

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that local government agencies, before taking action on projects over which they have discretionary approval authority, consider the environmental consequences of such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide both the public and local and State governmental agency decision-makers with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision-making.

This Executive Summary has been prepared according to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123 for the Recirculated Draft EIR for the proposed General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (proposed project). This Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared for the City of Long Beach (City) to analyze the proposed project's potential impacts on the environment; to propose mitigation measures for identified potentially significant impacts that would minimize, offset, or otherwise reduce or avoid those environmental impacts; and to discuss alternatives that could reduce the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

1.2 SUMMARY OF LOCATION AND SETTING

The planning area includes the entire 50 square miles within the limits of the City of Long Beach (excluding the City of Signal Hill, which is completely surrounded by the City of Long Beach) in Los Angeles County (County), California. The City is bordered on the west by the Cities of Carson and Los Angeles (including Wilmington and the Port of Los Angeles); on the north by the Cities of Compton, Paramount, and Bellflower; and on the east by the Cities of Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach. The City is also bordered by the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez to the north and Rossmoor to the east. The Pacific Ocean borders the southern portion of the City, and as such, portions of the City are located within the California Coastal Zone.

Regional access to the City is provided by Interstate 710 (I-710, which traverses the western portion of the City from north to south), Interstate 405 (I-405, which traverses the central portion of the City from northwest to southeast), State Route 91 (SR-91, which traverses the northernmost portion of the City from east to west), State Routes 103 and 47 (SR-103 and SR-47, respectively, which traverse the western border of the City from north to south), and State Route 1 (SR-1, which traverses the central portion of the City from east to west), commonly referred to as Pacific Coast Highway (PCH or SR-1). In addition, Interstate 605 and State Route 22 (I-605 and SR-22, respectively, and located northeast and east of the City) provide access to the eastern portion of the City.

In addition, a variety of transit routes maintained by the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro), the Long Beach Transit, and the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) provides both regional and local access to and within the City. A variety of bicycle lanes and paths serve the City, including regional connections along PCH, the San Gabriel River pathway, and the Los Angeles River pathway.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is an update to the City’s existing General Plan and is intended to guide growth and future development within the planning area through the horizon year 2040. The proposed project includes the approval of both the General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) and Urban Design Element (UDE), which would replace the existing LUE and the Scenic Routes Element (SRE). The following discussion summarizes the key components of each of the proposed General Plan Elements.

See Chapter 3.0, Project Description, for a complete description of the project components.

1.3.1 Land Use Element

The project proposes to update the current General Plan LUE with a new LUE that would reflect the current needs and opportunities within the City, update land uses and bring the General Plan into conformity with the City’s recently adopted General Plan Mobility Element (October 2013), and provide for future development opportunities that would accommodate projected growth outlined in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016–2040 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) and housing needs established in the City’s General Plan 2013–2021 Housing Element and the 2016 Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH).

The proposed updated LUE would introduce the concept of “PlaceTypes,” which would replace the current approach in the existing LUE of segregating property within the City through traditional land uses designations and zoning classifications. The updated LUE would establish 14 primary PlaceTypes that would divide the City into distinct neighborhoods, thus allowing for greater flexibility and a mix of compatible land uses within these areas. Each PlaceType would be defined by unique land use, form, and character-defining goals, policies, and implementation strategies tailored specifically to the particular application of that PlaceType within the City. The proposed 14 PlaceTypes are listed below.

1. Open Space
2. Founding and Contemporary Neighborhood
3. Multi-Family Residential—Low
4. Multi-Family Residential—Moderate
5. Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors—Low
6. Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors—Moderate
7. Transit-Oriented Development—Low
8. Transit-Oriented Development—Moderate
9. Community Commercial
10. Industrial
11. Neo-Industrial
12. Regional-Serving Facility
13. Downtown
14. Waterfront

Major land use changes proposed as part of the LUE are identified as Major Areas of Change (refer to Figure 3.5, Major Areas of Change, in Chapter 3.0, Project Description). The eight primary areas where changes associated with the updated LUE would be focused are listed below.

1. Create, restore, and preserve more Open Space
2. Convert targeted industrial edges and districts to Neo-Industrial uses
3. Promote Regional-Serving uses
4. Convert some industrial uses to Commercial and Regional-Serving uses
5. Create new Transit-Oriented development
6. Continue Downtown development
7. Promote infill and redevelopment to support transit
8. Revitalize the Belmont Pier Complex and Alamitos Bay to its highest and best use

In total, the LUE proposes opportunity for major changes to approximately 13 percent of the land area (or the equivalent of 4,180 acres) in the City. In establishing PlaceTypes and focusing new development within the Major Areas of Change, the proposed LUE takes into account existing land use patterns in the City and the demand for new land uses and increased densities to alleviate overcrowding of existing residences and accommodate the projected population growth (refer to Section 4.6, Population and Housing, in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, for further information related to population growth).

1.3.2 Urban Design Element

The UDE would be an entirely new element of the City's General Plan and would replace the existing SRE upon approval by the City Council. The decision to include an UDE in the City's General Plan grew from the City's stated need to provide an urban framework that addresses the varying aesthetic characteristics associated with the historic districts, traditional neighborhoods, auto-oriented commercial centers, urbanized centers, and corridors located throughout the City.

The UDE would define the physical aspects of the urban environment. Specifically, the UDE aims to further enhance the City's PlaceTypes established in the LUE by creating great places; improving the urban fabric, and public spaces; and defining edges, thoroughfares, and corridors. In addition, the City intends to utilize the UDE to foster healthy, sustainable neighborhoods; promote compact and connected development; minimize and fill in gaps in the urban fabric of existing neighborhoods; improve the cohesion between buildings, roadways, public spaces, and people; and improve the economic vitality of the City.

1.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe significant impacts that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. As determined in this Recirculated Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts related to air quality, global climate change, noise, and transportation. With the exception of air quality, global climate change, noise, and transportation impacts, all other potentially significant impacts have been effectively mitigated to a less than significant level.

1.4.1 Air Quality

The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to conflicts with an adopted Air Quality Management Plan, the violation of applicable air quality standards, and the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The project would result in conflicts with the 2016 AQMP because air emissions under future with project conditions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and CO as a result of additional housing anticipated under the proposed project. Construction and operational activities associated with future development occurring under the proposed project would be significant and unavoidable because the scale of future specific projects is not known and project-specific emissions cannot be estimated. Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 requires future projects to comply with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during the construction of future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project. In addition, Mitigation Measures MMs AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 require the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating potential construction and operational-related air quality impacts to ensure that criteria pollutant emissions and emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of future projects facilitated by the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable even with implementation of Mitigation Measures MMs AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3.

1.4.2 Global Climate Change

The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that could significantly impact the environment. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to Global Climate Change (GCC) through direct and indirect emissions of GHGs from land uses within the City of Long Beach. On a service population basis, the anticipated General Plan build out would reduce the GHG emissions from 3.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year per service population (MT of CO₂e/yr/SP) under existing conditions down to 2.5 MT CO₂e/yr/SP (with reduction measures incorporated). Although the GHG emissions per service population would be lower under future year conditions, the emission rate of 2.5 MT CO₂e/yr/SP would exceed the 1.92 MT CO₂e/yr/SP criterion established by the City in its draft *City of Long Beach Climate Action and Adaptation Plan GHG Emissions Reduction Target Options Memo* (2018) and used for purposes of this environmental evaluation. As such, Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1 would be required to reduce GHG emissions. This measure requires the preparation of a GHG Reduction Plan or Climate Action Plan to ensure that future development projects meet or exceed the statewide goals aimed at the reduction of GHG emissions. In addition to the proposed mitigation measure, additional statewide measures would be necessary to reduce GHG emissions from development that may occur with adoption of the proposed project to meet the long-term GHG reduction goals. Although the implementation of the proposed project would result in lower GHG emissions within the City as compared to existing conditions, because the project would generate emissions above the interim threshold level and because no additional statewide measures are currently available that can be implemented, GHG emission impacts under the horizon year 2040 scenario would remain significant and unavoidable.

1.4.3 Noise

The proposed project would result in significant unavoidable construction-related impacts. Construction activities associated with development anticipated under the project would be subject to compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced. Some projects may have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.). Therefore, construction projects may result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, and mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects to implement construction best management practices to reduce potential construction-period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors. Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, because the location, the proximity to sensitive receptors, and the type of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are all unknown at this time, in an abundance of caution construction noise impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

1.4.4 Transportation

The proposed project would have significant unavoidable impacts related to conflicts with applicable plans, ordinances, and policies, as well as conflicts with an applicable Congestion Management Plan (CMP). The *Traffic Impact Analysis* (LSA 2019) prepared for the proposed project determined that 48 intersections could be significantly impacted by implementation of future development projects in the anticipated 2040 General Plan build out scenario based on the City's criteria. Potentially significant traffic impacts were also identified at freeway facilities. Although physical improvements that would retain the performance goal of level of service (LOS) D were identified, all of the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D are subject to constraints that render the addition of vehicle capacity infeasible (see Table 4.8.I). The City's Capital Improvement Program, Mobility Element, and/or applicable specific plans were also reviewed for pending and planned vehicle and non-vehicle capacity improvements throughout the City. As such, applicants for future discretionary projects would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure MM T-1. Mitigation Measure MM T-1 requires applicants for future projects to prepare a traffic improvement analysis to identify feasible physical improvements to reduce impacts at intersections within the planning area. While recommended improvements and implementation of Mitigation Measure MM T-1 could contribute to a reduced vehicle LOS, the effectiveness of these improvements cannot be quantified at this time, as future specific projects have not been identified; therefore, these improvements cannot be considered mitigation for the 48 impacted study area intersections for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, impacts to the 48 intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.

