonable measures to correct the problem. A telephone number for the liaison shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site. • If two or more noise complaints are registered, the liaison, or project representative, shall retain a City-approved noise consultant to conduct noise measurements at the locations that registered the complaints. The noise measurements shall be conducted for a minimum of 1 hour and shall include 1-minute intervals. The consultant shall prepare a letter report summarizing the measurements and potential measures to reduce noise levels to the maximum extent feasible. The letter report shall include all measurement and calculation data used in determining impacts and resolutions. The letter report shall be provided to code enforcement for determining the adequacy and if the recommendations are adequate. **Mitigation Measure Noise-1(b)** The City will require the following measures, where applicable based on noise level of source, proximity of receptors, and presence of intervening structures, to be incorporated into contract specifications for construction projects within 300 feet of existing noise-sensitive land uses (including, but not limited to residences, schools, hospitals/nursing homes, churches, and parks) implemented under the proposed Plan: • Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed around construction sites adjacent to, or within 150 feet of, operational business, residences, or other noise-sensitive land uses. Temporary noise barriers shall be constructed of material with a minimum weight of 4 pounds per square foot with no gaps or perforations. Noise barriers may be constructed of, but are not limited to, 5/8-inch plywood, 5/8-inch oriented strand board, or hay bales. If a project-specific noise analysis determines that the barriers described above would not be sufficient to avoid a significant construction noise impact, a temporary sound control blanket barrier, shall be erected along building façades facing construction sites. This mitigation would only be necessary if conflicts occurred that were irresolvable by proper scheduling and other means of noise control were unavailable. The sound blankets are required to have a minimum breaking and tear strength of 120 pounds and 30 pounds, respectively. The sound blankets shall have a minimum sound transmission classification of 27 and noise reduction coefficient of 0.70. The sound blankets shall be of sufficient length to extend from the top of the building and drape on the ground or be sealed at the ground. The sound blankets shall have a minimum overlap of 2 inches.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact Noise-2 Implementation of the proposed Downtown Plan would include construction activities that would include vibrations sources, including pile driving. This would result in a significant adverse impact on vibration. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure Noise-2(a)** The City shall review all construction projects for potential vibration-generating activities from demolition, excavation, pile– driving, and construction within 100 feet of existing structures and shall require site-specific vibration studies to be conducted to determine the area of impact and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. The studies shall, at a minimum, include the following: • Identification of the project's vibration compaction activities, pile driving, and other vibration-generating activities that have the potential to generate ground-borne vibration; and the sensitivity of nearby structures to ground-borne vibration. This task should be conducted by a qualified structural engineer. • A vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted; establish a vibration monitoring schedule; define structure-specific vibration limits; and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies shall be identified for actions to be taken when vibration levels approached the defined vibration limits. • Maintain a monitoring log of vibrations during initial demolition activities and during pile driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for a more or less intensive measurement schedule. • Vibration levels limits for suspension of construction activities and implementation of contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures. • Post-construction survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high vibration levels or complaints of damage have been made. Make appropriate repairs or compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities. **Mitigation Measure Noise-2(b)** Any construction activity that generates vibration exceeding the "vibration perception threshold" as specified in Municipal Code Section 8.80.200 at any school shall be scheduled at a time when school is not in session.
Impact Noise-5 The proposed Downtown Plan would allow the location of sensitive receptors in areas that would exceed the standards identified for the applicable land use by the Noise Element of the Long Beach General Plan. While there is a potential for a significant adverse impact related to noise compatibility, compliance with mitigation measures identified herein would reduce impacts to Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Noise-5** In areas where new residential development would be exposed than L_{dn} of greater than 65 dBA, the City will require site-specific noise studies prior to issuance of building permits to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures, which may include, but are not limited to the following: • Utilize site planning to minimize noise in shared residential outdoor activity areas by locating the areas behind the buildings or in courtyards, or orienting the terraces to alleyways rather than streets, whenever possible. • Provide mechanical ventilation in all residential units proposed along roadways or in areas where noise levels could exceed 65 dBA L_{dn} so that windows can remain closed at the choice of the occupants to maintain interior noise levels below 45 dBA L_{dn}. • Install sound-rated windows and construction methods to provide the requisite noise control for residential units proposed along roadways or in areas where noise levels could exceed 70 dBA L_{dn}.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Impact Noise-6 The Plan would allow the development of new residential uses adjacent to existing commercial and retail uses. In addition, new residential uses may be proposed adjacent to or sometimes within the same building as noise-generating commercial uses. Noise levels resulting from existing and proposed noise-generating uses (i.e., office and retail uses) could expose such noise-sensitive uses to noise levels in excess of the City's or Noise Ordinance limits. This would be a potentially significant impact and mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce this impact to Class II, significant and mitigable.	**Mitigation Measure Noise-6** In areas where new residential development would be located adjacent to commercial uses, the City will require site-specific noise studies prior to issuance of building permits to determine the area of impact and to present appropriate mitigation measures, which may include, but are not limited to the following: • Require the placement of loading and unloading areas so that commercial buildings shield nearby residential land uses from noise generated by loading dock and delivery activities. If necessary, additional sound barriers shall be constructed on the commercial sites to protect nearby noise sensitive uses. • Require the placement of all commercial HVAC machinery to be placed within mechanical equipment rooms wherever possible. • Require the provision of localized noise barriers or rooftop parapets around HVAC, cooling towers, and mechanical equipment so that line-of-sight to the noise source from the property line of the noise sensitive receptors is blocked.
Transportation and Traffic	
Impact Traf-1 The proposed Downtown Plan, in combination with cumulative traffic growth, would result in a significant impact at 16 intersections. Partial mitigation is available for that impact, but physical constraints make expansion of the roadway cross-sections difficult. This would result in a significant adverse impact to traffic and transportation. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a)** As the system's capacity is reached, it will become important to manage the street system in a more efficient and coordinated manner. Improvements to the Project area transportation system are proposed as part of the overall Downtown development, including improvements that have been required of other area projects previously approved by the City. Therefore, the mitigation focuses on improvements that would not require significant additional rights-of-way and are achievable within the life of the Plan. There are five proposed mitigation measures for the Downtown Plan, as follows: 1. Implement traffic control system improvements in Downtown on selected arterials. 2. Improve the Alamitos Avenue corridor via removal of selected parking spaces and the implementation of additional travel lanes plus bike lanes in each direction. 3. Reconfigure the 6th Street and 7th Street intersections with Martin Luther King Avenue and Alamitos Avenue for safety and traffic flow enhancements. 4. Enhance freeway access to I-710 to and from Downtown Long Beach. 5. Implement transit facilities and programs to encourage public transit usage and Transportation Demand Management Policies. **Mitigation Measure Traf-1(b)** A series of traffic signal system improvements are recommended in Downtown to accommodate the anticipated growth in travel. The following traffic signal system improvements are recommended as part of this mitigation measure: 1. Implement Adaptive Traffic Signal Control System (ATCS) improvements throughout Downtown consistent with currently planned improvements on Ocean Boulevard and Atlantic Avenue. Streets that are proposed to be included in the ATCS as a mitigation measure for the Downtown Long Beach Strategic Plan include the following: o Alamitos Avenue north of Ocean Boulevard o Pine Avenue north of Ocean Boulevard o Pacific Avenue north of Ocean Boulevard o 7th Street from I-710 to Alamitos Avenue

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
	o 6th Street from I-710 to Alamitos Avenue o Broadway from I-710 to Alamitos Avenue o Ocean Boulevard from Shoreline to Alamitos Avenue (to join the proposed system starting at Alamitos Avenue) o Others as needed, to be determined by the City Traffic Engineer and Public Works Director 2. Implement pan/tilt/zoom Closed Circuit Television Camera (CCTV) surveillance and communications with power and control capability to the Department of Public Works to monitor real-time traffic operations from rooftops of selected new buildings as needed and to be determined based on the location of appropriate new high-rise structures along the Alamitos Avenue, Shoreline Drive, and Ocean Boulevard corridors. 3. Implement transit signal priority for Long Beach Boulevard and upgrade traffic signal system equipment and operations along the Blue Line light rail route. 4. Upgrade and improve traffic signal equipment throughout Downtown for safety and operational enhancements. **Mitigation Measure Traf-1(c)** As part of this mitigation measure, a number of intersections would receive major or minor signal modifications, depending on their current status. In addition to the enhancements listed, other potential improvements that can be included are: • Bicycle improvements (detection, signalization, etc.) • In-pavement LED crosswalk lights • Automatic pedestrian detection (i.e., infrared, microwave, or video detection) • Illuminated push buttons • Countdown pedestrian signals • Adaptive pedestrian clearance (increasing the flashing DON'T WALK time based on location of pedestrians in the crosswalk) • Enhanced signal equipment including mast arms, poles, signal heads, and other necessary enhancements for safety and operations • Communications enhancements as needed to tie the system together with the Traffic Control Center in City Hall **Mitigation Measure Traf-1(d) Traffic Calming and Pedestrian Amenities.** Appropriate traffic calming and pedestrian amenities shall be provided in conjunction with development projects. Potential improvements include corner curb extensions, enhanced paving of crosswalks, and pedestrian-activated signals at mid-block crossings to make it easier for pedestrians to cross the street and to make them more visible to motorists. Other potential improvements include wider sidewalks in locations where the existing sidewalks are less than 10 feet wide, pedestrian-scale street lights, and street furniture (City of Long Beach 2005). **Mitigation Measure Traf-1(e)** Currently, due to on-street parking, there is only one lane of travel on Alamitos Avenue in the southbound direction between 3rd Street and Broadway. Parking spaces on the west side of Alamitos Avenue will be removed, the street will be restriped and reconstructed, a bike lane will be added in each direction of travel, and the street will provide for two travel lanes in each direction plus exclusive left turn lanes from 7th Street to Ocean Boulevard. Traffic signal enhancements to implement the Alamitos Avenue improvements shall also be implemented as needed. **Mitigation Measure Traf-1(f)** Developments in the project area will be required to coordinate with area transit providers to accommodate and encourage transit use by residents and patrons. For non-residential sites, appropriate programs and facilities will be included to encourage car and van pooling, provide information on transportation alternatives, and encourage trip reduction strategies in accordance with the City's TDM policies for non-residential development.

TABLE 1
CERTIFIED PEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact	Mitigation Measures
Utilities and System Services	
Impact Utilities-3 Buildout of the proposed project would incrementally increase solid waste disposal treatment demand in the City. Based on LACSD's operation of the Mesquite Regional Landfill, which is permitted for up to 20,000 tons per day for approximately 100 years, adequate landfill capacity exists to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the proposed Project. In addition, mitigation measures are identified that would reduce the Project's solid waste impacts. Therefore, the impact on solid waste disposal systems would be considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.	**Mitigation Measure Utilities-3(a)** All construction related to Project implementation shall include verification by the construction contractor that all companies providing waste disposal services recycle all demolition and construction-related wastes. The contract specifying recycled waste service shall be submitted to the City Building Official prior to approval of the certificate of occupancy. **Mitigation Measure Utilities-3(b)** In order to facilitate onsite separation and recycling of construction related wastes, all construction contractors shall provide temporary waste separation bins onsite during demolition and construction. **Mitigation Measure Utilities-3(c)** All future developments in the Project area shall include recycling bins at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and all other recyclable materials. Materials from these bins shall be collected on a regular basis consistent with the City's refuse disposal program. **Mitigation Measure Utilities-3(d)** All Project area residents and commercial tenants shall be provided with educational materials on the proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste, in accordance with educational materials made available by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.

Proposed Project

As shown in Figure 1, *Project Location*, the proposed project would develop a mixed-use residential and commercial development in the Downtown Plan area. The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings— an 8-story building at the north end of the property (North Building) and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site (South Building) on a 1.2-acre site. The buildings would be developed in two phases with the North Building constructed as part of Phase I and the South Building as part of Phase II. Both buildings would include ground floor retail, with residential units on the upper stories. During Phase I, a pedestrian-focused paseo would be constructed at the location of the existing alley (Roble Way) between the two buildings. Parking for the project site would include two levels of subterranean parking for each building. In addition, the North Building has an additional level of parking at ground-level and level 2 and the South Building would provide four levels of parking on levels 2 through 5. The project floor plans, including subterranean parking levels, are included in Figures 2a through 2d.

The proposed project would include a total of 345 residential units that would range from studios to 3-bedroom units, 14,437 sf of retail commercial space, 563 vehicle parking spaces, and 128 bicycle parking spaces. Table 2, *Proposed Development*, provides a summary of the uses, square footage, number of units, and total area of the proposed development. As described in Table 2, the project's residential component would consist of 429,456 square feet (sf) of residential uses, including amenities, 14,337 sf of commercial retail uses, 217,493 sf of parking. The proposed project would also include 42,307 sf of open space, namely 13,944 sf of residential common outdoor open space, 11,688 sf of residential indoor common open space, 11,340 sf of residential private open space, and 5,335 sf of public open space. The proposed project's gross building area would be approximately 661,430 sf, including all below-grade levels. As shown on Table 3, *FAR and Site Area*, the project's base floor area ratio (FAR) is 8:1 and the project's total FAR would be 9.48.[2] To exceed the base FAR (and building height), the project intends to secure incentives for green roofs, LEED Silver certification, and have 10 percent of the project site be public open space. The proposed project would also provide solar panels that would generate renewable energy, on the roofs of both buildings. As shown in Figure 3, *Roble Way Vacation Request Diagram*, and Figure 4, *Dedication Request Diagrams*, the project also proposes to increase the Solana Court alley right-of-way with a 2-foot dedication along its western border abutting the project site and add 5-foot setback for the ground floor of both buildings between their parking garage entries and curb cuts to Solana Court at West 3rd Street and West 4th Street. Given the depth of construction of the north building's underground parking, an existing 14-inch water main along Roble Way would be relocated or demolished. New water laterals to serve the proposed project would be installed to connect to the public main. Construction of the new water laterals serving the project site would be limited to minor off-site work associated with connections to the public main. A trench would be constructed for the removal or demolition of the existing 14-inch water main and for installation of the new water laterals. No pile driving would be required as part of project construction.

[2] FAR is calculated by dividing the gross floor area by the buildable land area.

LOWER LEVEL GARAGE - 3



LOWER LEVEL GARAGE - 1



LOWER LEVEL GARAGE - 2



GROUND LEVEL



0 40 Feet

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 2a
Floor Plans for Garage and Ground Level

ESA

2nd FLOOR



3rd FLOOR



4th FLOOR

5TH FLOOR

0 40 Feet

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 2b
Floor Plans for Levels 2 to 5

ESA

6TH FLOOR

7TH FLOOR

8TH FLOOR NORTH - FLOORS 8TH-20TH SOUTH

0 40
Feet

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 2c
Floor Plans for Level 6 to 7, Level 8 (North) and Levels 8 to 20 (South)

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

NORTH ROOF - FLOORS 9 & 21 SOUTH



22TH FLOOR SOUTH



23RD FLOOR SOUTH - ROOF LEVEL AMENITY



0 40 Feet

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 2d
North Roof Floor Plans for Levels 9 and 21 (South), Floor Plans for Level 22 (South) and Level 23 (South) - Roof Level Amenity



NEW PROPOSED PROPERTY LINE (AFTER ALLEY DEDICATION)

PROPOSED PROPERTY LINE TO BE VACATED

AREA TO BE VACATED - 1,430 SF

NEW PROPOSED PROPERTY LINE (AFTER ALLEY DEDICATION)



0 30
Feet

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 3
Roble Way Vacation Request

ESA





0 30
Feet

D:\150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 4
Reverse Dedication Request

ESA

TABLE 2
PROPOSED PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Type of Use	North Building-Phase I	South Building-Phase II	Total
Residential			
Residential dwelling units	114,137 sf (142 dwelling units)	220,189 sf (203 dwelling units)	334,326 sf (345 dwelling units)
Residential amenities and services	29,543 sf	65,587 sf	95,130 sf
Subtotal			*429,456 sf (345 dwelling units)*
Retail			
Retail space	6,802 sf	7,679 sf	14,481 sf
Parking			
Vehicle Parking	90,160 sf (242 vehicle stalls)	127,333 sf (321 vehicle stalls)	217,493 sf (563 vehicle stalls)
Open Space			
Residential Common Outdoor (ground floor paseo and outdoor decks)	10,864 sf	8,415 sf	19,279 sf
Residential Common Indoor (residential amenities such as a gym, bike lock and storage areas, and lobbies)	4,438 sf	7,250 sf	11,688
Residential Private Outdoor (balconies and patios)	3,940 sf (57 balconies; 6 patios)	7,400 sf (45 balconies; 5 patios)	11,340 sf (102 balconies; 11 patios)
Subtotal			*42,307 sf*
Total Building Area			661,430 sf

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects, 2018.

TABLE 3
FAR AND SITE AREA

Site Area	53,3335 sf
Base FAR : 8:1 [a]	426,680 sf
FAR Total	505,536 sf
Ratio	9.48
Total proposed building area [b]	661,430 sf
Lot Coverage [c]	86%

Notes:

[a] Site FAR extents include north and south half block parcels, vacated Roble Alley, 2' dedication at Solana, and a reverse dedication at Pacific Ave (western) boundary of south parcel.

[b] Total Building area includes all below grade levels.

[c] FAR calculation excludes vertical circulation and utility spaces

Figures 5a and 5b, *North and South Building – Split View,* illustrate the proposed elevations, uses, and heights for the proposed project. The North Building would include two levels of subterranean parking. The ground floor would consist of the lobby, retail space, and parking. Level 2 would consist of parking and levels 3 through 8 would consist of studios, one-, two, and three-bedroom units, and residential amenities, such as a pool deck and barbecue area on level 3, and a rooftop deck. In total, the North Building would develop 142 units and would be 8 stories or approximately 85 feet in height.

The South Building would include two levels of subterranean parking. The ground floor would consist of the lobby and retail space. Levels 2 through 5 would consist of parking. Levels 6 through 23 would consist of studios, one-, two, and three-bedroom units, with residential amenities, such as a podium deck, pool and spa, game room and gym on level 6 and a rooftop deck with amenity rooms and two terraces. In total, the South Building would develop 203 units and would be 23 stories or 269 feet in height, including the rooftop deck.

During construction, in order to avoid archaeological resources, human remains, and paleontological resources plans containing specific details and logistics for carrying out these measures will be prepared. The plans would cover archaeological resources/human remains and paleontological resources, and would include: the professional qualification standards for archaeological and paleontological staff (following the Secretary of the Interior and Society for Vertebrate Paleontology, as applicable); communication protocols; a description and maps noting the locations/depths of where monitoring is required based on sensitivity and construction plans; training for construction personnel; the process for modifying monitoring frequency (reducing or discontinuing); protocols to follow in the event of a discovery, including work stoppage and notification procedures; an outline for significance evaluations of discovered resources; protocols for sampling, recovery, treatment, and analysis of resources; and reporting and curation requirements.

Open Space and Landscaping

As depicted above in Table 2, *Proposed Development,* the proposed project would provide 42,307 sf of open space, including 19,279 sf of residential common outdoor open space, 11,688 sf of residential indoor common open space, and 11,340 sf of residential private open space. The residential common outdoor space would include 5,335 sf of ground floor pedestrian paseo that would replace the existing Roble Way alley and serve as the main pedestrian entry for both buildings. The paseo would join the north and south portions of the site by opening the space to between the two buildings for a more welcoming pedestrian realm. Landscaping and paving in the paseo would enrich the space and provide opportunities for seating, plantings, and activity. This pedestrian space would also invite more daylight between the buildings than the existing, narrower Roble Way right-of-way. As shown in Figure 6, *Roble Way Landscape Plan,* the paseo would be landscaped with trees and shrubs and would include patterned paving, a seating area, and overhead lighting to serve as a visual connection to the commercial district on Pine Avenue.

The project's common outdoor space would also include 13,944 sf of outdoor decks. Specifically, the North Building would include a pool deck, barbecue area, and landscaping and furnishing on level 3 and a roof deck with an outdoor fire pit and seating area. The South Building would include

podium deck on level 6 with a swimming pool and spa, and covered outdoor space with open seating and landscaping. The South Building also includes two top floor amenity rooms which would open out to two terraces. As shown in Figures 7a and 7b, *Concept Site Plan*, the decks would be landscaped with trees, shrubs, and raised planter beds.

The residential indoor common open space would include 11,688 sf of residential amenities. Specifically, the North Building would include a bike kitchen with 30 bike stalls, a mailroom, lobby and leasing area on the ground floor and a 1,120 sf amenity room on level 3. The South Building would include a bike storage room, mailroom, and lobby and leasing area on the ground floor and a 1,885 sf gym with high ceiling and a 1,515 sf game room on level 6.

The residential private open space would include 11,340 sf of balconies and patios, including 57 balconies and 6 patios in the North Building and 45 balconies and 5 patios in the South Building. The project would also include 5,335 sf of public ground-level open space.

As shown in Figure 7a, *Concept Site Plan*, street trees would be planted along the public right of way surrounding the project site. Trees would include the Mexican palm and golden trumpet tree. The courtyards would be planted with the Marina strawberry tree and desert museum palo verde. Other plants include yarrow, dwarf cayote brush, purple needlegrass, and goldenrod.

Access and Parking

Residential and commercial parking would be provided in subterranean and above-grade parking levels in both buildings. Additionally, the North Building would include two levels of subterranean parking, with additional parking on the ground-level and level 2. The North Building's above grade parking would designed to be concealed from the street facades, behind the double-height retail and lobby functions facing the streets and paseo. The South Building would include two levels of subterranean parking and four levels of parking above the ground floor lobby and retail spaces on levels 2 through 5.

As shown in Figure 2a, *Floor Plans for Garage, Ground Level, and Level 2*, vehicular access to the parking levels would be provided via Solana Court alley, which bisects the project site. Solana Court alley would include two entrances: one to the North Building and one to the South Building. A rideshare loading area would be located on the northwest portion of the project site, along West 4th Street. Parking entry security gates would be set back from Solana Court. As noted above, the Solana Court alley right-of-way would be increased with a 2-foot dedication along its western border abutting the project site. The project would further propose a 5-foot setback for the ground floor of both buildings between their parking garage entries and curb cuts to Solana Court at West 3rd and West 4th Streets. This broader width for vehicle access to the parking garages would enhance visibility and ease traffic flow to and from the parking areas. Stepping the building facades back to the 2-foot dedication line beyond the parking entries is intended to slow through traffic in Solana Court. Vehicle queuing space is planned for within the buildings by level landings adjacent to the entry doors and ramp slopes held back at least 20 feet.

The Downtown Plan requires one vehicle parking space per residential unit, one additional guest vehicle parking space for every four residential units, and one vehicle parking space per 1,000 sf of

retail space (after the first 6,000 sf). Thus, the project is required to provide 432 vehicle parking spaces for the project's residential uses (345 for units; 87 for guests) and 15 parking spaces for commercial uses. In total, the project is required to provide 447 vehicle parking spaces.

The proposed project would provide the required 447 vehicle parking spaces, plus an additional 116 spaces. In total, the project would provide 563 vehicle parking spaces, with 242 parking stalls in the North Building and 321 parking stalls in the South Building. The parking spaces would include 353 standard spaces, 169 compact spaces, 22 tandem spaces, 14 handicap spaces, and 5 EV spaces. EV charging stations would also be provided and would account for at least 3 percent of the total parking space count.

As noted above, the project would include also include a total of 128 bicycle parking spaces, with 68 spaces in the North Building (60 residential and 8 commercial), and 60 spaces in the South Building (50 residential and 10 commercial).



D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 5a
North and South Building - Split View

ESA



NORTH BUILDING SECTION





SOUTH TOWER BELOW GRADE LEVELS SHOWN TO LEFT

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 5b
North and South Building - Split View

ROBLE WAY LANDSCAPE - PAVING

MATERIAL SCHEDULE

M-1 CIP CONCRETE

M-2 PRE-CAST CONCRETE /UNIT PAVER

ROBLE WAY LANDSCAPE - SEATING

SITE FURNISHING

18" HEIGHT TIMBER SEATING RAISED PLANTER

ROBLE WAY LANDSCAPE - LIGHTING

LIGHTING FEATURES

16' POST MOUNTED CATENARY LIGHTING

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 6
Roble Way Landscape

ESA

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 7a
Conceptual Site Plan
Level 3, Level 6 and Level 8

ESA





D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: Ankrom Moisan Architects/Ensemble Investments, 2019

3rd and Pacific

Figure 7b
Conceptual Site Plan
Level 21, Level 22 and Level 23

ESA

Comparison of Approved and Proposed Project

For the purposes of this Addendum, the Approved Project is used as a baseline for the analysis. As described above, full implementation of the Downtown Plan would increase the density and intensity of existing Downtown land uses by allowing up to (1) approximately 5,000 new residential units; (2) 1.5 million sf of new office, civic, cultural, and similar uses; (3) 384,000 sf of new retail; (4) 96,000 sf of restaurants; and (5) 800 new hotel rooms, over a 25-year time period.

The Downtown Plan development standards include height incentive areas. The Downtown Plan's Figure 3-2, *Height Areas and Minimum Streetwall*, shows project site is within the Height Incentive Area, which allows for a maximum permitted height of 240 feet and FAR of 8.0. In addition, the Height Incentive Area would allow increases in maximum height and FAR up to a maximum height of 500 feet and a FAR of 11.0, if a project met certain criteria, as outlined in Table 3-4, *Development Incentives*, of the Downtown Plan. The purpose of bonuses is to incentivize the provision of certain project attributes such as sustainable features, provision of additional open space, and rehabilitation of certain existing buildings. Table 3-4 describes the specific incentives available for this area the Height Inventive Area, such as having a LEED Certification or equivalent process; implementing green or eco roofs which reduce stormwater runoff, lower energy, and provide open space; meeting or exceeding 25 percent of the project's energy needs with renewable energy; providing public open space in excess of the required standards; and/or rehabilitating historic buildings.

The proposed project would provide a total of 345 new residential units, which is within land use density evaluated in the Approved Project. The North Building would develop 142 units and would be 8 stories or approximately 85 feet in height. The South Building would develop 203 units and would be 23 stories or 269 feet in height. Given the proposed elevation of the South Building (269 feet), the proposed project would need an allowance for an increase in maximum permitted height. As shown on Table 3, *FAR and Site Area*, the project's base FAR is 8:1. The site FAR extents include north and south half block parcels, vacated Roble Way alley, 2 feet dedication at Solana Court, and a reverse dedication at Pacific Avenue (western boundary of south parcel). The project's total FAR would be 9.48. To exceed the base FAR (and building height), the project would secure incentives for green roofs, LEED Silver certification, and have 10 percent of the project site be dedicated as public open space.

The Downtown Plan zoning include standards for ground-floor pedestrian oriented uses such as "Main" or "Secondary" designated streets. The purpose of such streets is to further encourage active land uses in certain areas such as restaurants, retail stores, entertainment, dining, services, etc. to provide a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented experience throughout much of the day. On Main or Secondary-designated streets, 100 percent of the ground-floor street fronts should contain active uses. The Downtown Plan's Zoning Standards Map Downtown Neighborhood Overlay and Areas of Required Pedestrian-Oriented Uses (Figure 3-1 of the Downtown Plan) identify the block surrounding the project site as future "Pedestrian-Oriented Use: Secondary Streets".

The Downtown Plan's Figure 2-2, *Connectivity Network Map*, shows the project site as being very close to the Metro Blue Line, Long Beach Transit and Metro bus stops, including a stop at the Metro Blue Line Pacific Avenue Station located approximately 0.4 miles northwest of the project site; Long

Beach Transit Passport Bus Routes and existing bike routes along West 3rd Street; and, key mobility streets along Pine Avenue approximately 0.4 miles east of the project site.

As a part of this Addendum, an analysis of each environmental issue analyzed as a part of the Approved Project will be provided and will focus on the potential changes in environmental impacts due to the proposed project. Specifically, the analysis of each environmental issue provided below will first summarize the findings of the Approved Project and then analyze the potential physical effects of the proposed project. The impacts attributable to the proposed project are then compared to the analysis and findings within the Approved Project to determine if such impacts are within the envelope of impacts documented in the Approved Project. Mitigation measures identified for the Approved Project (identified in Table 1) would apply to the proposed project, as would the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Programs for that PEIR.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is located in the Business and Entertainment Area, as identified in the Downtown Plan of Downtown Long Beach. Surrounding uses to the north include multi-family residential buildings, mixed-uses, with ground floor retail and residential units above. Retail and commercial uses including a fast-food restaurant across West 4th Street, cleaners, and the Metro Blue Line Pacific Avenue Station. Land uses to the west include residential buildings and commercial uses, such as a bakery and a hotel. Land uses to the south are also comprised of multi-family residential buildings and commercial uses, such as a restaurant, a bank, and retail stores. Immediately east of the project site, is a gym and retail stores, as well as residential and office uses.

10. Required Approvals

The following approvals are required as a part of this project:

1. Site Plan Review
2. Tentative Map
3. Street and Alley Vacations including General Plan Conformity Findings
4. Subsurface and Airspace Vacations
5. Alley Dedications

The City of Long Beach is the lead agency and the approvals of other public agencies are not required. The City of Long Beach has coordinated with Metro about potential impacts on the adjacent Blue Line Light Rail alignment, but Metro has no approval authority over the mixed-use development.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

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

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial study:

☐ 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.

Signature _____ Date 9-4-19

Environmental Checklist

This section addresses each of the environmental issues discussed in the Certified PEIR and subsequent CEQA documents to determine if the currently proposed project has the potential to create new significant impacts or a result in a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact as compared to what was identified in the Certified PEIR and subsequent CEQA documents. Additionally, impacts are compared to existing on-the-ground conditions. As described above, the approved Downtown Plan and Certified PEIR are also referred to as the "Approved Project." Topics that were scoped out in the Certified PEIR's Initial Study, hereby referred to simply as Certified PEIR, are included in this analysis.[3]

I. Aesthetics

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project"*
1.	**AESTHETICS — Would the project:**		
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☒
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☒
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☒
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☒
e)	Result in shadow impacts?	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Scenic Vista

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in less-than-significant impact to scenic vista.

The proposed project would be within the defined plan area and development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to scenic vista that was not previously considered.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

[3] In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15164(a), this Addendum tiers off of the analysis and conclusions found in the Certified PEIR. Thus, this Addendum relies on the thresholds published at the time of the Certified PEIR's adoption in January 2012.

b) Scenic Resources

The Certified PEIR determined that 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. Thus, the Certified PEIR concluded that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to scenic resources.

The proposed project would be within the defined plan area and development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to scenic resources that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, there would be no impact to scenic resources.

c) Visual Character

As described in the Certified PEIR, the visual character of the Downtown Plan area would be altered through the introduction of additional high-rise structures and full-block complexes at locations within the Downtown Plan area. However, with implementation of the Downtown Plan's Design Guidelines and the City's Design Review process, future development would be compatible with existing development patterns and enhance the visual environment. Thus, the Certified PEIR determined that impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would introduce one mid-rise building (8 stories in height) and one high-rise building (23 stories in height), which would alter the visual character of the Downtown area by adding high rise structures on a previously paved ground level parking lot. The development of a 23-story tower, in particular, has the potential to alter the visual character of the Downtown skyline, which can be seen from many directions including the highlands of Central Long Beach and Signal Hill and the South Waterfront and Port. However, the proposed project would be constructed in two phases to allow for more detailed development and to ensure that building design choices, such as texture, are complimentary to the surrounding area's character. Furthermore, the proposed design of the project is intended to create a dynamically shaped modern building with unique massing profiles from each direction. The project vicinity is developed with mixed-use commercial and residential uses with historical-period built-environment resources interspersed with more-recent construction. Thus, the introduction of another modern structure would not be out of character with the existing uses. Therefore, the project's effect on the visual character of the Downtown area would be in conformance with the guidelines provided within the Downtown Plan.

Additionally, as stated in the Certified PEIR, the proposed project would be required to be in compliance with the Downtown Plan's Design Guidelines and implement the City's Design Review process; thus, would contribute to its overall goals of promoting the development of a distinctive Downtown skyline, while enhancing the visual environment of Downtown. The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project

would not result in an impact to visual character that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Light and Glare

As described in the Certified PEIR, future development within the Downtown Plan area would introduce new sources of light and glare due to the increased height and scale of future development. Projects would also increase the proportion of glazing on building façades and potential use of reflective materials. Potential sources of lighting include the windows of the residential units and ground-floor commercial/institutional space, and spillover of light onto the street from the illumination of the high-rise structures and podium development during the nighttime hours. Glare sources also include the sun's reflection from metallic or glass surfaces on vehicles parked in surface parking lots and along the roadways. The introduction of such materials would be a potentially significant impact. However, this impact would be reduced through the implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures AES-2(a), Lighting Plans and Specifications; AES-2(b), Building Material Specifications; AES-2(c), Light Fixture Shielding; and AES-2(d), Window Tinting, identified in Table 1.