In addition to identifying significant and unavoidable impacts at the 48 impacted intersections based on the City's criteria, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* also identified significant impacts at 4 of the 10 monitored intersections within the study area based on Los Angeles County's 2010 CMP criteria. Despite recommended improvements in Mitigation Measure MM T-1, potentially significant impacts to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) intersections and freeway facilities may remain significant and unavoidable. Therefore, the impacts to these intersections are considered significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.

1.5 ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration, including the No Project Alternative as required by CEQA:

1.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

This alternative would involve no amendments to the City of Long Beach's (City) General Plan, no adoption of PlaceTypes, and no changes to the existing land use designations in the City's planning documents. The existing General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) and the Scenic Routes Element (SRE) would continue to determine land uses and design principles that guide future development in the City.

1.5.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

This Reduced Project Alternative assumes the planning area would be subject to the LUE and UDE goals, strategies, and policies similar to those included under the proposed project, but with adjustments to the proposed PlaceType intensities. This alternative would decrease overall intensities by 25 percent on a citywide basis as compared to the proposed project. In total, Alternative 2 would facilitate 21,393 dwelling units (7,131 fewer residential units than the proposed project) and 10,156,963 square feet of non-residential uses (3,385,654 fewer non-residential square feet than the proposed project). Alternative 2 would require a General Plan Update/Amendment, a future Local Coastal Plan Amendment, and a Rezone Amendment, similar to the proposed project.

In evaluating an appropriate range of alternatives to the proposed project, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected by the Lead Agency. These included consideration of the following options: (1) consideration of alternative sites; (2) a Reduced Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)/Transit-Oriented Development Alternative; and (3) a Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative.

Each of these alternatives was rejected for differing reasons, as described further in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives.

Under the No Project Alternative, development would continue as allowed under the 1989 General Plan LUE and 1975 SRE and would result in 15,121 fewer housing units in the horizon year as compared to the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would not require a General Plan Update/Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment, or Rezone Amendment. No change to the adopted land use designations would occur. Overall, impacts for the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, although incrementally reduced for air quality, GHG, and traffic under the horizon year (2040). However, similar to the proposed project, under the No Project scenario, significant unavoidable air quality, GHG, and traffic impacts would occur.

Under the Reduced Project Alternative (Alternative 2), significant unavoidable impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and transportation would occur, similar to the proposed project. Although the decreased efficiency of development intensity near transit in Alternative 2 may lead to more significant impacts related to some air quality, GHG, and transportation sub-sectors, due to the

reduction in development potential under Alternative 2, overall impacts would be less than with the proposed project.

Although overall environmental impacts would be reduced under Alternative 2, this alternative would not facilitate the same number of residential units (28,524) as anticipated under the proposed project that are required to alleviate existing issues related to affordability and overcrowding and could potentially exacerbate such conditions through 2040. As such, Alternative 2 would not allow the City to comply with State-mandated affordable housing requirements established during the RHNA process and the shortages identified in the AFH to the same extent as the proposed project. Moreover, failure to comply with the RHNA mandate is enforceable through the Housing Accountability Act and could result in a loss of funding to the City and legal action by the State, as evidenced by the State's recent actions elsewhere in Southern California. Therefore, impacts to population and housing would be increased, and considered significant and adverse under this alternative.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, "the EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives" (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126. 6(e)(2)). Alternative 2, Reduced Project Alternative, would lessen most of the significant environmental impacts or result in impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project, with the exception of housing, which would have greater impacts under this Alternative due to the reduced number of housing units that would be facilitated. As such, with the exception of the No Project Alternative, the Environmentally Superior Alternative would be the Reduced Project Alternative. This alternative would lessen significant environmental impacts or result in impacts similar to those associated with the proposed project.

Alternative 2 would promote livability, environmental quality, community health and safety, the quality of the built environment, and economic vitality (Project Objective 1); however, this alternative's consistency with the overall LUE goals of creating compact new development (Project Objective 4), job growth (Project Objective 5), and land use changes that coincide with the regional economy (Project Objective 6) would be achieved to a lesser extent due to the reduction in development potential. Alternative 2 would encourage sustainable development practices to create walkable and complete neighborhoods (Project Objectives 4, 12, 13, 14, 16, and 17). This alternative would achieve some of the Project Objectives related to the provision of diverse housing types but not to the same extent as the proposed project due to the reduction in development potential, and would preserve existing neighborhoods (Project Objectives 7 and 8); however, Alternative 2 would not meet Project Objective 2 related to meeting housing needs identified during the RHNA process (7,048 new dwelling units by the year 2021) and the AFH (21,476 housing units to address existing housing needs) to the same extent as the proposed project.

In summary, the reduction in air quality, GHGs, noise, and traffic impacts would be minimal in comparison to the economic value of providing housing and employment opportunities throughout the City.

The alternatives analysis is described in greater detail in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives.

1.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123, this EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the City or that were raised during the scoping process. Major issues and concerns raised at the scoping meeting held on May 27, 2015, and comments submitted in writing during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process included: (1) concerns regarding project-related impacts on air quality in the South Coast Air Basin; (2) concerns regarding the project's consistency with applicable land use documents, including the SCAG RTP/SCS; (3) concerns regarding the project's inclusion of land use goals and policies and zoning requirements that would allow for flexibility in housing densities and types on residential properties; (4) concerns regarding potential project-related conflicts with applicable plans, ordinances, and/or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system; (5) potential project-related impacts to Caltrans facilities; (6) concerns regarding the ability of the City to provide water to accommodate new development allowed under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario; (7) concerns related to significant increases in allowable building heights and density within the Downtown area; and (8) concerns regarding the potential loss of open space and recreational resources resulting from project implementation.

Additional areas of controversy that were brought forth during the public review period for the 2016 Draft EIR included project-related impacts with respect to increased traffic throughout the planning area, increased density on the west side of the City and along the coast, and changes in the aesthetic character of the City. Please note that these are not exhaustive lists of areas of controversy, but rather key issues that were raised during the scoping process and public review period for the 2016 Draft EIR.

This Recirculated Draft EIR addresses each of these areas of concern or controversy in detail, examines project-related and cumulative environmental impacts, identifies significant adverse environmental impacts, and proposes mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts of the proposed project.

1.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.A identifies the potential environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation is incorporated into the proposed project. Table 1.A also identifies cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project. Environmental topics addressed in this Recirculated Draft EIR include: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Global Climate Change, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation, Utilities, and Energy.

Refer to Section 2.0, Introduction, of this Recirculated Draft EIR for a discussion of additional effects found not to be significant through the NOP process (e.g., Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural and Tribal Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Recreation, and Wildfires).