The proposed project would develop one mid-rise building (8 stories in height) and one high-rise building (23 stories in height), which would introduce new sources of light and glare due to the increased development on the project site. The proposed project would feature predominately energy saving LED lighting and minimum foot candles would be provided for safety throughout the project site. The pedestrian paseo would include overhead lighting and interior decks would include architectural lighting designed by an architectural lighting designer. Exterior lighting would emphasize the pedestrian paseo entrance and the retail storefronts. In addition, there would be vertical accent lighting on key architectural features such as the South Building's metal clad "crown". Lighting for individual retails spaces would contribute to the larger design and would not detract from the architectural integrity of the project. Additionally, expanses of ground floor glazing would allow light into spaces, offering views into and from ground floor areas. As noted in the Certified PEIR, increased light and glare is, in part, a desired outcome in creating a vibrant urban environment, a key objective of the Downtown Plan. While the proposed project would increase light and glare in the Downtown Plan area, it would not allow for development at a greater density or intensity than previously considered in the Certified PEIR. Furthermore, as described above, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AES-2(a) through AES-2(d) from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1. Mitigation Measures AES-2(a) through AES-2(d) require the implementation of various building material specifications, window tinting specifications, and light fixture shielding components to mitigate impacts related to lighting and glare as a result of project development and, thus, any potential impacts from light and glare would be reduced.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than

significant with implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures AES-2(a) through AES-2(d).

e) Shading

As described in the Certified PEIR, development projects that include high-rise structures, as encouraged by the Downtown Plan, would cast shadows onto adjacent properties, particularly in the wintertime when shadows extend the farthest from a tall structure and are the most extreme. For a project to generate a significant shadow impact, it must increase shadows cast upon shadow-sensitive uses. Shadow-sensitive uses are defined as facilities and operations sensitive to the effects of shading include solar collectors; nurseries; primarily outdoor-oriented commercial uses (e.g., certain restaurants); or routinely useable outdoor spaces associated with recreational, institutional (e.g., schools), or residential land uses. These uses are considered sensitive because sunlight is important to their function, physical comfort, and/or commerce. Shadow impacts are considered significant if shadow-sensitive uses would be shaded by proposed structures for more than three hours between late October and early April (including the Winter Solstice, which typically occurs on December 21, and the Spring Equinox, which typically occurs on March 20), or for more than four hours between early April and late October (including the Summer Solstice expected to occur on June 21, and the Fall Equinox expected to occur on September 23). Since shadows caused by the development of high-rise structures have the potential to fall on sensitive uses within the Downtown Plan area for more than three hours during the winter months, shadow impacts in the Certified PEIR were determined to be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, the Certified PEIR requires implementation of Mitigation Measure AES-3, Shadow Impacts, identified in Table 1, above, which requires a shading study to be completed to disclose potential impacts.

The proposed project would develop one mid-rise building (8 stories in height) and one high-rise building (23 stories in height). The 23-story high-rise building would reach 269 feet in height with the mechanical equipment area on the roof and architectural metal clad "crown". Due to the development of new high-rise structures, the proposed project would modify shading patterns surrounding the project site and has the potential to create shading impacts. In accordance with Mitigation Measure AES-3, Shadow Impacts, a shading study was completed for the proposed project, included in Appendix A, and results are illustrated in Figures 8 through 11, below. Areas of shadow are based upon the duration each colored area remains shaded by the proposed project. The sensitive receptors that surround the project site include outdoor dining uses located approximately 170 feet north of the project site.

Figure 8, *Winter Solstice*, depicts off-site shadow impacts for sensitive receptors traveling gradually from west to east during the winter solstice between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. As shown in Figure 8, the proposed project would not cast shadows on any sensitive receptors for more than three hours during the Winter Solstice. The shadow created by the project site during the Winter Solstice would primarily shade West 4th Street and Pacific Avenue, which are not considered sensitive receptors.

Figure 9, *Spring Equinox*, depicts off-site shadow impacts for sensitive receptors traveling gradually from west to east during the spring equinox between the hours of 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. As shown in Figure 8, the proposed project would not cast shadows on any sensitive receptors for more

than three hours during the Spring Equinox. The shadow created by the project site during the Spring Equinox would primarily shade Solano Court and West 4th Street, which are not considered sensitive receptors.

Figure 10, *Summer Solstice*, depicts off-site shadow impacts for sensitive receptors traveling gradually from west to east during the summer solstice between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. As shown in Figure 9, the proposed project would not cast shadows on any sensitive receptors for more than three hours during the Summer Solstice. The shadow cast by the project site during the Summer Solstice would primarily shade Solano Court, which is not considered a sensitive receptor.

Figure 11, *Fall Equinox*, depicts off-site shadow impacts for sensitive receptors traveling gradually from west to east during the fall equinox between the hours of 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. As shown in Figure 10, the proposed project would not cast shadows on any sensitive receptors for more than three hours during the Fall Equinox. The shadow cast by the project site during the Fall Equinox would primarily shade Solano Court and West 4th Street, which are not considered sensitive receptors.

As shown in Figures 8 through 11, the proposed project would create new shadows in the project area; however, shadows cast by this project will not significantly increase the shaded area or shade duration of sensitive uses as there are no shadow-sensitive uses in the impacted areas. Thus, the proposed project would have a less than significant aesthetic impact on shadow-sensitive resources surrounding the project site.

Although not an offsite sensitive use, Figures 8 through 11 also present the shadow impact the project's onsite solar panels in the North Building. As shown in Figure 8, the proposed solar panels on the roof of the North Building would be shaded for up to six hours during the winter solstice. The solar panels would not be impacted by shade during the spring equinox, summer solstice, or fall equinox. Because onsite impacts are not evaluated as part of this Addendum, no impact determination is required for onsite shadow impacts.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than the Certified PEIR's significant and unavoidable impact; thus, impacts would be less than significant implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure AES-3.

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: 8th Wave

3rd and Pacific

Figure 8
Spring Equinox

ESA



D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: 8th Wave

3rd and Pacific

Figure 9
Summer Solstice

ESA

D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: 8th Wave

3rd and Pacific

Figure 10
Fall Equinox

ESA



D150712.15 - 3rd and Pacific\05 Graphics-GIS-Modeling\Illustrator

SOURCE: 8th Wave

3rd and Pacific

Figure 11
Winter Solstice

ESA

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST 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 Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. **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?	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☒

Discussion

a–e) Agricultural and Forest Resources

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to agricultural and forest resources.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to agricultural and forest resources that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

III. Air Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
3.	**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?	☐	☒
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☒
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☒

Discussion

The Downtown Plan was determined to be consistent with the applicable air quality plan because it would not increase the allowable density in the Downtown Area from densities allowed under the General Plan. The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan is consistent with the growth assumptions contained in the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which is the air quality plan for the region.[4]

The Certified PEIR determined that buildout of the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with regard to construction and operational air quality emissions. As discussed in the Certified PEIR Section 4.2, *Air Quality,* construction pursuant to the Downtown Plan and resulting emissions would exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regional significance thresholds for volatile organic compounds (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_X), respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}), and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). Even with compliance with applicable SCAQMD rules and Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6, which require implementation of the City's Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices as well as a project-level CEQA analysis, emissions would still exceed SCAQMD's applicable significance thresholds. Therefore, the Certified PEIR found impacts from construction pursuant to the Downtown Plan would be significant and unavoidable. The Certified PEIR found that implementation of the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable long-term operational impacts from operational emissions due to increased vehicle trips and associated emissions. However, during operation of the Downtown Plan, traffic generated as the result of full buildout is not predicted to result in the formation of localized CO hotspots at impacted roadway intersections.

4

The Certified PEIR concluded construction- and operations- related significant and unavoidable emissions attributable to development envisioned under the Downtown Plan, along with other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) as a whole, would continue to contribute to long-term increases in emissions that would exacerbate existing and projected non-attainment. The Certified PEIR stated that compliance with applicable SCAQMD rules and Mitigation Measures AQ-1(a) and AQ-1(b), which require implementation of the City's Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices as well as a project-level CEQA analysis, would reduce construction-related emissions of criteria air pollutants and ozone precursors. However, emissions associated with development under the Downtown Plan would still exceed SCAQMD's applicable significance thresholds. Thus, the Certified PEIR found implementation of the Downtown Plan would contribute to a significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impact.

With respect to toxic air contaminants (TACs), the land uses analyzed in the Certified PEIR would not include substantial sources of long-term TAC emissions. However, the Certified PEIR identified potential impacts with regard to TAC exposure resulting from the exposure to dry cleaning operations using perchloroethylene, TACs from the Port of Long Beach (POLB) and stationary sources in the vicinity of the Downtown Plan area, and proposed commercial land uses that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity (e.g., loading docks). Mitigation measures would reduce concentrations of TAC that sensitive receptors would be exposed to for time spent indoors and would disclose to those considering residing in the Downtown Plan area the potential risks involved. However, the mitigation would not reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations for time spent outdoors and the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Odors from construction pursuant to the Downtown Plan were found to be less than significant. Commercial uses such as truck deliveries and development of convenience uses that may include sources of odorous emissions during operation of the Downtown Plan, and the Downtown Plan's proximity to the diesel sources associated with the POLB were found to be potentially significant. Mitigation would reduce impacts from odor to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6, identified in Table 1, above. Mitigation Measures AQ-1(a) and AQ-1(b), require implementation of the City's Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices as well as a project-level CEQA analysis; Mitigation Measures AQ-4(a) and AQ-4(b) require the preparation of plans and notification procedures in-relation to TAC emissions, to ensure minimal impacts during project development and operation; Mitigation Measure AQ-5 requires adequate distance be provided between sensitive receptors and any use of perchloroethylene; and Mitigation Measure AQ-6 lists certain procedures and requirements to reduce any impacts related to odors from project construction or operation.

However, Mitigation Measure AQ-2 has been revised for the project as follows:

AQ-2: Mitigation to reduce mobile source emissions due to implementation of the Plan addresses reducing the number of motor vehicle trips and reducing the emissions of individual vehicles under the control of the project applicant(s). The following

measures shall be implemented by project applicant(s) unless it can be demonstrated to the City that the measures would not be feasible.

a) The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall require the commercial development operator(s) to operate, maintain, and promote a ride-share program for employees of the various businesses.

b) The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall include one or more secure bicycle parking areas within the property and encourage bicycle riding for both employees and customers.

c) The proposed structures shall be designed to meet current Title 24 + 20 percent energy efficiency standards and shall include photovoltaic cells on the rooftops to achieve an additional 25 percent reduction in electricity use on an average sunny day.

d) The City shall ensure that all commercial developments include shower and locker facilities for employees to encourage bicycle, walking, and jogging as options for commuting.

e) The project applicant(s) for all project phases shall require that all equipment operated by the businesses within the facility be electric or use non-diesel engines.

f) All truck loading and unloading docks shall be equipped with one 110/208-volt power outlet for every two-dock door. Diesel trucks shall be prohibited from idling more than 5 minutes and must be required to connect to the 110/208-volt power to run any auxiliary equipment. Signs outlining the idling restrictions shall be provided.

g) If, at the time of construction, SCAQMD, CARB, or EPA has adopted a regulation or new guidance applicable to mobile- and area-source emissions, compliance with the regulation or new guidance may completely or partially replace this mitigation if it is equal to or more effective than the mitigation contained herein, and if the City so permits. Such a determination shall be supported by a project-level analysis that is approved by the City.

Clarification for the 3rd and Pacific Project: This mitigation measure is intended to reduce energy use. The project would be required to meet the Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance, which may be more stringent than the current standards. The Title 24 energy efficiency standards are updated approximately every three years. The 2019 Title 24 energy efficiency standards has been adopted in 2019 and will become effective in 2020 (CEC 2019a). These standards will improve upon the current standards for residential and nonresidential buildings and may result in an equal or more effective reduction in energy and completely or partially replace the mitigation measure. The project shall comply with the energy reduction requirements of this mitigation measure or provide evidence to the satisfaction of the City that the Title 24 energy efficiency standards in effect at the time of building permit issuance result in an equal or more effective reduction in energy.

a) Air Quality Plans

The 2007 Air Quality Management Plan was applicable to the Downtown Plan at the time of the analysis. Since then, the 2012 AQMP and then the 2016 AQMP has been adopted by the SCAQMD and the California Air Resource Board (CARB). United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) approval of the 2016 AQMP is pending, but is a necessary requirement before the 2016 AQMP can be incorporated into the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Until such time as the 2016 AQMP is approved by the USEPA, the 2012 AQMP remains the applicable AQMP for federal air quality planning purposes. However, for the purpose of CEQA, this Addendum considers the 2016 AQMP, because it has been fully approved in California. Projects that are consistent with the regional population, housing, and employment forecasts identified by Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are considered to be consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the forecast assumptions by SCAG forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP. Additionally, because SCAG's regional growth forecasts are based upon, among other things, land uses designated in general plans, a project that is consistent with the land use designated in a general plan would also be consistent with the SCAG's regional forecast projections, and thus, also with the AQMP growth projections.

The proposed project's construction-related emissions would be temporary in nature, lasting only for the duration of the construction period, and would not have a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet state and federal air quality standards. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations for new or modified sources. For example, the proposed project must comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 for the control of fugitive dust during construction, Rule 1113 for Architectural Coatings, and Rule 445 for Wood-Burning Devices. According to the SCAQMD, the application of water to disturbed areas two times a day has a control efficiency of 55 percent. Moreover, to reduce DPM emissions, the proposed project would utilize a low- emissions construction fleet meeting the current emission standards of CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation (C.C.R. Title 13, Section 2449). All contractors using off-road diesel equipment are subject to the Regulations and are responsible for compliance with the Regulations. In addition, the proposed project would incorporate construction emission control measures as specified in the Certified PEIR. In particular, Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) requires that the project achieve a project-wide fleet-average 20 percent NO_X reduction, 20 percent VOC reduction, and 45 percent particulate reduction compared to the 2011 ARB fleet average, as contained in the URBEMIS output sheets in Appendix C [of the Downtown Plan Certified PEIR]. According to this measure, acceptable options for reducing emissions may include use of late-model engines, low-emission diesel products, alternative fuels, engine retrofit technology, after-treatment products, and/or other options as they become available. Incorporation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) into the project, and by meeting the applicable SCAQMD rules and regulations, project construction activities would be consistent with the goals and objectives of the AQMP to improve air quality in the Basin.

The number of households within the City of Long Beach is anticipated to increase by approximately 18,200 households, or approximately 4 percent between 2012 and 2040. The proposed project's net increase of 345 dwelling units would be well within the SCAG's household growth forecast for the City of Long Beach between 2012 and 2040. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the regional growth projections for the Long Beach City Subregion.

In addition to population growth projections, the SCAG's 2016-2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) includes transportation programs, measures, and strategies generally designed to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which are contained within baseline emissions inventory in the 2016 AQMP. The proposed project is an infill development project, consistent with the smart growth policies of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, which promote an increase in housing density within close proximity to High-Quality Transit Areas (HQTA). An HQTA is defined as a generally walkable transit village or corridor within one half-mile of a well-serviced transit stop or a transit corridor with 15- minute or less service frequency during peak commute hours. The proposed project would concentrate new development within a half of a mile (walking distance) of several Long Beach Transit and Commuter Express lines and the LA Metro Blue Line. Thus, the project site's location provides opportunities for residents and guests to use public transit to reduce vehicle trips. The project site is also located in a Transit Priority Area as defined by Public Resources Code Sections 21099 and 21064.3. Reports by the California Department of Transportation and SCAG have found that focusing development in areas served by transit can result in local, regional and statewide benefits including reduced air pollution and energy consumption. The proposed project's close proximity to other commercial/retail land uses and regional transit would result in fewer trips and a reduction to the proposed project's VMTs as compared to the base trip rates for similar stand-alone land uses that are not located in close proximity to transit. Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis, a 5 percent reduction of peak daily trips is included for non-auto trips. Thus, because the proposed project would be consistent with the growth projections and regional land use planning policies of the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the 2016 AQMP, and proposed project impacts would be less than significant.

As the 2016 RTP/SCS is incorporated into the 2016 AQMP, the project would be consistent with the latest air quality plan. Because the project would be consistent with land use designations and with projected growth under the Downtown Plan, which would not exceed growth projections for the region, and VMT reduction measures, there would be no impact not identified in the Certified PEIR with respect to AQMP consistency and growth projections.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a).

b) Air Quality Standards

The Certified PEIR did not perform quantitative emissions calculations for the construction emissions from individual implementing projects, but conservatively assumed 10 percent of buildout of the Downtown Plan per year. These emissions could exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds even with implementation of mitigation, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. Thus, construction emissions specific to the project were evaluated for this Addendum.

Since the preparation of the Certified PEIR, the methodology used to calculate project-level emissions has been updated with more recent vehicle and equipment fleet mixes, and newer emissions control technology. Construction and operational emissions in the Certified PEIR were analyzed using the URBEMIS model. Currently, the SCAQMD does not recommend using the

URBEMIS model for CEQA analyses and instead recommends the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). The CalEEMod model (Version 2016.3.2) contains updated vehicle fleet data (EMFAC2014) which is based on vehicle registration data from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The CalEEMod model also employs construction equipment data to reflect newer, more efficient equipment and better emissions control technology. In addition, fugitive dust emissions equations have been updated with the most recent United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) AP-42 emission factors.

As shown in Table 3, *Unmitigated Maximum Regional Construction Emissions*, the maximum daily construction emissions of VOC, NO_X, CO, SO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ would be below the SCAQMD regional mass daily thresholds and the construction emissions estimates within the Certified PEIR, and there would be no new significant impact.

TABLE 3
UNMITIGATED MAXIMUM REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Emission Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5
Onsite	46	21	15	0.0	2.4	1.3
Off-Site Worker	1.8	1.2	15	0.0	3.9	1.0
Off-Site Vendor	0.3	8.0	2.3	0.0	0.5	0.2
Off-Site Hauling	1.0	33	7.6	0.1	2.1	0.6
Total Emissions	***49***	***63***	***40***	***0.2***	***9***	***3***
SCAQMD Thresholds	**75**	**100**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Significant Impact?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: Calculations assume compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings. Calculation sheets are provided in Appendix B to this Addendum. Totals may not add up due to rounding.
Source: Ramboll US Corporation, 2019. See Appendix B to this Addendum for detail.

As identified in the Certified PEIR, following buildout of the Downtown Plan, regional operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD significance thresholds even with implementation of mitigation, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact. Operational emissions generated from the project were analyzed and compared to the Certified PEIR.

The analysis of stationary and mobile operational source emissions was performed with the CalEEMod model and compared to pollutant emissions from the Certified PEIR. The Traffic Impact Analysis provided data with regard to weekday trip rates. Saturday and Sunday trip rates were scaled based on the CalEEMod defaults. Area source emissions are based on SCAQMD-recommended values for natural gas consumption, landscaping equipment emissions, and consumer product and architectural coating usage. As shown in Table 4, *Unmitigated Maximum Regional Operational Emissions*, operational emissions from the project would not exceed the SCAQMD's regional mass daily threshold or the operational emissions estimated in the Certified PEIR. Thus, operation of the project would not result in any new significant operational air quality impacts nor would it result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts compared to those identified in the Certified PEIR.

TABLE 4
UNMITIGATED MAXIMUM REGIONAL OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

Emissions Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day					
	ROG	NOx	CO	SOx	PM10	PM2.5
Area	11	5.5	31	0.0	0.6	0.6
Energy	0.1	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.1
Mobile	5.1	24	65	0.2	17	4.7
Total Project Site Emissions:	**16**	**30**	**96**	**0.3**	**18**	**5**
SCAQMD Thresholds	**55**	**55**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Potentially Significant Impact?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Note: Existing condition of the project site is a parking lot. Emissions from the parking lot were not calculated and conservatively not incorporated. Totals may not add up due to rounding.
Source: Ramboll US Corporation, 2019. See Appendix B to this Addendum for detail.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; however, impacts would be less than those identified in the Certified PEIR. Thus, impacts would be less than significant; however, overall PEIR impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

c) Cumulative

The SCAQMD's project-specific and cumulative significance thresholds are the same, and projects that exceed the project-specific significance thresholds are considered to be cumulatively considerable. Projects that do not exceed the project-specific thresholds are not considered to be cumulatively significant (SCAQMD, 2003). The Certified PEIR found that construction- and operations- related emissions attributable to development envisioned under the Downtown Plan would be significant and unavoidable, along with other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the Basin as a whole, the Certified PEIR found implementation of the Downtown Plan would continue to contribute to long-term increases in emissions that would exacerbate existing and projected non-attainment, thus, would contribute to a significant and unavoidable cumulative air quality impact.

As discussed above, construction and operational emissions from the proposed project would not exceed the applicable project-specific thresholds and would be consistent with all air quality plans. Furthermore, SCAQMD's localized significance thresholds would not be exceeded, as described in the next section. Therefore, the proposed project cumulative contribution to air quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis; however, impacts would be less than those identified in the Certified PEIR. Thus, the proposed project's cumulative impacts would be less than significant; however, overall PEIR impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

d) Sensitive Receptors

The proposed project is located within 25 meters of residential uses. Therefore, pursuant to Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b) of the Certified PEIR, a project-level localized significance analysis has been conducted based on the SCAQMD *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology* (SCAQMD 2008a). Localized construction emissions presented in Table 5, *Localized Construction Emissions*, take into account the applicable and feasible portions of Mitigation Measures AQ-1(a) and SCAQMD applicable rules and regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 403 for fugitive dust and low VOC coatings. Implementation of these mitigation measures would result in a reduction of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) and equipment exhaust (such as NO_X, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$), such that regional project-related construction emissions would not exceed the SCAQMD significance thresholds during construction. Localized emissions during construction would be below the SCAQMD localized significance thresholds. Therefore, the project would not result in new significant construction air quality impacts and would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts compared to those identified in the Certified PEIR. Detailed air quality worksheets are provided in Appendix B of this Addendum.

TABLE 5
LOCALIZED CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS

Construction [a]	Total On-site Emissions (Pounds per Day)			
	NOx	CO	PM10	PM2.5
Onsite construction	21	15	2.4	1.3
SCAQMD Localized Thresholds	**57**	**585**	**4.0**	**3.0**
Potentially Significant Impact?	***No***	***No***	***No***	***No***

Notes:
[a] *The localized thresholds for all phases are based on a receptor distance of 25 meters in SCAQMD's SRA 4 for a project site of 1 acre.*
Source: Ramboll US Corporation, 2019. See Appendix B to this Addendum for detail.

With respect to localized CO hotspots, for the project, the peak daily trips affected by the project would be consistent with those anticipated in the Certified PEIR. Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis, a 5 percent reduction is included for non-auto trips. The peak daily trips with non-auto trip adjustment for the project would be 2,570 trips. This is less than the total added vehicle trips (Downtown Plan + cumulative projects) analyzed in the Certified PEIR of 130,433 daily trips, 7,757 AM peak hour trips, and 9,034 PM peak hour trips. As CO concentrations at intersections are directly influenced by peak hour traffic flow, the project would result in lower CO concentrations compared to those anticipated for the project site in the Certified PEIR. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and is consistent with the findings in the Certified PEIR. The project would not result in any new significant operational air quality impacts nor result in a substantial increase in the severity of CO impacts compared to those identified in the Certified PEIR.

With respect to TACs, the land uses analyzed in the Certified PEIR would not include substantial sources of long-term TAC emissions. The Certified PEIR found that implementation of the

Downtown Plan would have less than significant impacts from short-term construction, long-term onsite stationary sources and offsite mobile-sources. However, the Certified PEIR identified potential impacts with regard to TAC exposure resulting from the exposure to dry cleaning operations using perchloroethylene, TACs from the Port of Long Beach (POLB) and offsite stationary sources in the vicinity of the Downtown Plan area, and onsite mobile sources associated with proposed commercial land uses that have the potential to emit TACs or host TAC-generating activity (e.g., loading docks). Mitigation measures would reduce concentrations of TAC that sensitive receptors would be exposed to for time spent indoors and would disclose to those considering residing in the Downtown Plan area the potential risks involved. However, the mitigation would not reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations for time spent outdoors and the impact would be considered significant and unavoidable.

The commercial land uses associated with the project consist of commercial retail uses, and would not include dry cleaning facilities that use perchloroethylene and would not accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, or 40 trucks equipped with Transport Refrigeration Units (TRUs). Furthermore, construction of the project would be required to minimize air pollutant emissions via implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a), which includes enhanced exhaust control practices on off-road vehicle and off-road construction equipment. Thus, the project is not expected to expose sensitive receptors to TAC emissions that exceed an incremental increase of 10 in 1 million for the cancer risk and/or a noncarcinogenic Hazard Index of 1.0. Therefore, as described in Mitigation Measure AQ-4(a) of the Certified PEIR, a site-specific project-level HRA is not required.

While minor incidental TAC emissions from sources, such as solvents, and maintenance materials, could result from the project, these TAC emissions sources would not result in substantial exposures to on- or off-site sensitive receptors that would result in an exceedance of health risk standards. The project would therefore not result in new significant impacts and would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts compared to those identified in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis; however, impacts would be less than those identified in the Certified PEIR. Thus, the proposed project's impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

e) Odors

The project would not introduce any new sources of odors not previously considered and analyzed in the Certified PEIR. Furthermore, the proposed land uses are not typical odor-generating uses (e.g., landfill, sewage treatment, etc.). Therefore, the project would not result in any new significant odor impacts nor would it result in a substantial increase in the severity of impacts compared to those identified in the Certified PEIR. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure AQ-6 from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1, above. Mitigation Measure AQ-6 lists certain procedures and requirements to reduce any impacts related to odors from project construction or operation; thus, any potential odors generated by the project would be minimized.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

IV. Biological Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
4.	**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 U.S. 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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a–f) Biological Resources

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan is located within an urbanized area with no sensitive habitat or animal species present. In addition, the Certified PEIR stated that the Downtown Plan would not propose to alter existing parks or open space where native or migratory bird species could be present. Therefore, the Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to biological resources.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to biological resources that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, no impacts would occur as a result of the project.

V. Cultural Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
5.	**CULTURAL RESOURCES — Would the project:**		
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☒
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☒
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Historic Resources

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, adoption of the Downtown Plan may result in redevelopment of properties considered to be eligible for listing on the National Register or the California Register, or that is determined eligible for listing as a City Landmark. The Historic Survey Report—prepared for the Certified PEIR—identified 58 properties presently listed as local landmarks within the Downtown Plan area. Compliance with Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) through CR-1(b), identified in Table 1, which encourage the identification and preservation of cultural and historic resources in the Downtown Plan area, would provide an opportunity to avoid or reduce impacts to historic properties. However, it is not feasible to fully implement the Downtown Plan without impacting historic resources. Therefore, the Certified PEIR found that impacts to historic resources would be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings – an 8-story building at the north end of the property and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site – and a parking structure that includes subterranean levels. While there are no historic resources on the project site, the project vicinity is developed with mixed use commercial and residential uses with historical-period built-environment resources interspersed with more-recent construction. There are two historical resources in the immediate vicinity of the project: (1) the Dolly Varden Hotel rooftop sign, which sits atop a three-story building directly across Pacific Avenue to the west; and (2) the 4–6-story Walkers Department Store building across West 4th Street, to the northeast. These two properties would have a direct and unimpeded view of the proposed project, a 23-story high rise building. Given that the project would not result in the physical demolition, destruction, or relocation of a historical resource and would not alter the two historical resources in the immediate vicinity such that they would be materially impaired, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than the Certified PEIR's significant and unavoidable impact; thus, impacts would be less than significant with implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) and CR-1(b).

b–d) Archeological Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Remains

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, due to the lack of natural ground surfaces in the project area, no surveys would be conducted prior to onset of demolition or other ground-disturbing activities. Nearly all properties (with the exception of parks and natural resource preserves) have been previously disturbed by grading and other prior development activities. Therefore, near-surface archeological or paleontological resources, or human remains, on previously developed properties that may have existed are likely to have been disturbed or removed. Despite this, the potential still exists for development activities to encounter and damage archaeological or paleontological resources, or encounter human remains and, thus, impacts would be potentially significant. However, impacts would be mitigated by complying with Mitigation Measures CR-2(a) through CR-2(c), as well as Mitigation Measure CR-3(a) and Mitigation Measure CR-3(b), of the Certified PEIR, and identified in Table 1. Mitigation Measures CR-2(a) through CR-2(c), as well as Mitigation Measure CR-3(a) and Mitigation Measure CR-3(b), of the Certified PEIR require the project proponent to hire a qualified archaeologist, paleontologist, and Native American representative to monitor the project site during construction and address preservation of any identified resources that may be encountered during project implementation.

The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings – an 8-story building at the north end of the property and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site – and a parking structure that includes subterranean levels. The development would be constructed in accordance with the standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR. Given the subterranean parking that would be provided as a part of the project, excavation would occur up to a depth of approximately 38 feet. A Cultural and Paleontological Resource Evaluation and Impact Assessment was prepared for the proposed project (Appendix C) and determined that although the project site has been previously developed with parking lots and commercial buildings, the proposed project would require excavation to depths where undisturbed soils may be encountered. This creates the potential for a significant impact to archaeological or paleontological resources, or human remains. However, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures CR-2(a) through CR-3(b) from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1, which would require archaeological monitoring during ground-disturbing activities; preparation of treatment plans, notices, and reports for unearthed resources; and coordination with agencies such as California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places, the County Coroner, and the Native American Heritage Commission. Thus, any potential impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources, or human remains, would be mitigated.[5] As described in the Project Description, the City of Long Beach would require the Applicant to prepare plans containing specific details and logistics for carrying out these measures as a condition of

[5] Although tribal consultation is not required for this Addendum, the Lead Agency sent out AB 52 letters to local tribes and no tribe has requested consultation. However, cultural tribal monitoring with the local culturally affiliated tribe will still be required during construction as a condition of approval.

approval. The plans would cover archaeological resources/human remains and paleontological resources, and would include: the professional qualification standards for archaeological and paleontological staff (following the Secretary of the Interior and Society for Vertebrate Paleontology, as applicable); communication protocols; a description and maps noting the locations/depths of where monitoring is required based on sensitivity and construction plans; training for construction personnel; the process for modifying monitoring frequency (reducing or discontinuing); protocols to follow in the event of a discovery, including work stoppage and notification procedures; an outline for significance evaluations of discovered resources; protocols for sampling, recovery, treatment, and analysis of resources; and reporting and curation requirements.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

VI. Geology and Soils

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
6. 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:		
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.)	☐	☒
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒
iv) Landslides?	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☒

Discussion

a.i–iii) Seismically Induced Ground Shaking

As described in the Certified PEIR, seismically induced ground shaking could damage existing and proposed structures in the Downtown Plan area and could expose people or structures to potential substantial risk of loss, injury, or death. 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 Downtown Plan Project area. Several other fault zones located within approximately 5 to 30 miles have the potential to impact the project area. The Plan area is located at an elevation of approximately 30 feet above mean sea level with essentially flat topography. Groundwater associated with sea level has recently been encountered at between 29 and 35 feet below ground level (City of Long Beach, 2010). These conditions create the potential for substantial adverse effects associated with seismic activity. However, this impact would be reduced through the implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Geo-1, identified in Table 1.

The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings— an 8-story building at the north end of the property and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site. The project would excavate to a depth of approximately 38 feet to accommodate the subterranean parking component of the proposed project, including foundation depths, according

to standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR. An *Updated Geotechnical Investigation* was prepared for the proposed project by Geocon West, Inc. (2017) (Appendix D). The geotechnical report noted that the project site is located in the seismically active Southern California region, and could be subjected to moderate to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on one of the many active Southern California faults. This hazard is common in Southern California and the effects of ground shaking can be mitigated if the proposed structures are designed and constructed in conformance with current building codes and engineering practices. The faults nearest the project site are associated with the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone located approximately 2.3 miles northeast from the project site. The project site is not within a state-designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards and no active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture due to faulting occurring beneath the site during the design life of the proposed development is considered low. The proposed project would be build according to standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure Geo-1 from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1, which requires new construction to be engineered to withstand the expected ground acceleration that may occur at the project site, taking into consideration the soil type, potential for liquefaction, and the most current and applicable seismic attenuation methods that are available. The proposed project would also comply with applicable provisions of the most recent International Building Code (International Code Council, 2018) adopted by the City of Long Beach. Thus, with implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Geo-1, any potential impacts associated with seismically induced ground shaking would be reduced and impacts would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

a.iv) Landslides

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. The proposed project would adhere to standard engineering practices specified in the Certified PEIR and would not alter the extent of developed lands. Additionally, the *Updated Geotechnical Investigation* was prepared for the proposed project by Geocon West, Inc. (2017) (Appendix D) concluded that the project site is not located within an area identified as having a potential for slope instability and the potential for slope stability hazards at the site are considered low. Thus, the proposed project would not result in impacts associated with landslides that were not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

b) Soil Erosion

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in less-than-significant impact associated with soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. The proposed project would adhere to standard engineering practices specified in the Certified PEIR and would not alter the extent of developed lands. Thus, the proposed project would not result in impacts associated with landslides that were not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Liquefaction

As described in the Certified PEIR, seismic activity could induce ground shaking that could cause structural failure and potential subsidence risk of loss, injury, or death. The Seismic Safety Element maps a portion of the Downtown Plan area, immediately adjacent to the Los Angeles River, as an area of highest potential impact. However, even within the central Downtown area, groundwater may occur at depths of 20 feet and subterranean structures, such as parking garages and basements, could extend to depths at which groundwater is encountered. This creates the potential for a significant impact associated with liquefaction at the project site. However, the Certified PEIR found this impact would be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure Geo-2, identified in Table 1, which required the preparation of a comprehensive geotechnical investigation for the project site, as provided in Appendix D.