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
4.1: AESTHETICS		
<p>Threshold 4.1.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. There are no City-designated scenic viewpoints or scenic corridors in the City. However, the City’s existing Open Space Element requires protection of scenic features in the City, including beaches, bluffs, wetlands, and water bodies. Due to the prominence of existing urban and industrial developments adjacent to the Pacific Ocean and the Port of Long Beach, views of these resources would not be significantly altered by development envisioned under the proposed project. Further, future development facilitated by project approval would be designed according to the development strategies, policies, and standards in the proposed Urban Design Element (UDE) and would be subject to height and density/intensity limitations for each PlaceType as outlined in the proposed Land Use Element (LUE). The proposed UDE also includes development strategies and policies that consider the context of existing scenic vistas and neighborhoods when designing and implementing projects. Although future development facilitated by project approval would modify views to and from areas throughout the City, such as potentially blocking distant views of the San Gabriel Mountains from public vantage points, project applicants would be required to demonstrate consistency with goals, policies, and strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE that are aimed at preserving scenic vistas in the planning area. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed project on scenic vistas would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.1.3: In a non-urbanized area, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The visual character and quality of the planning area would be preserved and enhanced through the application of goals, policies, strategies, and development standards outlined in the LUE and UDE that are intended to guide the quality and aesthetic value of existing and future development in the City. Future projects within the City would also be required to submit detailed plans to the City to ensure consistency with the City’s design requirements (including those outlined in the proposed UDE) aimed at improving the visual character of the planning area. As such, project implementation would ensure that the majority of the planning area, including identified aesthetic resources and scenic vistas, would not be affected by future growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially degrade the visual character of the planning area or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
<p>Threshold 4.1.4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Future development facilitated by the project would introduce new sources of light to the City that are typical of development projects. Future development projects would be required to comply with the design standards established in the proposed UDE and the City’s Municipal Code. On-site landscaping proposed as part of new development projects would further reduce glare and would serve to screen</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>light sources to reduce the visual impact of lighting from buildings and parking lots. The City would review site plans and architectural renderings for new projects with an emphasis on the presence of reflective materials and proposed lighting to minimize potential impacts related to light and glare, and propose mitigation, if necessary. Although future development would introduce new sources of light that would contribute to the light visible in the night sky and surrounding area, the planning area is located within a highly urbanized area that is currently characterized by significant nighttime lighting. Therefore, the proposed project’s impact related to light and glare would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The cumulative aesthetic study area for the proposed project is the visual resource areas within the City’s viewshed. The viewshed from the planning area includes vantage points with views of the Pacific Ocean, the Port of Long Beach, the Long Beach marinas, the San Gabriel Mountains, and the Santa Ana Mountains.</p> <p>Future development facilitated by the proposed project would change the visual character of the planning area, specifically within the Major Areas of Change, as compared to existing conditions. However, the site design, landscaping, and architectural design of future projects would be required to be consistent with goals, policies, strategies, and development standards established by the proposed UDE, which are intended to avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimize identified potential adverse impacts of the proposed project or provide significant benefits to the community and/or to the physical environment. Furthermore, development envisioned by the proposed project is intended to improve the overall visual</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>character of the City through new development projects that would shape the urban environment of the City, while preserving existing development that defines its unique aesthetic character.</p> <p>The proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare on the planning area as a result of future development projects facilitated by project approval. However, because the City is currently characterized as an urban environment with existing high levels of light pollution, light emitted by future development projects would not result in a cumulatively significant visual impact related to light and glare. Cumulative impacts are, therefore, considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
4.2: AIR QUALITY		
<p>Threshold 4.2.1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable Impact. CEQA requires that general plans be evaluated for consistency with the AQMP. There are two key indicators of consistency. Indicator 1 relates to whether the project would result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the AAQS or emission reductions in the AQMP. Indicator 2 relates to whether the project would exceed the assumptions in the AQMP. The AQMP strategy is, in part, based on projections from local general plans.</p> <p><i>Indicator 1:</i> The proposed project involves long-term growth associated with the anticipated build out of the City and therefore, emissions of criteria pollutants associated with future development allowed for under the project could contribute emissions of PM10, PM2.5, NOx, and VOCs, which could affect</p>	<p>No feasible mitigation.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>attainment of the AAQS. Future development allowed under the proposed project would be required to comply with CARB motor vehicle standards, SCAQMD regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings, Title 24 energy efficiency standards, and the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies. Additionally, future projects would be required to comply with existing City policies and regulations, as well as the proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies, in order to further reduce air quality impacts.</p> <p>Based on the emissions modeling prepared for the project, emissions under future with project conditions would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and CO as a result of additional housing anticipated under the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact associated with consistency with the applicable AQMP, and would not be consistent with the AQMP under the first indicator.</p> <p><i>Indicator 2:</i> The land-use designations in the City’s existing LUE form, in part, the foundation for the emissions inventory for the Basin in the AQMP. The AQMP is based on projections in population, employment, and VMT in the Basin projected by SCAG. SCAG projections for the City LUE and UDE proposed land uses are partially based on the current adopted General Plan. Implementation of the proposed General Plan LUE and UDE would not result in higher population and would not generate employment for the City compared to SCAG forecasts. Growth expected under the proposed project was estimated based on SCAG projections for population and housing units in the City. Additional units included as part of the project would serve the existing population that is currently in overcrowded housing and the LUE simply focuses that projected growth near transit. These demographic trends are incorporated into the RTP/SCS</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>compiled by SCAG to determine priority transportation projects and VMT in the SCAG region. Growth projections of the proposed project assume the anticipated General Plan build out by the year 2040, since there is no schedule for when this development would occur. As a result, the growth projections for the City would be based on SCAG’s 2016 RTP/SCS and the associated emissions inventory in SCAQMD’s 2016 AQMP. Based on the requirements for consistency with emission control strategies in the AQMP, the project would be consistent with the 2016 AQMP’s land use policies aimed at reducing air emissions and would not increase population or employment in the City. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the 2016 AQMP under Indicator 2.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.2.2: Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?</p> <p>Construction Emissions. Significant and Unavoidable Impact. Construction activities associated with future projects facilitated by project approval would cause short-term emissions of criteria air pollutants. On average, the maximum construction emissions associated with the development activity allowed under the project are not anticipated to exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM_{2.5}, or PM₁₀ emissions. However, because the scale of construction future activities has not been determined, maximum daily emissions associated with an individual development project could potentially be significant, and mitigation would be required.</p> <p>The proposed project includes goals regarding land use development and identifies policies designed to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants. While existing City policies and regulations and proposed LUE/UDE goals and policies are intended to</p>	<p>Compliance Measure:</p> <p>CM AQ-1: To ensure compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) rules and provide Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction of future projects facilitated under the proposed project, the construction contractor shall implement the following BMPs during construction, where feasible, to further reduce emissions from construction emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Install temporary construction power supply meters on site and use these to provide power to electric power tools whenever feasible. If temporary electric power is available on site, forbid the use of portable gasoline- or diesel-fueled electric generators. ● Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and/or 	<p>Construction and Operation Emissions: Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>CO Hot Spots: Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>minimize impacts associated with nonattainment criteria pollutants, Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 includes a list of the types of measures within the existing regulatory framework that future projects may be required to comply with based on their specific impacts to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Additionally, Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1 requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments evaluating construction-related air quality impacts to further ensure that construction-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, since the combination, number, and size of projects that could be under construction at any one time are unknown, in an abundance of caution, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Operation Emissions. Significant and Unavoidable. Emissions associated with the anticipated General Plan build out would not exceed the daily SCAQMD regional thresholds for VOC, NO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}, and CO in 2040 when compared to the existing conditions 2018 scenario. However, the decrease in emissions is associated with the overall decrease in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and reduction in vehicle emission rates that would occur with or without the proposed project. Therefore, an analysis was conducted to evaluate the change in emissions associated with the project, holding the emission factors constant for the year 2040. This analysis indicates that both VOC (an O₃ precursor emission) and CO emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds under this scenario.</p> <p>Future development under the proposed project would be required to demonstrate compliance with the AQMP, SIP, California Air Resources Board's (CARB) motor vehicle standards; SCAQMD regulations for stationary sources and architectural coatings; the California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen Code) building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy</p>	<p>catalyzed diesel particulate traps on diesel equipment, as feasible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain equipment according to manufacturers' specifications. • Restrict idling of equipment and trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes (per California Air Resources Board [CARB] regulation). • Phase grading operations to reduce disturbed areas and times of exposure. • Avoid excavation and grading during wet weather. • Limit on-site construction routes and stabilize construction entrance(s). • Remove existing vegetation only when absolutely necessary. • Sweep up spilled dry materials (e.g., cement, mortar, or dirt track-out) immediately. Never attempt to wash them away with water. Use only minimal water for dust control. • Store stockpiled materials and wastes under a temporary roof or secured plastic sheeting or tarp. • Properly dispose of all demolition wastes. Materials that can be recycled from demolition projects include: metal framing, wood, concrete, asphalt, and plate glass. Unusable, un-recyclable debris should be confined to dumpsters, covered at night, and taken to a landfill for disposal. • Hazardous debris such as asbestos must be handled in accordance with specific laws and regulations and disposed of as hazardous waste. For more information on asbestos 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6); and the proposed LUE/UDE project goals and policies.</p> <p>Future projects would also be required to implement Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2, which requires the preparation of project-specific technical assessments to ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible. However, operational characteristics and the associated emissions for future specific development projects cannot be determined at the time of this analysis. Therefore, despite implementation of Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2, and in an abundance of caution, the potential emissions impact associated with the operation of the proposed project would remain significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Construction During Project Operation. Less than Significant Impact. It is possible that construction of residential units allowed under the plan would be underway while other units constructed under the plan are operational. Since the project is a programmatic level document and specific projects that would be developed under the plan are unknown at this time, the precise combination of emissions that would occur is unknown. However, in order to disclose a worst-case scenario, the Air Quality Impact Analysis (LSA 2019) included an analysis of average construction emissions along with the horizon year 2040 project emissions. It was determined that combined emissions would be below the significance threshold established by the SCAQMD for daily project emissions.</p> <p>CO Hot-Spot Analysis. Less than Significant Impact. Under existing and future vehicle emission rates, a project would have to increase traffic volumes at a single intersection by more than 44,000 vehicles per hour—or 24,000 vehicles per hour where vertical and/or horizontal air does not mix—in order to generate a significant CO impact. The anticipated General Plan build out would not produce the volume of traffic required to</p>	<p>handling and disposal regulations, contact the SCAQMD.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures:</p> <p>MM AQ-1: Prior to issuance of any construction permits, future development projects subject to discretionary review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City of Long Beach (City) Department of Development Services, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project construction-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) methodology for assessing air quality impacts. If construction-related criteria air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during construction activities. These identified measures shall be incorporated into all appropriate construction documents (e.g., construction management plans) submitted to the City and shall be verified by the Department of Development Services. Mitigation measures to reduce construction-related emissions include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require the following fugitive-dust control measures: 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>generate a CO hot spot. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in CO hot spots. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Use nontoxic soil stabilizers to reduce wind erosion. ○ Apply water every 4 hours to active soil-disturbing activities. ○ Tarp and/or maintain a minimum of 24 inches of freeboard on trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials. ● Use construction equipment rated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as having Tier 4 (model year 2008 or newer) emission limits (when available), or Tier 3 (model year 2006 or newer), applicable for engines between 50 and 750 horsepower. ● Ensure that construction equipment is properly serviced and maintained to the manufacturers' standards. ● Limit nonessential idling of construction equipment to no more than 5 consecutive minutes. ● Using Super-Compliant volatile organic compound (VOC) paints for coating of architectural surfaces whenever possible. (A list of Super-Compliant architectural coating manufactures can be found on the SCAQMD website at http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/brochures/Super-Compliant_AIM.pdf.) ● Suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour (mph) as instantaneous gusts or when visible plumes emanate from the site and stabilize all disturbed areas. ● Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the City of 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Long Beach regarding dust complaints. The SCAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sweep all streets at least once a day using SCAQMD Rule 1186, 1186.1 certified street sweepers or roadway washing trucks if visible soil materials are carried to adjacent streets. The use of water sweepers with reclaimed water is recommended. • Apply water three times daily or non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufactures’ specifications to all unpaved parking or staging areas, unpaved road surfaces, or to areas where soil is disturbed. Reclaimed water should be used when available. • Construction vendors, contractors, and/or haul truck operators shall utilize 2010 model year trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) that meet the California Air Resources Board’s (CARB) 2010 engine emission standards at 0.01 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr) of particulate (PM) and 0.20 g/bhp-hr of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emissions or newer, cleaner trucks. Operators shall maintain records of all trucks associated with the project construction to document that each truck used meets these emission standards, and shall make the records available for inspection. <p>MM AQ-2: Prior to future discretionary project approval, development project applicants shall prepare and submit to the Director of the City</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Department of Development Services, or designee, a technical assessment evaluating potential project operation phase-related air quality impacts. The evaluation shall be prepared in conformance with SCAQMD methodology in assessing air quality impacts. If operation-related air pollutants are determined to have the potential to exceed the SCAQMD-adopted thresholds of significance, the Department of Development Services shall require that applicants for new development projects incorporate mitigation measures to reduce air pollutant emissions during operational activities. The identified measures shall be included as part of the Project Conditions of Approval. Possible mitigation measures to reduce long-term emissions include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For site-specific development that requires refrigerated vehicles, the construction documents shall demonstrate an adequate number of electrical service connections at loading docks for plugging in the anticipated number of refrigerated trailers to reduce idling time and emissions. • Applicants for manufacturing and light industrial uses shall consider energy storage and combined heat and power in appropriate applications to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use. • Site-specific developments with truck delivery and loading areas and truck parking 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>spaces shall include signage as a reminder to limit idling of vehicles while parked for loading/unloading in accordance with CARB Rule 2845 (13 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Chapter 10, Section 2485).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require that 240-volt electrical outlets or Level 3 chargers be installed in parking lots that would enable charging of neighborhood electric vehicles (NEVs) and/or battery-powered vehicles. • Maximize use of solar energy including solar panels; installing the maximum possible number of solar energy arrays on the building roofs throughout the City to generate solar energy. • Maximize the planting of trees in landscaping and parking lots. • Use light-colored paving and roofing materials. • Require use of electric or alternatively fueled street-sweepers with HEPA filters. • Require use of electric lawn mowers and leaf blowers. • Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices, and appliances. • Use of water-based or low volatile organic compound (VOC) cleaning products. 	
<p>Threshold 4.2.3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation.</p> <p>Localized Criteria Pollutants: Construction emissions associated with future individual projects developed under the proposed project would have the potential to cause or contribute to</p>	<p>Refer to Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1, above.</p> <p>MM AQ-3: Prior to future discretionary approval for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA, the City of Long Beach shall evaluate new development</p>	<p>Criteria Pollutants and Health Effects: Less than Significant with Mitigation</p> <p>TAC Emissions: Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>significant localized air quality impacts to nearby residential land uses within the planning area. To address this, regulatory measures (e.g., SCAQMD Rule 201 for a permit to operate, Rule 403 for fugitive dust control, Rule 1113 for architectural coatings, Rule 1403 for new source review, and the CARB’s Airborne Toxic Control Measures) are currently in place, and mitigation would be imposed at the project level, which may include use of special equipment.</p> <p>Health Effects: Localized construction impacts of future projects could potentially exceed Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs), particularly for construction of areas larger than 5 acres or areas with more intense construction activities. Therefore, without mitigation, exceedances of the LSTs could have the potential to cause or exacerbate an exceedance of the ambient air quality standards (AAQS).</p> <p>SCAQMD acknowledges that they have only been able to correlate potential health outcomes for very large emissions sources; specifically, 6,620 pounds per day of NO_x and 89,180 pounds per day of VOC were expected to result in approximately 20 premature deaths per year and 89,947 school absences due to ozone. It is not expected that any future projects would generate 6,620 pounds per day of NO_x or 89,180 pounds per day of VOC emissions. Rather, based on the scale of development associated with the anticipated General Plan build out, construction projects would generate an average maximum of 46.5 pounds per day of NO_x and 60.5 pounds per day of VOC. However, individual projects would still be required to conduct a site-specific localized impact analysis that evaluates potential project health impacts at a project level to immediately adjacent land uses (refer to Compliance Measure CM AQ-1 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-1) to ensure that potential health impacts associated with the construction of the proposed project would be less than significant.</p>	<p>proposals for new industrial or warehousing land uses that (1) have the potential to generate 100 or more diesel truck trips per day or have 40 or more trucks with operating diesel-powered transport refrigeration units, and (2) are within 1,000 feet of a sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools, hospitals, or nursing homes), as measured from the property line of the project to the property line of the nearest sensitive use. Such projects shall submit a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) to the City Department of Development Services. The HRA shall be prepared in accordance with policies and procedures of the most current State Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) and the SCAQMD. If the HRA shows that the incremental health risks exceed their respective thresholds, as established by the SCAQMD at the time a project is considered, the Applicant will be required to identify and demonstrate that best available control technologies for toxics (T-BACTs), including appropriate enforcement mechanisms to reduce risks to an acceptable level. T-BACTs may include, but are not limited to, restricting idling on site or electrifying warehousing docks to reduce diesel particulate matter, or requiring use of newer equipment and/or vehicles. T-BACTs identified in the HRA shall be identified as mitigation measures in the environmental document and/or incorporated into the site plan.</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>Toxic Air Contaminant (TAC) Emissions: The proposed project includes a number of goals and policies that are intended to minimize TAC impacts associated with sensitive receptors. In addition, specific measures for future development projects are required to ensure that the intended environmental protections are achieved. Compliance with Policy 16-13 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-3 would ensure that mobile sources of TACs not covered under SCAQMD permits are considered during subsequent project-level environmental review. Policy 16-13 and Mitigation Measure MM AQ-3 would also require the preparation of project-specific technical health risk assessments for certain large discretionary industrial or warehousing uses to evaluate operational-related health risk impacts to ensure that operational-related emissions are reduced to the maximum extent feasible for projects that require environmental evaluation under CEQA. However, because the scale of individual project level emissions that would be result under implementation of the LUE has not been determined or estimated and in order to present conservative assumptions, the TAC health risk impacts associated with future operation of individual projects that may occur with implementation of the proposed project are assumed to be potentially significant.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.2.4: Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. During construction activities, construction equipment exhaust and application of asphalt and architectural coatings would temporarily generate odors. Any construction-related odor emissions would be temporary and intermittent. Additionally, noxious odors would be confined to the immediate vicinity of the construction equipment and</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>unlikely to affect a substantial number of people. In addition, by the time such emissions reached any sensitive receptor sites, they would be diluted to well below any level of air quality concern. Furthermore, short-term construction-related odors are expected to cease upon the drying or hardening of the odor-producing materials. Therefore, impacts associated with construction-generated odors are considered less than significant.</p> <p>While odor sources are present within the City, the odor policies enforced by the SCAQMD, including Rule 402, and City of Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.64.040, prohibit nuisance odors and identify enforcement measures to reduce odor impacts to nearby receptors. Therefore, impacts associated with objectionable odors would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Air Quality Impacts.</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable Impact. The cumulative study area analyzed for potential air quality impacts is the South Coast Air Basin (Basin). Each project in the Basin is required to comply with SCAQMD rules and regulations and is subject to independent review.</p> <p>Future development that may occur with implementation of the project would contribute criteria pollutants to the area during project construction and operation. However, future development under the proposed project would be required to comply with CARB motor vehicle standards, SCAQMD regulations from stationary sources and architectural coatings, CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), and the proposed LUE/UDE project goals and policies.</p>	<p>Refer to Compliance Measure CM AQ-1, as well as Mitigation Measures MM AQ-1 through MM AQ-3.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Since the combination, number, and size of projects that could be under construction at any one time are unknown, even with implementation of MM AQ-1, the proposed project would result in significant cumulative construction emissions from criteria pollutants. Additionally, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM AQ-2, operational impacts from criteria pollutant emissions would contribute to an O₃ exceedance, which could hinder the attainment of air quality standards. Further, cumulative growth within the City could result in potential TAC health risks exceeding 10 in one million and could cumulatively contribute to elevated health risks in the Basin, as identified in the Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES). Therefore, air quality emissions associated with future development that may occur under the proposed project could result in cumulatively considerable impacts, even with implementation of mitigation.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts with respect to the generation of odors affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant following compliance with odor policies enforced by the SCAQMD (including Rule 402) and City of Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.64.040.</p>		
4.3: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
<p>Threshold 4.3.1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would contribute to global climate change (GCC) through direct and indirect emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) from land uses within the City of Long Beach (City). The anticipated build out of the proposed project would reduce the GHG emissions from 3.8 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year per service population (MT of CO₂e/yr/SP) under existing conditions down to 2.5 MT of</p>	<p>MM GHG-1: The City of Long Beach (City) shall develop and adopt a greenhouse gas (GHG) Reduction Plan or Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term State GHG reduction goals. Within approximately 36 months of adoption of the proposed General Plan Land Use Element (LUE)/Urban Design Element (UDE) project, the City of Long Beach shall prepare and present a CAAP to the City Council for adoption. The CAAP shall identify</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>CO₂e/yr/SP. Although the GHG emissions per service population would be lower under future year conditions, the emission rate of 2.5 MT CO₂e/yr/SP would exceed the 1.92 MT CO₂e/yr/SP criterion established by the City for purposes of this environmental evaluation.</p> <p>While the proposed project includes various policies that would contribute to reduced GHG emissions, the City would require assistance from additional federal and State programs and regulations to achieve the long-term GHG emissions goal and efficiency threshold. Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1 would reduce GHG emissions. However, in addition to the proposed mitigation measure, additional statewide measures may be required in order to meet the service population threshold set by the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). Because the performance of GHG reduction measures in the CAAP and compliance with future targets cannot be assured at this time, and in an abundance of caution, GHG emission impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>strategies to be implemented to reduce GHG emissions associated with the City. In addition, the City shall monitor GHG emissions by updating its community-wide GHG emissions inventory every 5 years upon adoption of the initial CAAP, which will include details on how the reduction programs will be implemented and will designate responsible parties to monitor progress and ensure implementation of the reductions within the CAAP. A monitoring and reporting program shall be included to ensure the CAAP achieves the reduction targets.</p>	
<p>Threshold 4.3.2: Would the project conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</p> <p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. In addition to the City's <i>Sustainable City Action Plan</i> (SCAP), the CARB's Scoping Plan, and the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS identify strategies to reduce GHG emissions, both of which are applicable to the proposed project. The proposed project and its policies would be consistent with applicable measures and goals identified in the City's SCAP, the CARB Scoping Plan, and SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS). Furthermore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1, which requires the City to adopt a GHG Reduction Plan or Climate Action and Adaption Plan, the proposed project would not conflict with or impede</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure MM GHG-1, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>implementation of reduction goals identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and Senate Bill (SB) 32. The project would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the GHG emissions of the project. Further, the proposed project would result in a net reduction of overall GHG emissions as compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, program, policy, or regulation related to the reduction of GHG emissions.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Although the proposed project is expected to emit GHGs, the emission of GHGs by any single project into the atmosphere is not itself necessarily an adverse environmental effect. Rather, it is the increased accumulation of GHGs from more than one project and many sources in the atmosphere that may result in GHG impacts. The resultant climate change consequences of those emissions, including sea level rise, could cause adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>The proposed project would result in a GHG emission profile that is lower than existing GHG emissions within the City. Additionally, since climate change is a global issue, it is unlikely that the proposed project would generate enough GHG emissions to influence GCC on its own. Because the proposed project’s impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to GCC, project-related CO₂e emissions and their contribution to GCC impacts in the State of California would not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable GHG emission impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant long-term cumulative impact on GCC (including sea level rise).</p> <p>Rising sea levels may affect the built environment, including coastal development such as buildings, roads, and</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>infrastructure. However, future projects facilitated under the proposed project would be planned in consideration of the conditions at the time they are proposed and would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis during environmental review for their potential to be affected by the change in sea level resulting from GCC.</p>		