The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings— an 8-story building at the north end of the property and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site. The project would excavate to a depth of approximately 38 feet to accommodate the subterranean parking component of the proposed project, including foundation depths, according to standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR. In accordance with Mitigation Measure Geo-2, an *Updated Geotechnical Investigation* was prepared for the proposed project (Appendix D). The geotechnical investigation concluded that the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone Map for the Long Beach Quadrangle (CDMG, 1999) does not locate the project site in an area designated as having a potential for liquefaction. Additionally, according to the County of Los Angeles Safety Element (Leighton, 1990), and the City of Long Beach General Plan (2004), the project site is not located within an area identified as having a potential for liquefaction. The soils encountered at the project site during exploration consist of Pleistocene age old paralic deposits which are generally stiff to hard or dense. Based on the dense and well consolidated nature of the old paralic deposits, the geotechnical report concluded that the potential for liquefaction of the site soils is very low and no surface manifestations of liquefaction, including settlement and lateral spread, are expected at the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in impacts associated with liquefaction that were not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Geo-2.

d) Expansive or Unstable Soils

As described in the Certified PEIR, the potential exists within the Downtown Plan area to encounter expansive soils or soils that are unstable or would become unstable as a result of new development. These conditions could result in onsite or offsite lateral spreading or subsidence. Although native soils in the Downtown Plan area typically have low expansion potential, soil characteristics vary widely and clay deposits may occur on the project site. This variation creates the potential for a significant impact associated with expansive or unstable soils in the Downtown Plan area. However, this impact would be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure Geo-3 identified in Table 1.

The proposed project would replace two existing surface parking lots with two buildings— an 8-story building at the north end of the property (North Building) and a 23-story high rise building at the south portion of the site (South Building). The project would excavate to a depth of approximately 38 feet to accommodate the subterranean parking component of the proposed project, including foundation depths, according to standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR. In accordance with Mitigation Measure Geo-3, the potential presence of expansive or unstable soils at the project site was evaluated in the *Updated Geotechnical Investigation* was prepared for the proposed project (Appendix D). The geotechnical report concluded that the upper 5 feet of existing site soils encountered during the investigation are considered to have a "low" expansive potential (EI = 30 and 43); and the soils are classified as "expansive" based on the 2016 California Building Code (CBC) Section 1803.5.3. Furthermore, soils with a "high" expansive potential (EI = 144) were encountered at a depth of 16 feet below the ground surface. However, the proposed subterranean levels are expected to penetrate through these soils into material which is primarily granular in nature and are considered to be "non-expansive". Thus, the geotechnical report concludes that that foundations and slabs will derive support in materials with a "low" expansive potential. Therefore, the impacts from the potential presence of expansive soils would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

e) Wastewater Disposal

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to the risk associated with soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. The proposed project would adhere to standard engineering practices and design criteria specified in the Certified PEIR and would be served by the City's sewage disposal system. Thus, the proposed

project would not result in impacts associated with wastewater disposal that were not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
7.	**GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS — Would the project:**		
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☒

Discussion

As discussed in Certified PEIR Section 4.5, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with regard to construction and operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Certified PEIR calculated GHG emissions resulting from construction and operational activities. These emissions were compared to ARB's statewide target of 6.6 metric tons CO_2e per service population per year ($MTCO_2e$/SP/year) and a SCAQMD 2020 threshold of 4.8 $MTCO_2e$/SP/year. The Certified PEIR concluded the anticipated growth and increased density in the Plan Area that the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable GHG emission impacts. Mitigation Measures GHG-1(a) through GHG-2(b) are applicable to the project and are identified in Table 1. These Mitigation Measures require project-specific mitigation measures that are appropriate and feasible during each phase or increment of Project development, and would respond to changes in the regulatory environment and to new GHG reduction technologies that would continue to be innovated over time.

a) Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts

Since the preparation of the Certified PEIR, methodology used to calculate project-level emissions have been updated with more recent vehicle and equipment fleet mixes, and newer emissions control technology. Construction and operational GHG emissions in the Certified PEIR were analyzed using the URBEMIS model. Currently, the SCAQMD does not recommend using the URBEMIS model for CEQA analyses and is now recommending the CalEEMod model. The CalEEMod model contains updated vehicle fleet data (EMFAC2014) which is based on vehicle registration data from Caltrans. The CalEEMod model also contains updated construction equipment data to reflect newer, more efficient equipment and better emissions control technology.

As identified in the Certified PEIR, GHG emissions from individual implementing projects could exceed thresholds, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact, even after implementation of Mitigation Measures GHG-1(a) through GHG-2(b). Thus, construction and operational GHG

emissions generated from the project were analyzed and compared to the Certified PEIR. The analysis of stationary and mobile operational source emissions was also performed with the CalEEMod model.

The project would result in the emission of GHGs during construction and operation. Emission of GHGs during construction are a small contributor to the overall GHG emissions associated with the Certified PEIR, and the project would result in GHG emissions consistent with other land uses analyzed in the Certified PEIR. Operational GHG emissions from the project would be less than the Certified PEIR as the project would develop a portion of the Downtown Plan Area. Construction GHG emissions for the project are expected to be similar to the emissions presented in the Certified PEIR on an annual basis. As a result, total GHG emissions from the project would be similar to or less than the Certified PEIR.

The SCAQMD *Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold* recognizes that construction-related GHG emissions from projects "occur over a relatively short-term period of time" and that "they contribute a relatively small portion of the overall lifetime project GHG emissions" (SCAQMD 2008b). The guidance recommends that construction project GHG emissions should be "amortized over a 30-year project lifetime, so that GHG reduction measures will address construction GHG emissions as part of the operational GHG reduction strategies" (SCAQMD 2008b). In accordance with SCAQMD guidance, GHG emissions from construction have been amortized over the 30-year lifetime of the project.

As shown in Table 6, *Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, total project emissions of 4,389 CO_2e MTY would be less than the net annual emissions increase of 191,352 CO_2e MTY estimated in the Certified PEIR, and would not exceed the 6.6 metric tons CO_2e per service population per year ($MTCO_2e$/SP/year) significance threshold used in the Certified PEIR. Additionally, the project does not exceed the SCAQMD proposed 4.8 CO_2e MTY per service population for project level threshold for 2020. The service population was estimated using the Downtown Plan EIR for residential density in Long Beach and the U.S. Energy Information Administration work estimate for retail.

Table 6

Estimated Project Generated CO2e Emissions (Metric Tons per Year)

Emissions Source	**Proposed Project ($MTCO_2e$/ year)**
Area	81
Energy	827
Traffic	3,192
Waste	87
Water	143
Construction Emissions [a]	58
Proposed Project Total:	**4,389**

Anticipated Service Population Service Population	**1,013**
CO_2e Efficiency Metric, MTCO2/SP/year	**4.3**
SCAQMD Significance Threshold for 2020, MTCO2/SP/year	**4.8**
Significance Threshold Used in the Certified EIR, MTCO2/SP/year	**6.6**
Exceed Threshold?	**No**

Notes:
[a] *The total construction GHG emissions were amortized over 30 years and added to the operation of the project.*
Source: Ramboll US Corporation, 2019. See Appendix E to this Addendum for detail.

Total project emissions would not exceed the service population significance threshold in the Certified PEIR and 2020 SCAQMD significance threshold. Therefore, the project GHG emissions would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of GHG impacts previously identified in the Certified PEIR for the Downtown Plan. Calculation details are provided in Appendix E of this Addendum. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, GHG-1(a) and GHG-2(b) from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1; thus, any potential GHG emission impacts would be reduced.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than identified in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, GHG-1(a) and GHG-2(b).

b) Applicable Plans, Policies, or Regulations

The project incorporates a number of characteristics that would reduce GHG emissions by increasing energy-efficiency beyond the minimum requirements, reducing indoor and outdoor water demand, and installing energy-efficient appliances and equipment. The project promotes high density residential/commercial development with access to public transit and a pedestrian oriented design with a Paseo that joins the north and south portions of the site and enhances the midblock experience, a promenade path linking east to the retail district of Pine Avenue and an alley extension east of Pine reaching to City Place Parking. These measures are consistent with the City's Sustainable City Action Plan policy and goals.

The project would be developed consistent with the Downtown Plan's land uses and development standards. The project would be located in a planned mixed-use district well served by existing and planned mass transit options. The project is also consistent with the City's 2013 Mobility Plan Element of the General Plan, which seeks to concentrate a mix of uses within walking distance. The project would include a minimum of one accessible EV parking space in each building, design for increasing EV charging, a ride sharing staging area on the site plan, and a bicycle storage and service center. In addition, the project would support the transit-oriented development (TOD) designation of the Downtown Plan area through the placement of residential uses within walking distance to other commercial retail land uses as well as alternative modes of transit. New plans, such as the SCAG's 2016-2040 RTP/SCS, were adopted subsequent to the Certified PEIR, the proposed project would be consistent with these new plans including the new RTP/SCS by placing

residential and commercial uses, including retail and restaurant, in close proximity to the 1st Street Metro Blue Line station and numerous bus lines, which will likely further reduce the VMT related GHG emissions compared to the Certified PEIR. Per the Greenhouse Gas Technical Report, the project would be consistent with AB 32, SB 375, and the 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS (see Appendix E of this Addendum).

The project would employ mandatory and voluntary design features consistent with, at a minimum, the water conservation, energy conservation, waste reduction, and other requirements of the CALGreen Code. The project would also implement an operational recycling and composting program during the life of the project. The project incorporates energy saving measures such as solar water heaters and living roofs and it would target LEED accreditation. The project would be supplied by the Long Beach Water Department, which is increasing its recycled water use. Landscaping on the project site would include native trees, eco/green walls, trees over structured elements, irrigation, and plantings at the building bases. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulation to reduce GHG emissions.

The project's GHG impacts are within the scope of the impacts identified in the Certified PEIR. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of GHG impacts previously identified in the Certified PEIR for the Downtown Plan and would be less than significant. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measures AQ-2, GHG-2(a) and GHG-2(b) from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1; thus, any potential GHG emission impacts would be reduced.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures AQ-2, GHG-2(a) and GHG-2(b)..

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
8.	**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Would the project:**		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☒
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☒
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☒
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☒
e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a-b) Transport, Use, Disposal, or Release of Hazardous Materials

As described in the Certified PEIR, the types of commercial and residential land uses envisioned for the Downtown Plan area would not typically contain businesses involved in the transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials. Therefore, hazardous material impacts to residences, schools, or other properties would not be expected to result from transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials from business anticipated to locate within the Downtown Plan area. However, future development projects would involve the demolition of existing structures, some of which, may contain asbestos and lead-based paint materials. Additionally, the historic activity involving industrial uses and storage of hydrocarbons, heavy metals, and acids on properties within the Downtown Plan area may have contaminated onsite soils and/or groundwater quality. Any disturbances to ground surfaces associated with new development may disturb surface or near-surface contaminants, and excavation and transport of such contaminants could result in exposure of workers to public health hazards. This creates the potential for significant impacts associated with the transport, use, disposal, upset or accidental release of hazardous materials. These impacts

would be reduced with the implementation of Mitigation Measures Haz-1(a) through Haz-1(c) identified in Table 1, which would require that all demolition, renovation, and excavation projects survey and remove any lead or asbestos found in their project sites in accordance with proper abatement procedures in compliance with California, federal OSHA, and SCAQMD requirements. The materials would be hauled to a licensed receiving facility by a certified transportation company and an abatement report submitted to the City, prior to the issuance of construction or demolition permits. Additionally, implementation of Mitigation Measures Haz-3(a) through Haz-3(c), identified in Table 1, would require all projects to prepare and implement a contingency plan, coordinate with local regulatory agencies for review and approval of remedial activities, prepare a report, and conduct soil and groundwater sampling assessments.

The proposed project would be located on a site currently occupied by a surface parking lot and, thus, would not require demolition of structures that may contain lead or asbestos, or other hazardous materials. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix F1, *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment*, of this Addendum) conducted on January 4, 2017, by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., determined that the project site was formerly developed with an automotive station, and two former dry-cleaning establishments. The Phase II Subsurface Investigation Reports (Appendix F2, *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment*, of this Addendum) conducted on April 6, 2017, by Partner Engineering and Science, included soil and soil gas sampling to identify potential contamination from petroleum hydrocarbons and volatile organic compounds (VOC) as a result of former site uses, in accordance with Mitigation Measure Haz-3(b). The results of soil sampling indicated no detectable levels of petroleum hydrocarbons or VOC in any of the samples selected for laboratory analysis. Results from soil gas sampling indicated no detectable concentrations of VOC in soil gas. No further actions were recommended. Given the conclusions from the Phase I and II reports and that no structures would be demolished, the project's impact potential related to hazardous materials resulting from transport, use, or disposal would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-1(a) through Haz-1(c) and Haz-3(a) through Haz-3(c).

c) Hazardous Materials near Schools

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, a total of six schools are located within the Downtown Plan area and three others are within 0.25 mile of downtown. Demolition, renovation, or excavation activities within 0.25 mile of these schools could expose children to release of hazardous materials, particularly which walking to and from school and during time spent outside classrooms.

There are currently no existing or proposed schools within 0.25 mile of the project site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to risks associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials in the vicinity of school facilities.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

d) Hazardous Sites

As described in the Certified PEIR, it is possible that projects in the Downtown Plan area would be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, therefore, would pose a potentially significant impact to risks associated with contaminated sites. However, Mitigation Measures Haz-1(a) through Haz-1(c) and Mitigation Measures Haz-3(a) through Haz-3(c), identified in Table 1, would require that all demolition, renovation, and excavation projects perform surveys to determine whether hazardous materials exist on the project sites and would require that the project to remove the materials in accordance with proper abatement procedures.

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Appendix F1 of this Addendum) and Limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation Reports (Appendix F2 of this Addendum) conducted for the project site do not identify the site as being included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Additionally, a search in the EnviroStor Database shows that there are no cleanup sites within 1,000 feet of the project site (EnviroStor Database, 2019). Thus, impacts relating to Government Code Section 65962.5 are less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Haz-1(a) through Haz-1(c) and Haz-3(a) through Haz-3(c).

e, f) Airport Safety

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to airport safety.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would be approximately 3.5 miles from the nearest airport/airstrip. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to airport safety that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

g) Emergency Preparedness

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to emergency preparedness.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not alter existing street patterns. Furthermore, any proposed development within the Downtown Plan area would be required to pay fees pursuant to the Fire Facilities Impact Fee, as amended, in Chapter 18.23 of the LBMC, as well as the Police Facilities Impact Fee as amended in Chapter 18.22 of the LBMC. These fees would be used to finance the construction of additional emergency facilities or improvements to current facilities to help mitigate any impacts to

emergency access or preparedness. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to emergency preparedness that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

h) Wildlands

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to wildland resources.

The proposed project location does not contain wildlands nor is it adjacent to wildlands. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to wildland resources that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
9.	**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 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☒
e)	Create or contribute runoff water that 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 that 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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a, e, f) Water Quality and Waste Discharge

Construction Activities

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, construction activities associated with future developments could result in discharges of urban pollutants into the City drainage systems. This would include runoff from excavation and grading; fuel, lubricants, and solvents from construction vehicles and machinery; and trash and other debris. These factors would potentially result in a significant adverse impact on water quality. However, construction impacts would be reduced with the implementation of Mitigation Measure Hydro-1, identified in Table 1, which will determine the need for the developer to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and require the implementation of BMPs or equivalent measures to reduce erosion and sedimentation and

control pollutant runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Thus, with implementation of Mitigation Measure Hydro-1 impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

Similar to the proposed Certified PEIR, construction activities within the project site would be required to comply with all local, state, and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality and reduction of runoff, including BMPs and compliance with the County Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Additionally, a Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report was prepared for the proposed project by KPFF Consulting Engineers (Appendix G). The report determined that compliance with low impact development (LID) requirements as well as SUSMP requirements would effectively mitigate any potential impacts related to water quality or waste discharge during construction activities. Thus, development of the proposed project would not result in significant impacts to water quality of waste discharge during construction and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Operational Activities

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, future development in the Downtown Plan area would generate various urban pollutants such as soil, herbicides, and pesticides that could adversely affect surface water and groundwater quality in the project area watershed. These factors would potentially result in a significant impact on water quality. However, operational impacts would be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure Hydro-2, identified in Table 1, which will determine the need for the developer to prepare a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Thus, with implementation of Mitigation Measure Hydro-2 impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation.

The proposed project would incrementally increase the population density in the Downtown Plan area and would create the potential for new impacts caused by contaminated waste runoff. However, as stated in the Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report, the project would improve the project site′s hydrologic function. The project design would likely include the implementation of either a capture and use system or planter boxes that would comply with the City′s LID requirements. Whereas runoff water from the project site currently sheet flows without treatment into the underground storm drain network that ultimately discharges to the Los Angeles River Reach 1, the proposed capture and use system would capture the water runoff for irrigation. The Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report concluded that the surface water hydrology, water quality and groundwater impacts would be less than significant (Appendix G).

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Hydro-2.

b) Groundwater Supply and Recharge

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, future development within the Downtown Plan area would result in an incremental increase in water demand due to the intensification of development in the Plan area. 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 proposed project would be located on a previously developed site currently occupied by a relatively impervious surface parking lot. The proposed project would excavate to a maximum depth of approximately 38 feet to accommodate the subterranean parking garage component of the proposed development, including the foundation. Implementation of landscaping improvements, including native vegetation and shade trees, within the project site would decrease the amount of impervious surfaces from existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would increase the amount of groundwater recharge and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with ground water recharge.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c, d) Drainage Patterns

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, future development within the Downtown Plan area would result in an incremental increase in water usage due to the intensification of development in the Plan area. Although the Downtown Plan area is substantially urbanized, the Downtown Plan would convert areas of relatively low-intensity development into more intensely developed land. This conversion would create a potentially significant impact to existing drainage patterns for projects located within the Plan area. However, operational impacts would be reduced through the implementation of Mitigation Measure Hydro-3, identified in Table 1, which would determine the need for the developer to conduct an analysis of the existing stormwater drainage system and to identify improvements needed to accommodate any projected increased runoff that would result from the proposed project.

The project site is currently developed with two paved surface parking lots. As such, the site is almost entirely impervious to drainage. Adjacent areas are also predominately built-out and there are no nearby or adjacent streams or rivers. However, as stated in the Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report, the project would improve the project site′s hydrologic function. The project design would likely include the implementation of either a capture and use system or planter boxes that would comply with the City′s LID requirements. Whereas runoff water from the project site currently sheet flows without treatment into the underground storm drain network that ultimately discharges to the Los Angeles River Reach 1, the proposed capture and use system would capture the water runoff for irrigation. The Hydrology and Water Quality Technical Report concluded that the surface water hydrology, water quality and groundwater impacts would be less than significant (Appendix G).

Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surfaces of the area resulting in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or in the project vicinity. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to implement Mitigation Measure Hydro-3 from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1; thus, any potential drainage impacts would be reduced.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Hydro-3.

g–j) Flooding, Seiche, Tsunami, and Mudflow

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to risks associated with flooding, or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would be located within the boundaries of the Downtown Plan. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to risks related to flooding, seiche, tsunami, or mudflows that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

X. Land Use and Planning

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
10.	**LAND USE AND LAND USE PLANNING — Would the project:**		
a)	Physically divide an established community?	☐	☒
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☒
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Community

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in less-than-significant impact to community cohesion.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to community division that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Land Use Change

As described in the Certified PEIR, future development within the Downtown Plan area is subject to consistency with the Land Use Element of the Long Beach General Plan, which designates the majority of the Downtown Plan area as LUD No. 7 Mixed Use District and PD-30 zoning region, which allows for a mix of commercial and high density residential uses. The Certified PEIR determined that since the Downtown Plan would adopt updated plans and development regulations, future development subject to the Plan would be consistent with the existing and planned zoning and development district regulations. No other land use plans or regulations exist within the Plan area. Thus, the Downtown Plan would result in a less than significant impact to land use compatibility.

The proposed project would be located within the area designated in the Downtown Plan as LUD No. 7 Mixed Use District and within the PD-30 zoning region, which allows a mix of commercial and high density residential uses, entertainment and visitor–serving commercial uses, and a mix of other moderate to high-density residential uses with ground-floor storefronts, live/work spaces, and arts-related uses. Furthermore, the Downtown Plan's Figure 3-2, *Height Areas and Minimum Streetwall*, shows project site is within the Height Incentive Area, which allows for a maximum permitted height of 240 feet and FAR of 8.0. In addition, the Height Incentive Area would allow

increases in maximum height and FAR up to a maximum height of 500 feet and a FAR of 11.0, if a project met certain criteria, as outlined in Table 3-4, *Development Incentives*, of the Downtown Plan. In conformance with the Downtown Plan, the proposed project would develop a mix of commercial uses, including retail and restaurant, within the height restriction for the area, and, therefore, would be consistent with the Downtown Plan's planned development district regulations and impacts would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Habitat Conservation

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to habitat conservation.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Furthermore, the project site is already developed and there is no existing habitat located on site. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to habitat conservation that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

XI. Mineral Resources

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
11. 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?	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a, b) Mineral Resources

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to mineral resources.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to mineral resources that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

XII. Noise

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
12.	**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?	☐	☒
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☒
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the 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 located in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☒

Discussion

a) General Plans, Noise Ordinances or Applicable Standards

Construction

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan could expose nearby sensitive receptors to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies that would result in potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-2(b) proposed in the Certified PEIR would reduce construction noise levels to less-than-significant impact.

As stated in the Certified PEIR, the City's Noise Element of the General Plan and the City's Municipal Code regulates noise in the project area. The City's Municipal Code, summarized in Certified PEIR, Section 4.9.1, establishes requirements for exterior noise. All project construction activities must be conducted in compliance with the City's Municipal Code, which limits construction activities to between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. on weekdays and federal holidays, 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Saturdays, and no construction on Sunday. Project activity is prohibited unless a special permit is approved by the City's Noise Control Officer. Per the City's Municipal Code, Chapter 8.80.130, it is unlawful for any person to willfully make or continue, or cause to be made or continue, a loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood or which causes any discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area.

As indicated in the Certified PEIR, the highest construction noise levels during typical construction activities would be generated during grading, excavation, and foundation work, with lower noise

levels occurring during building construction. Maximum noise levels of 85 to 90 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 feet could occur during the noisiest phases of construction activity. However, typical hourly average construction-generated noise levels would be approximately 80 dBA L_{eq} measured at a distance of 50 feet from the noise-generating activity. The Certified PEIR stated that pile driving can produce very high noise levels on the order of 95 to 100 dBA at 50 feet, which are difficult to control (FTA, 2006).

According to the Certified PEIR, Section 4.9.2, noise levels from construction activities would attenuate with distance at rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance between the noise source and the sensitive receptors. Noise levels may be attenuated an additional 3.0 to 5.0 dB by a first row of houses/buildings and 1.5 dB for each additional row of houses in built-up environments (FHWA, 1978). These factors generally limit the distance construction noise travels and ensure noise impacts from construction are localized. The Certified PEIR concluded that project construction would result in a potentially significant impact from construction noise: however, implementation of Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) through Noise-1(b), which require specific conditions during construction activities, such as construction of temporary noise barriers and/or the use of equipment mufflers, would reduce the noise impacts to less than significant.

Project construction would require the use of similar types of heavy-duty equipment that were considered in the Certified PEIR (refer to the Certified PEIR, Appendix E, Table 9), therefore, resulting in a potentially significant construction noise impacts as in the Certified PEIR. However, the project would not use impact pile driving methods during construction. As stated in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, it is recommended to avoid using high impact pile drivers and instead use alternative equipment to reduce noise levels. Consistent with this recommendation, project construction would not utilize pile drivers.

Furthermore, a *Noise Impact Study* was prepared for the proposed project by Acoustical Engineering Services (Appendix H). As detailed in Table 11, Construction Noise Levels, of the Noise Study prepared for the proposed project, the estimated construction noise levels would exceed the significance threshold at off-site noise sensitive receptors R1, R2 and R4, without noise control measures. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-1(b) proposed in the Certified PEIR, which would further reduce impacts. Thus, project construction noise would not exceed the construction noise levels already identified and disclosed in the Certified PEIR and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation

The Certified PEIR determined that noise sources typically associated with commercial land uses include mechanical equipment operations, parking lot noise (e.g., opening and closing of vehicle doors, people talking, car alarms), delivery activities (e.g., use of forklifts, hydraulic lifts), trash compactors, and air compressors. As stated in the Certified PEIR, noise from such equipment can reach intermittent levels of approximately 90 dBA, 50 feet from the source. These elevated noise levels, which have the potential to be generated by commercial uses within mixed use land use designations, would expose nearby noise sensitive land uses (e.g., residential units) to excessive noise levels that violate the City Noise Ordinance.

Project operations would generate noise from project-related increase in roadway traffic and from mechanical equipment operations, parking lot noise (e.g., opening and closing of vehicle doors, people talking, car alarms), delivery activities (e.g., use of forklifts, hydraulic lifts), trash compactors, and air compressors. As shown in Tables 15 through 18 of the Noise Study prepared for the proposed project, operational noise resulting from mechanical equipment, common outdoor spaces, parking facilities, and loading dock/trash compactor services would not exceed the project significance threshold (Appendix H). Therefore, this impact was identified to be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in similar impacts as those identified in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-1(b).

b) Groundborne Vibration

Construction

The Certified PEIR determined that project construction would require the use of heavy-duty construction equipment including pile drivers (refer to the Certified PEIR, Appendix E, Table 9), which would generate vibration levels exceeding thresholds. The Certified PEIR determined that construction vibration during implementation of the Downtown Plan would result in a potentially significant impact from ground-borne vibration of heavy construction equipment. However, the Certified PEIR concluded that the use of administrative controls (such as scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby properties) would reduce perceptible vibration to a minimum. Despite these administrative controls, the Certified PEIR determined that the use of pile-driving and other substantial vibration impact equipment (e.g., jackhammers) during construction would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.

Project construction would require the use of similar typical heavy-duty equipment construction equipment, as required in the Certified EIR (refer to the Certified PEIR, Appendix E, Table 9). However, the project would not use impact pile driving methods during construction. Pile drilling or displacement does not require impact equipment and generates lower vibration levels than pile driving. According to the FTA *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, vibration levels generated from construction dissipate rapidly with distance, as shown in **Table 7**, *Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment*.

TABLE 7
VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

Equipment	Approximate Peak Particle Velocity (PPV) (inches/second)				
	25 Feet	50 Feet	60 Feet	75 Feet	100 Feet
Pile Driver (Impact-typical)	0.644	0.228	0.173	0.124	0.081
Caisson Drilling	0.089	0.031	0.024	0.017	0.011
Large Bulldozer	0.089	0.031	0.024	0.017	0.011
Loaded Trucks	0.076	0.027	0.020	0.015	0.010
Jackhammer	0.035	0.012	0.009	0.007	0.004
Small Bulldozer	0.003	0.001	0.0008	0.0006	0.0004

SOURCE: FTA, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006.

As shown in Table 7, vibration levels from pile drivers are substantially higher than caisson drilling or other types of construction equipment. Pile drilling or displacement, shown as caisson drilling in Table 7, generates vibration levels that are similar to large bulldozer equipment and only slightly greater than vibrations caused by loaded trucks.

The structures adjacent to or near the project site's boundary are classified as either FTA Building Category I (reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber [no plaster]), or FTA Building Category III (non-engineered timber and masonry buildings). According to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) *Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual*, the threshold for potential structural damage to Category I structures is 0.5 inches per second peak particle velocity (in/sec PPV) for continuous/frequent intermittent vibration sources. The threshold for potential structural damage to Category III structures is 0.2 in/sec PPV for continuous/frequent intermittent vibration sources. The threshold for distinct perceptibility with respect to human annoyance is 0.04 in/sec PPV for continuous/frequent intermittent sources, such as construction.

The nearest vibration-sensitive land uses (i.e., structures) and their distances to the project site would be the multi-story building on the north side of 4th Street located approximately 66 feet to the north, the multi-story building on the south side of 3rd Street located approximately 62 feet to the south, the multi-story commercial buildings on the east side of Solano Court located approximately 16 feet to the east, and the single- and multi-story buildings on the west side of Pacific Avenue located approximately 88 feet to the west.

Table 8, *Estimated Vibration Velocity Levels at the Nearest Off-Site Structures from the Project Construction Equipment*, provides the estimated vibration levels (in/sec PPV) at the nearest off-site structures to the project site.

TABLE 8
VIBRATION SOURCE LEVELS FOR CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT

Nearest Off-Site Building Structures[a]	Estimated Vibration Velocity Levels at the Nearest Off-Site Structures from the Project Construction Equipment (in/sec PPV)[b]						Significance Threshold	Significant Impacts?
	Vibratory Roller	Large Bulldozer	Caisson Drilling	Loaded Trucks	Jackhammer	Small Bulldozer		
FTA Reference Vibration Levels at 25 feet	0.210	0.089	0.089	0.076	0.035	0.003		
Multi-story building on the north side of 4th Street	0.037	0.016	0.016	0.013	0.006	0.001	0.2[c]	No
Multi-story building on the south side of 3rd Street	0.040	0.017	0.017	0.015	0.007	0.001	0.5[d]	No
Multi-story commercial buildings on the east side of Solano Court	0.344	0.128	0.128	0.109	0.050	0.004	0.2[c]	Yes
Single- and multi-story buildings on the west side of Pacific Avenue	0.026	0.011	0.011	0.010	0.004	0.001	0.2[c]	No

a Represents off-site building structures located nearest to the project site to the north, south, east, and west.
b Vibration level calculated based on FTA reference vibration level at 25 foot distance.
c FTA criteria for non-engineered timber and masonry buildings, applicable to the older buildings north, east, and west of the project site.
d FTA criteria for reinforced-concrete, steel, or timber buildings, applicable to the multi-story building (new construction) south of the project site.

SOURCE: FTA, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006.
AES, 3rd and Pacific Noise Report, March 2019 (see Appendix H of this Addendum).

As indicated in Table 8, the estimated vibration velocity levels from all construction equipment would be below the building damage criteria at all off-site building structures, with the exception of the commercial buildings located adjacent to the project site to the east. The estimated vibration levels at the commercial buildings adjacent to the project site to the east would be up to 0.344 in/sec PPV (due to operation of a vibratory roller within 25 feet of the building structure), which would exceed the 0.2 in/sec PPV significance threshold. Therefore, the on-site vibration impacts, pursuant to the significance criteria for building damage, during construction of the project would be significant before the implementation of project conditions. To mitigate this potential impact, the proposed project would be required to implement the Mitigation Measure Noise-2 from the Certified PEIR, identified in Table 1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure Noise-2, which requires City review and approval for all construction projects that include potential vibration-generating activities within 100 feet of existing structures, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, the project would result in construction vibration-related structural damage impacts that would be less than the impacts disclosed in the Certified PEIR.

With respect to human annoyance at a reference distance of 25 feet, vibration levels from construction equipment that would be used for the project, with the exception of a small bulldozer, at a distance of 25 feet would exceed the human annoyance threshold of 0.04 in/sec PPV as shown in Table 7.

Table 9, *Construction Vibration Impacts – Human Annoyance*, provides the estimated vibration levels at the nearest off-site sensitive receptor locations. As indicated in Table 9, the estimated vibration velocity levels from all construction equipment would be below the significance threshold at all off-site sensitive receptors. Therefore, the construction vibration impacts would be less than significant with respect to human annoyance and project impacts would be less than the impacts disclosed in the Certified PEIR.

TABLE 9
CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION IMPACTS – HUMAN ANNOYANCE

Receptor Location	Estimated Vibration Velocity Levels at the Off-Site Sensitive Uses (VdB)[a]						Significance Threshold	Significant Impacts?
	Vibratory Roller	Large Bulldozer	Caisson Drilling	Loaded Trucks	Jackhammer	Small Bulldozer		
FTA Reference Vibration Levels at 25 feet	94	87	87	86	79	58		
Multi-family residential use on the west side of Pacific Avenue, west of the project site	75.9	68.9	68.9	67.9	60.9	39.9	80	No
Multi-family residential use on the south side of 3rd Street, south of the project site	79.7	72.7	72.7	71.7	64.7	43.7	80	No
Multi-family residential use on the east side of Pine Avenue, east of the project site	64.3	57.3	57.3	56.3	49.3	28.3	80	No
Multi-family residential use on the north side of 4th Street, north of the project site	78.8	71.8	71.8	70.8	63.8	42.8	80	No

a Vibration level calculated based on FTA reference vibration level at 25-foot distance.

SOURCE: FTA, *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006.
AES, 3rd and Pacific Noise Report, March 2019 (see Appendix H of this Addendum).

Operation

The Certified PEIR determined that operational land uses would create vibration sources, which typically do not generate substantial vibrations at the source and attenuated with distance, and would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code. Vibration impacts with respect to operation would result in a less-than-significant impact.

The proposed project would not have any land uses that would generate substantial vibrations at the source. While delivery trucks travelling to and from the project site may have the potential to generate some vibration, these would be intermittent and would not generate substantial vibrations. Therefore, the low potential for vibration impacts during operation would be low and impacts would be less than significant, and less than the impacts identified for the Certified EIR.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than the Certified PEIR's significant and unavoidable impact; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Noise-2.

c) Permanent Increases in Ambient Noise Levels

The Certified PEIR determined that the implementation of the Downtown Plan would generate traffic volumes, which would increase traffic noise levels directly attributable to the project. However, noise from increased traffic from the implementation of the Downtown Plan would increase noise levels by 1 dB over future traffic noise without the project, which would be less-than-significant.

The project would increase vehicular traffic to and from the project site, which would increase traffic noise levels on local roadways. Vehicular traffic on 3rd Street, 4th Street, and Pacific Avenue are the primary noise sources in the project vicinity. As discussed in the Noise Study, there are two design options for rideshare locations: Option 1 would place a rideshare location along Pacific Avenue located north of Roble Way, while Option 2 would place a rideshare location along 4th Street. Option 2, which is the more conservative option, would increase traffic noise to a maximum of 1.1 dBA CNEL along 4th Street (between Pacific Avenue and Pine Avenue) (see Appendix H of this Addendum). The estimated increase in traffic noise would be below the 3 dBA significance threshold and, therefore, impacts to traffic noise would be less than significant.