4.4: LAND USE AND PLANNING		
<p>Threshold 4.4.2: Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>California Coastal Act. In accordance with Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act (CCA), the proposed project aims to protect, maintain, and enhance the overall quality of the California Coastal Zone by preserving existing natural resources within the Coastal Zone. The proposed project allows a balance between orderly, new development and conservation. Specifically, Strategy No. 19 in the LUE aims to protect and preserve water bodies, and LU Policies 19-1 through LU 19-5 aim to protect and preserve marine resources and the coastal environment. The proposed project also includes a number of other goals, policies, and strategies aimed at achieving compliance with goals outlined in Chapter 3 of the CCA, including those focused on maintaining public to the coast and encouraging coastal-dependent and water-related uses. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals and policies outlined in the CCA. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Local Coastal Program: The proposed LUE would re-designate land uses within the City’s Coastal Zone with the proposed</p>	<p>Project Design Feature 4.4.1: To ensure that the proposed project complies with and would not conflict with or impede the City of Long Beach (City) Zoning Code, the project shall implement a Zone Change Program and Local Coastal Program (LCP) update to ensure that changes facilitated by the adopted Land Use Element (LUE) are consistent with the Zoning Code and LCP. The Zone Change Program and LCP update shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the City Director of Development Services, or designee, and shall include the following specific performance criteria to be implemented within 5 years from the date of project approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 1: Within the first 12 months following project approval, all Land Use Element/Zoning Code/LCP inconsistencies shall be identified and mapped. The City shall evaluate these inconsistencies and prioritize areas needing intervention. • Year 2: Following the identification and mapping of any zoning and LCP inconsistencies, the City shall, within 24 months following project approval, begin processing zone changes, zone text 	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Downtown, Waterfront, Neighborhood-Serving Center or Corridor, Open Space, Founding and Contemporary Neighborhood, and Multi-Family Residential-Moderate PlaceTypes. Because the proposed project would result in updates to the City’s General Plan that would be inconsistent with portions of the City’s existing Local Coastal Program (LCP), project implementation could result in potential land use conflicts with the LCP. Therefore, updates/amendments to the City’s LCP could be required at the time individual applications for development within the City’s Coastal Zone are proposed, if they were determined by the City to be inconsistent with the adopted General Plan LUE. All environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) within the Coastal Zone will remain protected following project implementation. The ESHA map for the City will not change, and future LCP amendments will be further refined at the time individual applications for development within the City’s Coastal Zone are proposed. In addition, the proposed project includes Project Design Feature 4.4.1, which mandates a Zone Change Program and LCP update to ensure that changes facilitated by the adopted LUE are consistent with the Zoning Code and LCP. Approval of these future LCP amendments would reduce potential inconsistencies with the City’s LCP to a less than significant level. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>SCAG 2008 RCP. The 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) aims to balance growth with conservation by focusing growth in existing centers and along major transportation corridors, encouraging mixed-use development, providing new housing opportunities, encouraging development near transportation stations to reduce congestion and air pollutants, preserving single-family neighborhoods, and protecting open space areas from development.</p>	<p>amendments, and LCP updates in batches, as required to ensure that the Zoning Code and LCP are consistent with the adopted LUE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Year 3: The City shall, within 36 months following project approval, begin drafting new zones, or begin preparation of a comprehensive Zoning Code and LCP update, to better reflect the PlaceTypes identified in the adopted LUE. • Year 5: All zoning and LCP inconsistencies shall be resolved through mapping and text amendments by the end of the fifth year following project approval. The City shall also submit the updated LCP to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for consideration and approval by the end of the fifth year following project approval. 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>The proposed project would adopt PlaceTypes, which would emphasize flexible land use patterns and would allow for a mix of compatible uses in areas throughout the City. Specifically, the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType would encourage mixed-use development near transit-rich areas, which would serve to reduce congestion and associated air pollutants. The project would also allow for residential uses within the Founding and Contemporary Neighborhood, Multi-Family, Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors, Transit-Oriented Development, Downtown, and Waterfront PlaceTypes, which would be consistent with the 2008 RCP’s goals to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods while also providing additional housing opportunities in denser areas of the City. The project would also establish the Open Space PlaceType, which is intended to protect existing open space uses and environmentally sensitive areas in the City. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the 2008 RCP’s goals to preserve existing single-family neighborhoods and protect open space and areas from development.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable goals outlined in the 2008 RCP. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>SCAG RTP/SCS Consistency. The RTP/SCS provides a comprehensive outline for transportation investments throughout the SCAG region. The RTP/SCS includes goals to protect the environment and health of its residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation, provide new housing opportunities, and enable businesses to be profitable and competitive. The proposed project would establish the Transit-Oriented Development-Low and Moderate PlaceTypes, which would promote mixed-use development adjacent to stations along existing bus routes and along the</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Metro Blue Line route. The project would also allow for mixed-use development in most of the proposed PlaceTypes and would focus on creating walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods that would reduce automobile dependence and improve the transportation network. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the RTP/SCS goal to protect the environment and health of its residents by improving air quality and encouraging active transportation. The proposed project would also promote a variety of housing types by allowing for varying building densities within the proposed PlaceTypes. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the RTP/SCS's goals of providing new housing opportunities.</p> <p>In addition, the project would promote a diverse economy by allowing for a variety of businesses within many of the proposed PlaceTypes and would preserve the natural environment through the establishment of the Open Space PlaceType. The project would also establish the Regional-Serving Facilities PlaceType, which would allow for the operation of existing regional-serving facilities in the City, such as the Port of Long Beach, California State University Long Beach, and the Long Beach Airport.</p> <p>The proposed project would be consistent with the 2016–2040 RTP. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>General Plan, Specific Plan, Paleontological Mitigation Plan (PMP), and Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) Consistency: As part of the proposed LUE, the 14 PlaceTypes would replace the existing land use designations. Although the proposed PlaceTypes are currently inconsistent with the existing General Plan land use designations, approval of the proposed project would result in the project being consistent with the General</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Plan and would ensure the proposed LUE would be the presiding policy document guiding land use in the City. The goals and policies in the General Plan would be updated and replaced by the goals, strategies, policies, and implementation strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE.</p> <p>The proposed PlaceTypes would be consistent with adopted specific plans currently regulating development in the City. For example, the land use plan incorporates the Southeast Area Specific Plan (SEASP) into the Regional-Serving Facility and Open Space PlaceTypes, the Downtown Plan into the Downtown PlaceType, and the Midtown Specific Plan in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType. The proposed project also incorporates the PMP into the Regional-Servicing Facility PlaceType. Similarly, the proposed project would allow for development within adopted airport land use plans to continue to be regulated by such plans. The proposed project, once approved, would therefore be consistent with adopted land use plans. Impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>City Zoning Code: The proposed LUE would allow for increased densities, intensities, and heights throughout the City as compared to the existing General Plan and Zoning Code. While the PlaceTypes included as part of the project would be inconsistent with some current zoning districts and regulations outlined in the City’s existing Zoning Code and corresponding Zoning Map, the project includes Project Design Feature 4.4.1 to address such inconsistencies. Additionally, the proposed UDE would also establish goals, policies, and implementation strategies aimed at guiding the desired urban form and character associated with each PlaceType included in the proposed LUE. Therefore, with incorporation of Project Design Feature 4.4.1, the proposed project would be consistent with the City’s Zoning Code and Zoning Map.</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The cumulative impact area for land use for the proposed project is the City of Long Beach. Given that the proposed project encompasses a comprehensive update to the City’s existing General Plan LUE and the adoption of a new UDE, the project itself would shape growth in the City through the horizon year 2040 and is therefore cumulative in nature. As such, each new development project facilitated by project approval and subject to discretionary review would be subject to its own General Plan consistency analysis and would be reviewed for consistency with adopted land use plans and policies.</p> <p>Approval of the proposed project would ensure that the proposed LUE would become the guiding land use document for the City, thereby mitigating any potential inconsistencies with the City’s General Plan and other applicable land use documents (i.e., the California Coastal Act, the City’s LCP, and SCAG’s RCP and RTP/SCS). The project would also address potential inconsistencies with the City’s Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map within the first 5 years following project approval (as outlined in Project Design Feature 4.4.1), which would reduce cumulative project impacts related to potential zoning inconsistencies to a less than significant level. No mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>
4.5: NOISE		
<p>Threshold 4.5.1: Would the project generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p>Significant Unavoidable Impact.</p>	<p>MM NOI-1 Project contractors shall implement the following construction best management practices during construction of activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schedule high-noise and vibration-producing activities to a shorter window of time during the day outside early morning hours to 	<p>Short-Term Construction-Related Noise: Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>Long-Term Stationary-Source Noise Impacts and Long Term Traffic Noise Impacts: Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Short-Term Construction-Related Noise Impacts. Two types of short-term noise impacts could occur during construction of potential development allowed by the LUE. First, construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the site for future projects would incrementally increase noise levels on access roads leading to the sites. Although there would be a relatively high single-event noise exposure potential causing intermittent noise nuisance, the effect on longer-term (hourly or daily) ambient noise levels would be small.</p> <p>The second type of short-term noise impact is related to noise generated during demolition, site preparation, excavation, grading, and building erection on the future project sites. The maximum noise level generated by a typical loud piece of construction equipment (e.g., a scraper) on future project sites would be approximately 87 A-weighted decibels (dBA) maximum instantaneous noise level (L_{max}) at 50 ft from the piece of equipment. Assuming that each piece of construction equipment operates at some distance from the other equipment, the worst-case combined noise level during this phase of future construction would be 91 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 ft from the active construction area.</p> <p>Specific construction project data that may occur with implementation of the LUE/UDE, including location and noise levels at surrounding sensitive receptors, are unknown at this time. Some projects may have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.). Therefore, construction projects may result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels, and mitigation would be required. Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects implemented under the LUE/UDE to implement Construction BMPS to reduce potential</p>	<p>minimize disruption to sensitive uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower noise and vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment. • Construction haul trucks and materials delivery traffic shall avoid residential areas whenever feasible. • The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses whenever feasible. • Locate equipment staging in areas that would create the greatest possible distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the active project site during all project construction. • Prohibit extended idling time of internal combustion engines. • Ensure that all general construction related activities are restricted to 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and federal holidays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction would be permitted on Sundays. Construction activities occurring outside of these hours may be permitted with authorization by the Building Official and/or permit issued by the Noise Control Officer. • All residential units located within 500 feet of a construction site shall be sent a notice 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>construction-period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors. Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, since the location, proximity to sensitive receptors, and type of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are unknown at this time, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Long-Term Stationary-Source Noise Impacts. Development allowed under the proposed LUE may include the installation or creation of new stationary sources of noise, or could include the development of new sensitive land uses in the vicinity of existing noise sources. However, noise generation would continue to be limited by the Noise Ordinance of the City’s Municipal Code (Chapter 8.80).</p> <p>Implementation of the LUE is not anticipated to result in increased railroad operations within the City. However, the LUE proposes the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType, which would allow future multifamily developments to be located along the Metro Blue Line fixed rail route. Locating multifamily developments near the light-rail corridor could expose sensitive land uses to operational rail noise.</p> <p>Several of the LUE and UDE policies require new development projects to incorporate site planning and project design strategies to separate or buffer neighborhoods from incompatible activities or land uses. Specifically Policy UD 26-2 requires new development projects to incorporate site planning and project design strategies to separate or buffer neighborhoods from incompatible activities or land uses and LU Policy 16-8 requires that all new developments in areas with noise levels greater than 60 dBA CNEL prepare an acoustical analysis. LU Policy 16-8 also requires new residential land uses</p>	<p>regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a distance of 50 feet shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for a “noise disturbance coordinator.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “noise disturbance coordinator” shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g. starting too early or bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable measures to reduce noise levels. • For all projects determined to have unusual or extremely loud construction activities (e.g., pile driving, nighttime construction work, or unusually long construction duration, etc.) that would generate noise levels over 90 dBA Leq at nearby sensitive receptors, temporary noise control blanket barriers shall be installed in a manner to shield sensitive receptors land uses. 	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>to be designed to maintain a standard of 45 dBA Ldn or less in building interiors. Any new noise-generating sources would also be subject to compliance with Chapter 8.80, Noise, of the City’s Municipal Code, which sets exterior noise standards for the various land uses within the City. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose persons to noise levels in excess of the City’s Municipal Code, and no mitigation measures are required.</p> <p>Long-Term Traffic Noise Impacts. Potential sources of permanent increase in ambient noise include noise resulting from the project-related increase in traffic on roadways in the planning area. Based on traffic volumes outlined in the <i>Traffic Impact Analysis</i> (TIA) (LSA 2019) for the proposed project, it was determined that the project-related increase in traffic noise would approach 2.1 dBA for all segments, which is considered less than the threshold of perceptibility for humans (i.e., 3 dBA). Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in the generation of substantial traffic noise increases, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.5.2: Would the project generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact With Mitigation.</p> <p>Chapter 8.80 of the City’s Noise Ordinance limits the operation of any device that creates vibration, including pile driving, that is above the vibration perception threshold. Any construction activities associated with implementation of the proposed project would be required to comply with the Noise Ordinance requirements. However, because the construction of future projects associated with implementation of the proposed project could result in the generation of ground-borne vibration, future discretionary projects occurring under the proposed project would also be required to comply with</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1. Specifically, Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would require future construction projects implemented under the LUE/UDE to implement construction best management practices to minimize vibration impacts for nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level. Compliance with Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would serve to reduce impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive ground-borne vibration or noise levels.</p> <p>As discussed above, implementation of the proposed project would include policies and strategies that protect sensitive receptors from vibration in excess of acceptable levels. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the exposure of persons to excessive ground-borne vibration and/or ground-borne noise levels.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.5.3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?</p> <p>No Impact. Aircraft noise in the City is primarily related to aircraft operations at Long Beach Airport, Los Angeles International Airport, and John Wayne Airport. Long Beach Airport is located centrally within the City, approximately 3 miles northeast of downtown. As stated in Section 16.43.050 of the Municipal Code, It is the goal of the City that Incompatible Property in the vicinity of the Airport shall not be exposed to noise above 65 dBA CNEL. Implementation of the LUE and UDE would locate business parks and airport-related land uses surrounding the airport and would not introduce any new noise-sensitive receptors within the 65 dBA noise contour. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No Impact</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources, no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Noise Impacts. Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Cumulative Stationary-Source Noise Impacts and Long-Term Traffic Noise Impacts. The proposed project would not create a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional noise conditions. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a 3 dBA increase in traffic noise levels in the City and would not generate a significant impact under cumulative noise conditions. Additionally, implementation of the LUE/UDE policies and land use strategies would require the City to consider noise and land use compatibility issues when evaluating future individual development proposals. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant cumulative impact under long-term cumulative noise conditions, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>Construction-Related Noise Impacts. Construction activities associated with development anticipated under the proposed project would be subject to compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced. In addition, with implementation of Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, individual projects would be required to implement construction best management practices to reduce potential construction-period noise impacts for nearby sensitive receptors. Although Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1 would reduce construction noise associated with future projects, since the location, the proximity to sensitive receptors, and the types of construction equipment associated with new construction projects are all unknown at this time, in an</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1, above.</p>	<p>Cumulative Stationary-Source Noise Impacts and Long-Term Traffic Noise Impacts: Less than Significant</p> <p>Cumulative Construction-Related Noise: Significant and Unavoidable</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>abundance of caution, cumulative construction noise impacts would have a significant and unavoidable cumulative contribution to the total noise environment in the City.</p>		
4.6: POPULATION AND HOUSING		
<p>Threshold 4.6.1: Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. A project could indirectly induce growth by reducing or removing barriers to growth or by creating a condition that attracts additional population or new economic activity. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG). Significant growth impacts could also occur if the project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth beyond the levels currently permitted by local or regional plans and policies. In general, growth induced by a project is considered a significant impact if it directly or indirectly affects the ability of agencies to provide needed public utilities, or if it can be demonstrated that the potential growth significantly affects the environment in some other way.</p> <p>The proposed project would allow for an increase in population, employment, and housing in the City of Long Beach through the horizon year 2040. With the exception of housing, this increase would be consistent with SCAG’s regional growth forecasts for each of these areas for the same horizon year. However, much of the housing unit increase is expected to accommodate existing residents due to a combination of aging in place and overcrowded housing conditions, as identified in the City’s AFH</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>report. Therefore, the project’s growth-inducing potential would be less than significant, as it would not foster growth in excess of what is already anticipated in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG). Further, because the proposed project would facilitate an increase in non-residential uses, the proposed project is anticipated to meet any increased demands for additional goods and services associated with the projected increase in population.</p> <p>In addition, improvements to public utilities, including new water, sanitary sewer, and storm water services would be identified on a project-specific basis as new developments are proposed. Infrastructure improvements associated with future development facilitated by project approval would be sized appropriately for each project and would not be oversized to serve additional growth beyond that envisioned under the proposed LUE. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to the inducement of substantial unplanned population growth in an area. No mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The City’s population and employment are anticipated to increase by 18,230 persons and 28,511 jobs by 2040. Project-related increases in population and employment have been accounted for in SCAG’s growth projections for the City. As demonstrated by growth projections outlined in SCAG’s 2016–2040 RTP, demographic growth is anticipated to occur in the planning area regardless of the proposed LUE; however, the proposed LUE would affect the distribution of projected demographic growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in cumulative population or employment increases that would exceed projected regional forecasts for the City.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Approval of the proposed project would allow for the future development of a variety of uses that would serve to provide a sound and diversified economic base and ample employment opportunities for the citizens of Long Beach. Furthermore, the proposed project will serve an existing demand for employment, while also meeting the cumulative demand of employment that will result from the City’s projected future population. With the exception of housing, project-related increases in population and employment would be within the total projected growth forecasts for 2040 established in the Final 2016–2040 RTP. The increase in housing above what is projected in the 2016–2040 is required to alleviate existing overcrowding conditions as identified in the AFH, as well as meet the City’s affordable housing requirements under the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). As such, housing growth envisioned under the proposed project would not significantly induce growth within the planning area. In addition, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with the City’s vision for the community and State housing requirements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively significant population or housing impact and the future development facilitated by project approval would not significantly induce growth in areas where growth was not previously anticipated. No mitigation would be required.</p>		
4.7: PUBLIC SERVICES		
<p>Threshold 4.7.1: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for fire protection?</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Less than Significant Impact. As a result of increased growth accommodated by the proposed project, overall demands for fire protection services and emergency services in the City would increase. Consequently, additional Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) resources (including staffing) would be required to provide fire protection for new residents, workers, and structures. The City’s costs to maintain facilities and equipment as well as train and equip personnel would also increase. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. The LBFD would also continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue; the City’s General Funds; the City’s Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. Therefore, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary improvements to provide for adequate fire facilities, equipment, and personnel upon the anticipated General Plan build out. Additionally, the proposed PlaceType designations would permit the future development and operation of new stations within these PlaceTypes. The proposed project permits development of new stations, proposes no physical improvements, and requires all future projects to assess project impacts on fire protection services. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.7.2: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for <i>police protection</i>?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements, but allows future development that is anticipated to create an increase in the typical range of police service calls within the City. New and/or additional police resources would be needed to prevent an impact to service ratios as a result of future growth accommodated by the project. The City’s costs to maintain facilities and equipment as well as train and equip personnel would also increase. The costs of additional personnel and materials are anticipated to be offset through the increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes, generated by future development. Future projects would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Prior to the issuance of building permits, future project applicants would be required to pay the adopted police facilities impact fees. Additional police personnel and resources would be provided through the annual budget review process. Furthermore, the Long Beach Police Department (LBPB) would continue to be supported by Proposition H revenue, a per barrel tax on all oil producers in Long Beach; the City’s Tidelands operation revenue; and other revenue sources. By following this process, sufficient revenue would be available for necessary service improvements to provide for adequate police facilities, equipment, and personnel under the anticipated General Plan build out. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.7.3: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for public schools?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would allow for the future development of up to 28,524 dwelling units by 2040, which would result in the generation of additional school-age children within the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) service area. Of the 28,524 units, the City has identified a need for 21,476 housing units to address existing housing needs attributed to overcrowding. As such, the majority of the 28,524 anticipated new housing units would serve to relieve overcrowding of existing households in the City, so those families are already being served by LBUSD. Still, this potential future growth could strain existing and/or planned school facilities.</p> <p>Based on student generation factors and projected growth in the City, it was determined that the anticipated General Plan build out would result in an increase in 5,272 students. With the anticipated General Plan build out, elementary and middle school enrollment in LBUSD would be within the 2017–2018 LBUSD facilities capacity, but the total estimated enrollment for high schools in 2040 could exceed the LBUSD current facilities’ capacity. All future development projects in the City would be required to pay school developer fees to LBUSD for the operation, maintenance, and development of schools to accommodate future student enrollment. If student growth generated by the anticipated General Plan build out exceeds the estimates identified above, the acquisition, modernization, or modification of school sites to accommodate additional facilities</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>could be required. Additional school resources would also continue to be funded by an increase in tax revenue as a result of future growth. In addition, new housing units would be built over the course of 21 years, during which enrollment rates would likely fluctuate. Therefore, impacts of the proposed project related to student generation and the potential need for additional school facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.7.5: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any other public facilities?</p> <p>Public Library.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include any physical improvements but would allow for new PlaceTypes that would facilitate an increase in housing units in the City and could increase the demand for library facilities. Demand for library services is typically determined based on the size of the resident population. The City has not formally adopted a service standard of library space per capita, but the City did establish a target of 0.45 square feet (sf) per capita in its budget for Fiscal Year 2007. Using this standard and the estimated future population of approximately 484,485, the Long Beach Public Library System (LBPL) would need to contain a total of 218,019¹ sf to meet this target. In total, the existing LBPL system has approximately 237,695 sf of library facilities, which is greater than the City’s threshold for providing library</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