As discussed under Issue a), above, noise sources typically associated with stationary sources that contribute to ambient noise levels from commercial land uses include mechanical equipment operations, parking lot noise (e.g., opening and closing of vehicle doors, people talking, car alarms), delivery activities (e.g., use of forklifts, hydraulic lifts), trash compactors, and air compressors. As stated in the Certified PEIR, noise from such equipment can reach intermittent levels of approximately 90 dBA, 50 feet from the source. These elevated noise levels, which have the potential to be generated by commercial uses within mixed use land use designations within the Downtown Plan area, would expose nearby noise sensitive land uses (e.g., residential units) to excessive noise levels that violate the City Noise Ordinance. Thus, point source noise levels associated with commercial land uses within the Downtown Plan area could potentially expose nearby existing and future noise sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels that violate the City Noise Ordinance. As a result, this impact was identified to be potentially significant. As described

in the Certified PEIR, Mitigation Measure Noise-6 would require site-specific noise studies to provide appropriate site-specific mitigation measures, which would reduce this impact to less than significant.

Similar to the Certified EIR, operational noise levels associated with commercial land uses could potentially expose nearby existing and future noise sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels that violate the City Noise Ordinance and, thus, a potentially significant impact. In compliance with Mitigation Measure Noise-6, a site specific Noise Study was prepared for the proposed project (Appendix H). As shown in Tables 15 through 18 of the Noise Study prepared for the proposed project, operational noise resulting from mechanical equipment, outdoor spaces, parking facilities, and loading dock/trash compactor services would not exceed the project significance threshold (Appendix H). Therefore, the project's operational noise level impacts would be the same as the noise impacts disclosed in the Certified PEIR. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, similar to the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measure Noise-6.

d) Temporary Increases in Ambient Noise Levels

As discussed under Issue a), the Certified PEIR determined that project construction would result in a temporary substantial ambient noise level increase, resulting in a potentially significant impact, requiring mitigation measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-1(b) (construction best management practices and temporary noise barriers) proposed in the Certified PEIR to reduce construction noise levels to less-than-significant impact.

Construction under the proposed project would require the use of similar heavy duty diesel-powered equipment with high noise level characteristics, as required in the Certified EIR. However, the project would not use pile driving methods during construction. Although construction noise would be localized to the project site and immediate vicinity during construction, noise sensitive receptors in proximity to the project site could be intermittently exposed to temporary elevated levels of construction noise throughout project construction. As detailed in Table 11, Construction Noise Levels, of the Noise Study prepared for the proposed project, the estimated construction noise levels would exceed the significance threshold at off-site noise sensitive receptors R1, R2 and R4, without noise control measures. However, with implementation of Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-1(b) noise levels associated with construction would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be the same or less than identified in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Noise-1(a) and Noise-1(b).

e, f) Aircraft Noise

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would not be located in proximity to an airport or airstrip and, therefore, would not be located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and would not expose workers or residents to excessive noise levels from aircraft.

The project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact from aircraft noise that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

XIII. Population and Housing

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
13. 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?	☐	☒

Discussion

d) Population Growth

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, the Downtown Plan is intended to accommodate substantial population growth in the Downtown Plan area with the proposed addition of 5,000 dwelling units. Based on the City average of 2.90 persons per household (City of Long Beach, 2010), the proposed Downtown Plan area's 5,000 dwelling units would generate a net increase of approximately 14,500 new residents. The SCAG projections estimated the City's population growth to be 6 percent during 2005 to 2015 and increase another 3 percent during 2015 to 2020. This represents an annual growth rate of less than 1 percent per year over the next two decades. According to the 2008 SCAG projections, the City was expected to increase in population to approximately 503,251 residents by 2010 and exceed 572,000 residents by 2035. The Downtown Plan area is expected to increase in population to approximately 70,091 residents by 2010 and nearly 80,000 residents by 2035. Thus, projected population increase in Downtown Plan is within the SCAG projections for the City. Although the area is presently zoned to permit densities of up to and exceeding 138 dwelling units per acre under the existing PD-30 zone, because implementation of the Downtown Plan would increase population growth substantially, the impact of this growth was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project would develop 345 residential dwelling units and, thus, would add approximately 1,001 residents to the population.[6] The proposed project's dwelling units and residential population is equivalent to approximately 6.9 percent of the projected 5,000 dwelling units and 7.4 percent of the expected 14,500 new residents expected to result from implementation of the Downtown Plan. The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Additionally, the proposed project would be within the SCAG projections for the Downtown Plan area and the City. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and less than the impacts identified in the Certified PEIR. As such, there would be no new impacts.

[6]The project's estimated residents were calculated by multiplying the City average of 2.90 persons per household by the number of proposed dwelling units (2.9 x 345 = 1,000.5) rounded up to the nearest person.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than the Certified PEIR's significant and unavoidable impact; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

B, c) Household Displacement

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, implementation of the Downtown Plan would occur over a period of 25 years or longer and would potentially result in the displacement of existing housing and people, primarily housed in medium density multifamily dwelling units. Although new development would occur at higher densities and with more modern housing, frequently as part of a mixed-use development, residents would be displaced from their existing dwelling units and may be unable to obtain similar housing with respect to quality, price, and/or location. Therefore, housing displacement impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project would be developed on a site containing two surface parking lots. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the demolition of existing residential dwellings and, thus, would not result in the displacement of people or housing. Therefore, no new impacts would occur with development of the proposed project and impacts would be less than identified in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Less Impact than "Approved Project."** The proposed project would result in less impacts than the Certified PEIR's significant and unavoidable impact; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. Public Services

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
14.	**PUBLIC SERVICES — Would the project:**		
a)	Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered government 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 following public services:		
	i) Fire protection?	☐	☒
	ii) Police protection?	☐	☒
	iii) Schools?	☐	☒
	iv) Parks?	☐	☒
	v) Other public facilities?	☐	☒

Discussion

a.i) Fire Protection

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, fire protection services would be provided by the Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD), which maintains 24 fire stations in addition to its headquarters near Long Beach Airport. The LBFD employs a total of 527 fire fighters with 133 suppression fire fighters on duty at all times. Additionally, structural fire suppression in the Downtown Plan area would receive response from three stations (Fire Stations 1,2, and 3) and approximately 27 firefighters (City of Long Beach, 2010). The standard established by the National Fire Protection Association for response to emergency calls is 6 minutes from call initiation to arrival on-scene of the first appropriate unit 90 percent of the time. The LBFD currently meets these standards (City of Long Beach, 2010).

The closest fire station to the project site is Fire Station 1, is located at 237 Magnolia Avenue, 0.24 miles southwest of the project site's western boundary. Fire Station 1 maintains a staff of fourteen fire fighters (City of Long Beach, 2010). The proposed project's addition of 345 residential units would incrementally increase the need for fire services at the project site. However, the project site is already served by Fire Station 1 and the proposed project would adhere to all Fire Prevention Bureau codes and regulations, including access, sprinklers, placement of fire hydrants and fire flows, in accordance with the Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC). Long Beach allocates funding to the LBFD during the annual budget process, the amount of which is based on cumulative development and the changing needs of the City. Through this process, funding for additional staffing and equipment needs would be addressed as the needs arise. Any proposed development within the Downtown Plan area would be required to pay fees pursuant to the Fire Facilities Impact Fee, as amended, in Chapter 18.23 of the LBMC. These fees would be used to finance the construction of additional fire facilities or improvements to current facilities. Furthermore, although the LBMC requires all buildings with occupiable floors more than 75 feet above ground to provide emergency helipads, the project would qualify for an exemption from this requirement by providing life safety

alternatives as detailed in the LBFD's Fire Prevention Requirement No. 1.016A Guidance document (LBFD 2017). Therefore, no new impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

a.ii) Police Protection

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, police protection services would be provided by the Long Beach Police Department (LBPD), which maintains 40 sworn officers in the Downtown Plan area and approximately 800 sworn officers in the entire City (City of Long Beach, 2010). LBPD's average response time for Priority One emergency calls is 4.2 minutes, meeting the target response time of 5 minutes. The Downtown Plan would incrementally increase demands on the LBPD and may require expansion facilities or replacement of existing facilities. However, as stated in the Certified PEIR, funding for the LBPD is not tied to individual development projects. Furthermore, the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services requires the payment of development impact fees for police facilities to ensure adequate service levels are maintained as per LBMC Chapter 18.22. Therefore, provided that additional funding is provided to the LBPD to support any expanded operations, the Downtown Plan's impact on police protection services would be less than significant.

The proposed project would provide 345 residential units, thereby increasing the demand for police protection services near the project site. However, the proposed project would include security features such as lighting, cameras, and security personnel that would help reduce the likelihood of crime on the project site. Additionally, the Police Headquarters and South Division within the Downtown Plan area is approximately 0.21 mile southwest of the project site's western boundary, which is likely to deter crime within the project site and vicinity with the increased presence of police officers in the area. Given the sufficient funding for the LBPD and timely police response times, as indicated in the Downtown Plan, there would be sufficient police protection services would be available to serve the project site and no new facilities would be required. As such, no new impacts would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

a.iii) Schools

The Downtown Plan area is within the boundaries of the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), which operates 52 elementary schools, 23 middle and K–8 schools, and 12 high schools. The total district enrollment for the 2005–2006 school year was approximately 83,691 students (City of Long Beach, 2010). As discussed in the Certified PEIR, the Downtown Plan would generate an estimated 670 school-age student, which could adversely affect school facilities. However, as a condition of development, each individual project within the Downtown Plan area would be required to pay the applicable required State-mandated school impact fees under the

provisions of SB 50. Therefore, impacts to school facilities and services in the Downtown Plan area would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The proposed project would contribute to the Downtown Plan's addition of 5,000 residential dwellings by providing 345 new residential units. This would generate approximately 26 new elementary school students, 8 new middle school students, and 14 new high school students.[7] However, as indicated in the Long Beach Unified School District Facility Master Plan Update in 2016, LBUSD is continuing to experience a period of declining student enrollment as a result of the community's slow growth residential population, declining birth rates, and aging population since 2003-04, resulting in excess capacity at some of the campuses. Additionally, the project's corresponding incremental increase in demand for schooling services would be mitigated by the proposed project's contribution to the State-mandated school impact fees. With the existing capacity and the payment of impact fees, the proposed project's impact on school services would also be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

a.iv) Parks and Recreation

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, the City of Long Beach is currently deficient in parkland by about 820 acres. With new development in the Downtown Plan area, the deficiency would likely increase with each subsequent project. The increased demand for recreational opportunities associated with the Downtown Plan would place additional stress on the City's recreation system. To reduce this stress, individual project approvals within the Downtown Plan area would be required to pay an in-lieu park and recreation facilities impact fee as a condition of approval. Although the collection of required fees would mitigate some of the overburden on the recreation system, it is not expected to be enough to meet the established standard of 8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the Certified PEIR found that the impact on park and recreation facilities from new development would be significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project would develop 345 residential units and, thus, would add approximately 1,001 residents to the Downtown Plan area; thereby, increasing the demand for parks and recreation services and facilities near the project site. The project would provide 5,335 sf ground floor paseo, or 10 percent of the site area, as public open space. Additionally, the project provides 11,688 sf of residential indoor common open space, 11,340 sf of residential private open space, and 19,279 sf of common outdoor open space or 36.15 percent of the site area. In total, the proposed project would provide 47,642 sf of open space. The open space provided by the project exceeds the 20 percent open space requirement, as indicated in Table 3-4 of the Downtown Plan. Additionally, as discussed in the Certified PEIR, the proposed project would be required to pay an in-lieu park

[7] According to the Certified PEIR for the Downtown Plan, 0.074 new elementary school students, 0.021 new middle school students, and 0.039 new high school students are generated with each additional residential unit. Therefore, the proposed project would add an additional 26 elementary school students (0.074 x 345 = 26); 8 middle school students (0.021 x 345 = 8); and 14 high school students (0.039 x 345 = 14).

and recreation facilities impact fee as a condition of approval. Therefore, no new impacts on park and recreation facilities would occur from implementation of the proposed project.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

a.v) Libraries and Other Public Facilities

The Downtown Plan area is service by the Long Beach Public Library (LBPL) system, which is staffed by approximately 250 personnel at the Main library located in Downtown and the 11 branch libraries. Buildout of the Downtown Plan would incrementally increase demand for library services in the City, and may cause demands for library services to exceed the capacity of the Main Library and at branch libraries that serve the Downtown Plan Area. However, as stated in the Certified PEIR, funding for the LBPL is not tied to individual development projects. Therefore, provided that additional funding is provided to the LBPL to support any expanded operations, the Downtown Plan's impact on library services would be less than significant.

Consistent with the Certified EIR, development of the proposed project would increase the demand for library services in the Downtown Plan area. However, as stated in the Certified PEIR, funding allocated to the LBPL to maintain adequate levels of service is not directly tied to individual development projects. The City has the authority to construct new facilities to serve the Downtown Plan project area and, as such, the environmental impact of such construction would not be a result of individual development projects such as the proposed project. Therefore, no new impacts would occur with development of the proposed project.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

XV. Recreation

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
15.	**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?	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a, b) Park and Recreation Resources

Refer to Section a.iv, *Parks and Recreation*, under Public Services, for a discussion on this topic.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC — Would the project:		
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	☐	☒
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☒
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?	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☒
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☒

Discussion

The discussion of potential impacts related to transportation and traffic is based on the *Revised Traffic Impact Analysis – W. 3rd and Pacific Apartments* (TIA), prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers on April 2, 2019. The TIA is provided in Appendix I. The proposed project would be required to pay a fair-share contribution to be determined in consultation with the City to implement Mitigation Measures Traf-1(a) through Traf-1(f), identified in Table 1, which require improvements to specific intersections and roadways in the Downtown Plan area.

a) Plans, Ordinances, and Policies

The Certified PEIR identified significant impacts at 16 intersections in the Downtown Plan area. Partial mitigation was identified to mitigate those impacts, but physical constraints at some locations make expansion of the roadway cross-sections difficult. Therefore, impacts at eight intersections were identified as significant and unavoidable.

The traffic study prepared for the Certified PEIR analyzed 28 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ). The proposed project is located within TAZ #12, which was evaluated in the Certified PEIR with an assumed combination of residential and office land uses that would generate a total of 251 AM peak hour trips, 271 PM peak hour trips, and 2,564 daily trips. As calculated in the TIA, the proposed project would generate a total of 256 AM peak hour trips, 206 PM peak hour trips, and 2,574 daily trips. The boundaries of TAZ #12 encompass one approved project (The Place at City Place), which includes 20 residential units and 5,200 square feet of retail uses. The Place at City

Place would be located at 495 The Promenade North, and is estimated to generate a total of approximately 14 AM peak hour trips, 29 PM peak hour trips, and 325 daily trips. With the implementation of the proposed project and other cumulative projects within TAZ #12, the traffic zone would generate a total of approximately 270 new AM peak hour trips, 235 new PM peak hour trips, and 2,899 new daily trips. Based on this data, the traffic zone would generate 19 more AM peak hour trips, 1 less PM peak hour trips, and 335 more daily trips as compared to the Certified PEIR. Although the daily and AM peak hour trip generation for TAZ #12 would exceed the estimate for the this TAZ in the Certified PEIR, the exceedance is not expected to cause additional significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the Certified PEIR.

Furthermore, the TIA included an impact evaluation for 14 intersections in the vicinity of the project site, the following nine of which were evaluated in the Certified PEIR: Magnolia Avenue/3rd Street, Magnolia Avenue/Broadway, Pacific Avenue/7th Street, Pacific Avenue/6th Street, Pacific Avenue/3rd Street, Pacific Avenue/Broadway, Pacific Avenue/Ocean Boulevard, Pine Avenue/3rd Street, and Long Beach Boulevard/3rd Street. As shown in Table 10, Level of Service Comparison and Project Impacts, of the Certified PEIR's traffic study, of the nine intersections evaluated in both the TIA for the proposed project and the traffic study for the Certified PEIR, the following two were identified in the Certified PEIR as having a significant impact before mitigation:

- Pacific Avenue/Broadway
- Pacific Avenue/Ocean Boulevard

According to Table 12, Year 2035 with Project Intersection Operating Conditions with Mitigation, of the Certified PEIR's traffic study, after mitigation the impact at these two intersections would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measure Traf-1(b), which would implement an Adaptive Traffic Control System (ATCS) along several Downtown corridors. ATCS is a traffic signal control software program that provides fully adaptive traffic signal control based on real-time traffic conditions. The TIA for the proposed project evaluated the effect of construction and operational project trips on existing traffic conditions and on future traffic conditions, taking into account growth in traffic due to other known development projects in the surrounding area as well as overall ambient growth in background traffic. The TIA concluded that the impact of traffic generated by construction and operation of the proposed project at the 14 study intersections would be less than significant. Therefore, no new potentially significant intersection impacts not identified in the Certified PEIR are expected.