¹ 0.45 square feet per the City’s population of 484,485 in 2040.

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>services for both the existing population and the projected demand generated by the anticipated build out of the General Plan. In addition, technology continues to evolve as does resident demand for library services and resources. With the increased demand for electronic resources, it may be valuable to measure library services by more than a square footage per capita benchmark. For example, the City is replacing the Main Library with a new library at the City’s Civic Center. Although this library is smaller in square footage than the original library, the new library makes more efficient use of its space. It also contains more electronic resources and requires less space to accommodate hardcopy library materials. Therefore, the loss of library square footage is not considered a loss of library volumes or available resources to serve the existing and projected population in the City. It is anticipated that the demand for electronic materials will continue to increase, potentially reducing the amount of square footage to service library patrons. The proposed project’s increase in demand on library services can be served by the existing facilities and would not adversely affect library services in the project area. As such, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to public libraries, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Public Service Impacts. Less than Significant Impact. Fire Protection. The proposed project would contribute to cumulative local and regional demand for fire services. Each future project requiring a discretionary action within the City would be evaluated individually, and project-specific mitigation would be proposed as needed. The costs of additional LBFD resources are anticipated to be offset through increased revenues and fees, such as property taxes and Fire Facilities Impact Fees, generated by future development. The City is</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>almost entirely built out, with most new development occurring as in-fill projects. The LBFD anticipates cumulative demand in order to plan for overall service. This cumulative demand is anticipated to be met through project implementation as the LUE establishes the development of future fire stations. Furthermore, through implementation of the proposed project, the City will reduce the potential for dangerous fires by concentrating development within urban areas where there is a low fire risk and by requiring that future projects, including those that would replace older outdated buildings, comply with applicable City and State regulations related to fire. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to fire protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Police Protection. The City is almost entirely built out, with most new development occurring as in-fill projects. The cumulative demand for police protection services is anticipated to be met through project implementation, as the LUE establishes the development of future police stations. In addition, the need for additional law enforcement associated with cumulative growth would be addressed through the annual budgeting process when budget adjustments would be made in an effort to meet changes in service demand. Police facility impact fees would also be required for new residential and nonresidential development to offset additional costs of new development. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to police protection impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Public Schools. The proposed project would generate approximately 5,272 school-aged children, which would lead to an increased demand on existing educational school facilities. Future projects consistent with the LUE would be accounted for on a project-by-project basis. Residential projects located within</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>the LBUSD service area, but outside the City, would have the potential to generate school-aged children, and, as a result, increase demand on educational school facilities. LBUSD would assess developer fees to future projects within its service area in an effort to fund future schools needed to meet the project-related increase in school-aged children. Therefore, the proposed project would not contribute to any cumulative school impacts, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Public Libraries. The City currently meets the LBPL system’s square footage requirements, and the proposed project would not exceed the LBPL system’s ability to meet the anticipated General Plan build out for library services. Further, the City has replaced older less-efficient library buildings with newer facilities with more electronic resources and library materials. As the demand for electronic resources continues to increase, less square footage is required for library facilities. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to library impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
4.8: TRANSPORTATION		
<p>Threshold 4.8.1: Would the project conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>Arterial Intersections. State agencies forecast regional demographic growth and the MPO (i.e., SCAG) uses the data provided by the State for the RTP/SCS process. As established in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS, demographic trends for the planning area (e.g., population and employment growth) are forecast to occur whether or not the proposed LUE/UDE are adopted. This has been shown to be true in Long Beach, where overcrowding resulted from population increase occurring even without a sufficient housing increase to support it. As is required by CEQA,</p>	<p>MM T-1 Prior to approval of any discretionary project that is forecast to generate 100 or more peak-hour trips, as determined by the City of Long Beach (City) Traffic Engineer, the property owners/developers shall prepare a traffic improvement analysis of any facilities under the jurisdiction of Caltrans at which the project is anticipated to contribute 50 or more peak-hour trips, analyzing the impact on such state transportation facilities where Caltrans has previously prepared a valid traffic study, as identified below, and identified feasible operational and physical improvements and has determined the associated fees necessary to</p>	<p>Arterial Intersections, Congestion Management Program Intersections, Caltrans Ramp Intersections, and Caltrans Arterial and Freeway Facilities: Significant and Unavoidable</p> <p>Congestion Management Program Transit: Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>however, the TIA for the proposed project compared traffic conditions in the future associated with the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) scenario with existing conditions (2018). Results of this analysis indicated that traffic growth associated with the anticipated General Plan Build Out would result in significant impacts at 48 of the 120 intersections included in the study area (40 percent).</p> <p>In order to provide an expanded comparison of the effects of the increased housing and locational change of land use concentration in the proposed project, the TIA also compared the results of the General Plan Build Out (2040) No Project and the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) With the Project scenarios. Results of this analysis showed that when compared to the previous plan, the project would result in some intersections operating better and some intersections operating poorer due to the redistribution of land uses.</p> <p>Congestion Management Program Intersections. The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Plan (CMP) monitors 10 intersections within the City of Long Beach. Based on the analysis presented in the TIA, future traffic growth and traffic growth associated with the proposed project are anticipated to result in level of service (LOS) F conditions (with a 0.02 or greater increase in volume-to-capacity [v/c]) at 4 of the 10 CMP intersections in Long Beach and would, therefore, have a significant impact.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Congestion Management Program Transit. Long Beach is served by a robust transit network. The proposed project increases density of land uses adjacent to transit corridors to leverage the existing transit infrastructure and potentially reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>mitigate project-related impacts. The fair share cost of such improvements shall be assessed if transportation analysis demonstrates such improvements can achieve vehicle level of service (LOS) D (as measured by Intersection Capacity Utilization or Highway Capacity Manual methodology) or an improved vehicle level of service, if LOS D cannot be feasibly achieved. The Conditions of Approval for the project shall require the property owner/developer to construct, bond for, or pay reasonable fair share fees to the City who will work jointly with Caltrans to implement such improvements, unless alternative funding sources have been identified.</p> <p>In the event that Caltrans prepares a valid study, as defined below, that identifies fair share contribution funding sources attributable to and paid from private development to supplement other regional and State funding sources necessary to undertake improvements of impacted state transportation facilities, then the project applicant shall use reasonable efforts to pay the applicable fair share amount to Caltrans. The study shall be reviewed and approved by the California Transportation Commission. It shall include fair share contributions related to private development based on nexus requirements contained in the Mitigation Fee Act (Govt. Code § 66000 et seq.) and 14 Cal. Code of Regs. § 15126.4(a)(4) and, to this end, the study shall recognize that impacts to Caltrans facilities that are not</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Based on the guidance provided in the Los Angeles County CMP, it is estimated that 7 percent of residential person-trips and 9 percent of commercial person-trips in the Downtown PlaceType (within 0.25 mile of the Transit Gallery multi-modal transportation corridor), 5 percent of residential person-trips and 7 percent of commercial person-trips in the Transit-Oriented Development PlaceType (within 0.25 mile of the Blue Line, a CMP transit corridor), and 3.5 percent of all other person-trips would be transit trips.</p> <p>For residential and commercial person-trip data, this analysis uses population and employment data respectively. The data developed for the anticipated General Plan Build Out (2040) With Proposed Land Use Plan scenario estimated that the population in the Downtown PlaceType would increase by 3,190 while employment would increase by 5,200. Transit-Oriented Development PlaceTypes will have a population increase of 7,448 and an employment increase of 268. The population increase for all other areas of Long Beach is 7,592, and the employment increase of all other areas is 23,043. To avoid double counting, 22 percent of the total 18,230 population change was estimated to both live and work in Long Beach, which is the existing percentage.</p> <p>The estimated percentage of transit trips and estimated person-trips described above result in an estimated new transit ridership of 2,014 during the single busiest morning peak hour and 2,014 during the single busiest evening peak hour by 2040. Morning and evening commute periods last for multiple hours, but the transit ridership during the remainder of the peak commute periods (as well as midday and late evening) would be lower than this single hour transit demand. The busiest hour transit demand would be spread across the Blue Line, 34 fixed routes operated by Long Beach Transit (LBT), and other transit operators in Long Beach. On average, each route would</p>	<p>attributable to development located within the City of Long Beach are not required to pay in excess of such developments' fair share obligations. The fee study shall also be compliant with Government Code § 66001(g) and any other applicable provisions of law. If Caltrans chooses to accept the project Applicant's fair share payment, Caltrans shall apply the payment to the fee program adopted by Caltrans or agreed upon by the City and Caltrans as a result of the fair share fee study.</p>	