CONCLUSION: **Same as "Approved Project."** The proposed project's contribution to traffic conditions at the two study intersections would be less than significant. However, the impacts identified in the Certified PEIR at eight intersections outside of the proposed project's study area would remain significant and unavoidable.

b) Congestion Management Programs

As noted in the Certified PEIR, the intersections of Alamitos Avenue/7th Street and Alamitos Avenue/Ocean Boulevard are the only Downtown Plan area intersections that are designated as CMP arterial monitoring locations. The traffic study prepared for the Certified PEIR concluded that

development of the Downtown Plan would result in a significant impact at both intersections because it would increase intersection delay by two percent or more. Considering right-of-way constraints and the potential for significant secondary impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists that could occur as a result of roadway widening, no feasible mitigation measures were identified to mitigate the significant CMP impacts. Therefore, the Certified PEIR's CMP impact at these intersections was identified as significant and unavoidable.

The TIA performed a CMP analysis for intersections and freeways using the guidelines specified in the *2010 Congestion Management Program* (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, 2010). Based on CMP thresholds of significance criteria, the proposed project would result in a less-than-significant impact to designated CMP arterial intersection and freeways.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would significant and unavoidable.

c) Air Traffic Patterns

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to air traffic patterns.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to air traffic patterns that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

d) Hazardous Design Features

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would result in no impact to hazardous conditions due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not result in an impact to hazardous conditions due to a design feature or incompatible uses that was not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

e) Emergency Access

As noted in the Certified PEIR, the Downtown Plan would not alter through-traffic operations for emergency vehicles nor would it eliminate existing roads or cause more circuitous access

conditions. Downtown Long Beach is served by a standard grid roadway system that provides multiple alternative emergency access routes. The Downtown Plan does not propose alteration to the roadway system and, therefore, emergency access would continue as it does under existing conditions and there would be no additional impacts to routes of travel for emergency vehicles. Therefore, impacts were identified as less than significant.

As discussed above in Section 8, Project Description and Background, vehicular access to the proposed project's parking garage would be provided via two (2) full access driveways on the east side of the North and South Building off of Solano Court; no vehicular access is proposed from West 3rd Street, West 4th Street, or Pacific Avenue. Solana Court would be widened by two feet along its western border abutting the project site and the ground floors of both buildings would be setback by five feet between their parking garage entries and curb cuts to Solana Court at West 3rd Street and West 4th Street. This broader width for vehicle access to the parking garages would enhance visibility and ease traffic flow to and from the parking areas. The TIS conducted an operational analysis of these driveways and determined that they would operate with very little vehicle delay based on estimated traffic volumes. Pedestrian access to both the residential and retail components of the project would be provided via building entries/exits located on the streets bordering the project site, as well as along the pedestrian-focused paseo that would redevelop the existing alley between the two buildings (Roble Way). The proposed project would not alter through-traffic operations for emergency vehicles or eliminate existing roads or cause more circuitous access conditions. Therefore, no impact beyond that identified in the Certified PEIR would occur.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Public Transit, Bicycle, or Pedestrian Facilities

The Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. Thus, the proposed project would not introduce any conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation that were not previously considered in the Certified PEIR.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would not be significant.

XVIII. Utilities and Service Systems

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):	*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:		
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☒
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☒

Discussion

a, b, e) Wastewater

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, buildout of the Downtown Plan would incrementally increase wastewater disposal demand in the City due to the increased demand for wastewater disposal and the increase in development activity in the Downtown Plan area. However, development projects built within the Downtown Plan area would generate an estimated 2.55 mgd of wastewater per day at peak flow, which would account for approximately 0.6 percent of the combined 400 mgd design capacity of the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) and the Long Beach Reclamation Plant's (LBWRP) 25 mgd capacity. Due to sufficient capacity levels, the Certified PEIR determined that the Downtown Plan's impacts to wastewater would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be served by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts). According to the Districts' evaluation of the project site, wastewater flow originating from the proposed project would discharge to a local sewer line, for conveyance to the Districts' De Forest Avenue Trunk Sewer. The Districts' 42-inch diameter trunk sewer has a capacity of 25 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 7 mgd when last measured in 2017 (LACSD, 2019). The wastewater generated by the proposed project would be treated at the JWPCP, which has a capacity of 400 mgd and currently produces an average recycled water flow of 254.7 mgd. The proposed project would develop one mid-rise building and one high-rise building with 14,481 sf of ground floor retail space, which would add 345 residential dwelling units, and result in an average wastewater flow of 58,512 gallons per day. The Districts determined that it would provide

service up to the levels that are legally permitted. Furthermore, a connection fee would be applied to the proposed project. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is imposed in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project. Payment of a connection fee would be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is issued.[8]

Therefore, in accordance with the Certified PEIR and the District's evaluation for the proposed project, the project's wastewater impacts would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

c) Storm Drain Resources

Refer to Section IX, Hydrology and Water Quality, of this document for discussion of the proposed project's impacts to the City's storm drain system.

d) Water Supply and Demand

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, buildout of the Downtown Plan would incrementally increase water supply and demand in the City. Due to the increased demand for water supply and the increase in development activity in the Downtown Plan area, the impact on water supply and demand would be considered potentially significant. However, the Certified PEIR evaluated the Long Beach Water Department (LBWD)'s capabilities and determined that the LBWD would have the resources to meet the demand of future projects in the Downtown Plan area. Therefore, development projects built within the Downtown Plan area that conform to the provisions of the Plan have been anticipated by the LBWD and impacts would be less than significant.

Water Code Section 10912(a) and (b) and SB 610 require that a Water Supply Assessment be prepared if the development is expected to demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than the amount of water needed for 500 dwelling units. The proposed project would develop 345 dwelling units, which does not exceed the 500 dwelling unit threshold under SB 610; therefore a Water Supply Assessment was not required for the proposed project.

As described in the Utility Infrastructure Technical Report: Water, Wastewater, and Energy, prepared by KPFF Consulting Engineers January 11, 2019 (Appendix J), water demand for the construction of the project would be required for dust control, cleaning of equipment, excavation/export, removal and re-compaction, and would range from approximately 1,000 to 2,000 gallons per day (gpd). The project would also relocate or demolish the existing 14-inch water main along Roble Way to construct the proposed North Building's underground parking. Thus, temporary construction related impacts in association with trenching for the relocated pipe would occur. During operation, domestic water would be required for the project's 345 residential units

[8] County of Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Will Serve Letter for the 3rd and Pacific Project, Adriana Raza, Custumer Service Specialist, letter correspondence dated January 23, 2019.

and associated amenities, as well as for the 14,481 sf of retail commercial space. The total water demand for the project during operation would be approximately 64,505 gpd.

The project proposes to connect to the existing 16-inch water main in Pacific Avenue or to the 8-inch water main in Solana Court with a domestic water lateral and a fire water lateral for the North Building and the South Building, which would be adequately sized to simultaneously accommodate fire demand and domestic demand. Installation of new water laterals serving the two new buildings infrastructure would be limited to minor off-site work associated with connections to the public main. Prior to ground disturbance, project contractors would coordinate with Long Beach Water Department (LBWD) to identify the locations and depth of all lines. Further, LBWD would be notified in advance of proposed ground disturbance activities to avoid water lines and disruption of water service. As described in the Will Serve Letter prepared by Long Beach Water Department (LBWD), there is existing water capacity and infrastructure surrounding the project site to meet the water demand associated with the project during construction and operation (Appendix J). Furthermore, the project would incorporate a fire sprinkler suppression system to reduce or eliminate the public hydrant demands, which will be subject to City of Long Beach Fire Department review and approval during the design and permitting of the project. As determined by LBWD's Fire Flow Test, it is expected that the existing fire hydrants have adequate fire flow to comply with the Fire Code requirement for the proposed project. In addition, the project would include backflow prevention devices and separate meters per City requirements. With compliance to CFC requirements and in accordance with LBWD's evaluation of the proposed project, water supply impacts would be less than significant.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant.

F, g) Solid Waste Disposal

As discussed in the Certified PEIR, buildout of the Downtown Plan would incrementally increase solid waste disposal treatment demand in the City. However, the City has one of the highest landfill diversion rates of any large city in the United States, with an estimated 69 percent of the City's trash diverted from disposal through recycling, reuse, and waste reduction as of 2006 (the most recent year reported). Following collection, refuse within the City is transported directly to landfills or to landfills following combustion in the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF), a publicly owned solid waste management facility. SERRF applies mass burn technology to reduce the volume of solid waste entering landfills by 80 percent this technology, generates electricity for operation of the SERRF and residual electricity is available for purchase by Southern California Edison (SCE) for use throughout the City and State. SERRF processes an average of 1,290 tons of municipal solid waste per day with a daily capacity for 1,380 tons. It has processed over 3.5 million tons of solid waste since it first opened and has reduced the volume of solid waste entering landfills by over 4 million cubic yards.

Based on Los Angeles County Sanitation District's (LACSD) operation of the Mesquite Regional Landfill, which is permitted for up to 20,000 tons per day for approximately 100 years, adequate landfill capacity exists to accommodate solid waste disposal needs of the Downtown Plan. Due to

the increased demand for solid waste disposal treatment and the increase in development activity in the Downtown Plan area, the impact on solid waste disposal systems would be considered potentially significant. However, this impact would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of Mitigation Measures Utilities-3(a) through Utilities-3(d), identified in Table 1.

The proposed project would generate solid waste during construction and operation. However, as indicated in the Certified PEIR, it is expected that a large percentage of the project's refuse would be diverted from disposal through recycling, reuse, and waste reduction, including combustion in the SERRF. The proposed project would be within the development parameters considered in the Certified PEIR and would not allow for development at a greater density/intensity than previously considered. The proposed project would also follow all applicable solid waste policies and objectives that are required by law, statute, or regulation and would be required to implement Mitigation Measures Utilities-3(a) through Utilities-3(d) from the Certified PEIR, which would implement recycling measures for all construction-related wastes in coordination with the City Building Official, as well as recycling bins and educational materials to encourage recycling and proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste. Thus, any potential impacts to solid waste disposal services would be reduced. Therefore, no new impacts would occur with implementation of the proposed project.

CONCLUSION: **Same Impact as "Approved Project."** The proposed project would be consistent with the analysis and conclusions presented in the Certified PEIR; thus, impacts would be less than significant with Certified PEIR Mitigation Measures Utilities-3(a) through Utilities-3(d).

XVIV. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):		*Potentially Significant Impact Not Identified in the "Approved Project"*	*Same or Less Impact than Identified in the "Approved Project*
19.	**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?	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Environmental Resources

As discussed in Section IV, Biological Resources, of this document, no impacts to rare or endangered species habitats or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California

history or prehistory are expected and therefore, no impact to environmental resources would occur and further study of this issue is not warranted.

b) Cumulative Impacts

To support the analysis of cumulative impacts in the Draft EIR for the project, a list of 62 related projects that are planned or under construction in the Downtown Plan area was compiled. The Certified PEIR determined the Downtown Plan would cause significant and unavoidable project-level and cumulative impacts to the following resource areas: Aesthetics (Shade and Shadow), Air Quality (construction and operation), Cultural Resources (Historic), Greenhouse Gases, Noise (construction vibration), Population and Housing, Public Services (Parks and Recreation), and Transportation and Traffic. Additionally, the Certified PEIR determined the Downtown Plan would cause cumulatively considerable impacts to Utilities and Service Systems (Solid Waste). Similar to the PEIR, significant and unavoidable project-level and cumulative impacts were identified for Public Services (Parks and Recreation) and Transportation and Traffic. While these impacts are significant and unavoidable, they would not introduce impacts that are greater than what was originally considered in the PEIR. Thus, considering the conclusions of this Addendum, the proposed project conforms with all of the conclusions provided in the Certified PEIR and there would be no additional cumulative impacts. A more detailed cumulative discussion is included below.

Public Services (Parks and Recreation)

The proposed project would increase the demand for parks and recreation services and facilities near the project site by adding approximately 1,001 residents to the Downtown Plan area, which currently does not meet the established standard in the City's General Plan of 8 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. The project would provide 5,335 sf ground floor paseo, or 10 percent of the site area, as public open space. Additionally, the project provides 11,688 sf of residential indoor common open space, 11,340 sf of residential private open space, and 19,279 sf of common outdoor open space or 36.15 percent of the site area. In total, the proposed project would provide 47,642 sf of open space. While the open space provided by the project exceeds the 20 percent open space requirement, as indicated in Table 3-4 of the Downtown Plan, and would be required to pay a park and recreation facilities impact fee, the project impacts were determined to be significant and unavoidable, consistent with the PEIR. The project, in combination with other cumulative projects in the Downtown Plan, would result in a cumulative increase in population that would also increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities. Similar to the project, all new developments in the City are either required to provide onsite park facilities or pay in-lieu fees to offset this increase. With collection of required fees on all new development and use of these fees to provide needed new facilities, cumulative impacts to parks and recreation would result in new park and open space amenities, but not in sufficient quantities to meet the citywide goal of 8 acres of open space per 1,000 residents. Therefore, the project's contribution to cumulative park and recreation impacts is cumulatively considerable.

Traffic and Transportation

The traffic study prepared for the Certified PEIR analyzed 28 Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ). The proposed project is located within TAZ #12, which was evaluated in the Certified PEIR with an assumed combination of residential and office land uses that would generate a total of 251 AM peak hour trips, 271 PM peak hour trips, and 2,564 daily trips. With the implementation of the proposed project and other cumulative projects within TAZ #12, the traffic zone would generate a total of approximately 270 new AM peak hour trips, 235 new PM peak hour trips, and 2,899 new daily trips. Based on this data, the traffic zone would generate 19 more AM peak hour trips, 1 less PM peak hour trips, and 335 more daily trips as compared to the Certified PEIR. Although the daily and AM peak hour trip generation for TAZ #12 would exceed the estimate for the this TAZ in the Certified PEIR, the exceedance is not expected to cause additional significant impacts beyond the ones identified in the Certified PEIR.

Cumulative impacts related to traffic and transportation are represented by the 2035 traffic analysis presented above in Section XVI. Transportation/Traffic. Since the proposed project would add traffic to intersections identified in the Certified PEIR as being significantly impacted by plan area growth, it would be required to pay a fair-share contribution to implement Mitigation Measures Traf-1(a) through Traf-1(f) from the Certified PEIR, which would reduce many of the intersection impacts identified in the Certified PEIR to less-than-significant levels. However, even with implementation of mitigation, some of the intersection impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, consistent with the Certified PEIR, the proposed project's cumulative traffic and transportation impacts would be cumulatively considerable.

c) Human Impacts

Generally, impacts to human beings are more specifically focused on impacts associated with air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise impact. As discussed in the previous sections, the proposed project would not result, either directly or indirectly, in adverse hazards related to air quality, hazardous materials, or noise. Compliance with applicable rules and regulations along with implementation of appropriate mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts on human beings to a less-than-significant level.

References

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2019. Envirostor Database search for 3rd and Pacific Project Site. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?global_id=60002588 Accessed May 2, 2019.

California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG), 1999; State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Long Beach Quadrangle, Official Map, Released: March 25, 1999.

CEC. 2019a. 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Available: https://www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2019standards/post_adoption/. Accessed May 3, 2019.

City of Long Beach. 2010. Long Beach Downtown Plan PEIR. December 2010. Available at: http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3579 Accessed May 3, 2019.

City of Long Beach. 2017. City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services Building and Safety Bureau, Development Impact Fees Guide. Available at http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/building--safety/inspections/information-bulletins/ib-bu-044-development-impact-fees--rev-04-04-17-.

County of Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Will Serve Letter for the 3rd and Pacific Project, Adriana Raza, Customer Service Specialist, letter correspondence dated January 23,2019.

International Code Council, Uniform Building Codes. 2018. 2018 International Building Code.

Leighton and Associates, Inc., 1990, Technical Appendix to the Safety Element of the Los Angeles County General Plan, Hazard Reduction in Los Angeles County.

Linscott Law and Greenspan (LL&G). 2019. Revised Traffic Impact Analysis. April 2, 2019.

Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD). 2017. Fire Prevention Requirement No. 1.016A, *Emergency Helicopter Landing Facility (EHLF)*.

Long Beach Unified School District. 2016. Long Beach Unified School District Facility Master Plan Update. Accessed May 20, 2019. http://lbschoolbonds.net/pdfs/LBUSD-Facilty-Master-Plan-Update-2016.pdf

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority. 2010 Congestion Management Program. 2010. Available at: http://media.metro.net/docs/cmp_final_2010.pdf Accessed May 2, 2019.

SCAQMD. 2003. White Paper on Potential Control Strategies to Address Cumulative Impacts from Air Pollution. Available at http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/Agendas/Environmental-Justice/cumulative-impacts-working-group/cumulative-impacts-white-paper-appendix.pdf?sfvrsn=4. Accessed February 1, 2018.

SCAQMD. 2008a. Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology. Revised July 2008. Available: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf. Accessed February 2, 2018.

SCAQMD. 2008b. Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold. Available: http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf. Accessed February 2, 2018.

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 1978. Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model. Office of Research, Office of Environmental Policy, December, NTIS, FHWA-RD-77-108.

United States Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). 2006. *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, May 2006.