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>experience an increase of approximately 50 riders during the peak hours, which is unlikely to create an impact to the existing and future transit service.</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p> <p>Caltrans Ramp Intersections. Based on the analysis in the TIA, 6 of the 30 sampled Caltrans intersections operate at unsatisfactory LOS (i.e., beyond LOS E) in the existing condition and would continue to operate at unsatisfactory LOS in the future regardless of the project. Two additional intersections function at LOS E or better in existing conditions, but would function at LOS F in the future regardless of the project.</p> <p>According to the performance criteria established for this TIA, the project is found to have potentially significant impacts on the following Caltrans intersections according to Caltrans impact criteria (i.e., contribution of traffic to a facility operating in excess of its operational standard). Because this analysis sampled Caltrans intersections, potentially significant traffic impacts may occur at additional intersections not included in the list below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redondo Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway • Lakewood Boulevard/Del Amo Boulevard • Lakewood Boulevard/Spring Street • Lakewood Boulevard/I-405 Eastbound Ramps • Pacific Coast Highway/Anaheim Street • I-605 Southbound Ramps/Carson Street <p>Caltrans Arterial and Freeway Facilities. The TIA analyzed freeway facilities including mainline segments, merging segments, and diverge segments. Many of these facilities were found to function beyond their designed LOS in existing conditions. The project would contribute additional traffic</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>volume, which would constitute a significant impact according to the established criteria. On- and off-ramps in the study area were found to meet the design guidelines.</p> <p>The TIA analyzed arterials that are on the State Highway System. The performance of these roadways was found to meet LOS standards meaning that vehicle delay on these facilities is a result of intersection performance.</p> <p>Potential Physical Improvements. The TIA identified potentially significant traffic impacts to vehicle LOS at intersections in Long Beach, intersections in neighboring cities, Caltrans intersections, and freeway facilities. Of the 120 intersections included in the study area, 48 of them (40 percent) would be significantly impacted by traffic volume increases between existing and future conditions. The TIA considered the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D with projected future traffic volumes. The TIA also considered the constraints to constructing the physical improvements. Constraints could include the intersection being located outside of the City’s jurisdiction, which eliminates the City’s authority to compel physical improvements. Physical improvements located outside of the existing right-of-way could be infeasible or result in increased environmental impacts.</p> <p>Physical improvements outside of existing rights-of-way would be further challenged if impacting existing structures or open space. Constraints could also exist if improvements could be completed within the existing rights-of-way but would conflict with other travel modes. The Mobility Element states that “the City may accept levels of service below the City standard of D in exchange for pedestrian, bicycle, and/or transit improvements. This balanced approach will help the City create a more balanced multimodal transportation system that supports appropriate infill projects and transit-oriented development strategies.”</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>All of the physical improvements necessary for impacted intersections to function at LOS D are subject to constraints that render the addition of vehicle capacity infeasible. Capacity enhancement of freeway facilities is also infeasible because the City cannot compel Caltrans to make improvements. In addition, analysis of freeway mainline segments show that up to 6 additional travel lanes might be necessary on freeways that are from 6–10 lanes wide currently. Additionally, capacity enhancements to freeway facilities to accommodate peak hour traffic volume may not be effective as additional traffic could be attracted from the shoulder periods (i.e., time periods just before or after peak periods).</p> <p>If the addition of capacity is infeasible to mitigate the impacts to the v/c ratio at an intersection or freeway facility, a reduction in traffic volume may mitigate the impact. The Mobility Element presents a number of Implementation Measures designed to promote mobility by supporting all travel modes, including walking, bicycling, and use of transit, thereby reducing the number of automobile trips on the roadway network. However, the effect of these measures on individual intersection LOS cannot be guaranteed because they rely on the changing attitudes and actions of many commuters. In addition, when some automobile trips are converted into alternative modes, some automobile trips that would otherwise have been discouraged by congestion may occur. Therefore, although these measures would contribute to a reduced vehicle LOS, their effects cannot be quantified, and they cannot be considered mitigation for the impacted freeway facilities and 48 impacted intersections for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, Mitigation Measure MM T-1 is recommended to reduce the level of traffic impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure MM T-1 would require consideration of feasible traffic improvements at the time individual projects are</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>proposed. If individual projects contribute to transportation impacts for which physical improvement is feasible, then physical improvements would be implemented and transportation impacts would be reduced. However, if feasible physical improvements are not feasible, then transportation impacts would remain significant. Therefore, implementation of the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to a program, plan, ordinance, or policy.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.8.2: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. The 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS provided calculations of VMT derived from the Regional Travel Demand Model. VMT per capita is anticipated to decline in the future as a result of previous planning efforts and is anticipated to decline further due to the elements of the 2016 SCAG RTP/SCS. VMT per capita in Long Beach is lower in the existing condition than the region as a whole or in Los Angeles County. With implementation of the 2016 RTP/SCS, VMT per capita in Long Beach is anticipated to still be lower than the region as a whole or in Los Angeles County.</p> <p>Similar to the trend shown in the 2016 RTP/SCS, VMT in Long Beach is projected to decline as a result of planning efforts. In absolute terms, VMT in Long Beach would be reduced from 9,482,252 per day in the existing condition to 9,028,327 with the proposed project (a 5 percent decrease). The population will increase as VMT declines, resulting in VMT per capita declining from 19.9 per day to 18.2 per day (a 9 percent decrease).</p> <p>Land use changes proposed in the LUE/UDE result in more efficient travel during the morning and evening peak commute hours (i.e., lower VMT during the peak periods). However, VMT during off-peak times increases slightly with the LUE/UDE as compared to the existing LUE. These off-peak VMT are</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>generated by discretionary trips associated with the number of households in the City. Because the project reduces overcrowding compared to the previous land use distribution, the number of discretionary trips increases as does the off-peak VMT and, subsequently, the total VMT, compared to the no project scenario. The existing VMT per household is 56.9 per day, which is anticipated to decline in the future to 49.9 per day without the project. The efficiency of the distribution of land uses in the LUE/UDE would reduce this further to 46.1 VMT per day per household (a 19 percent decrease from existing conditions).</p> <p>The State of California has concurrent goals of reducing VMT and increasing housing supply to improve affordability and reduce overcrowding. The proposed project increases the number of housing units to reduce overcrowding in Long Beach. The efficiency of the location of land uses in the project (i.e., infill development policies and sites) results in a 19 percent decrease in VMT per household compared to existing conditions. Other measures of VMT, including per capita and absolute terms, decline as well, compared to existing conditions. With the project, VMT per capita in Long Beach remains lower than the region as a whole and lower than Los Angeles County. Because the measures of VMT in absolute terms and per capita decrease from existing conditions with the project and the measure of VMT per household decreases from existing conditions and from the current LUE, it is determined that the project would have a less than significant impact related to <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.3 subdivision (b). No mitigation is required.</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Transportation Impacts.</p> <p>Significant and Unavoidable Impact. The project proposes an update to the City’s General Plan that would affect development patterns throughout the City. As such, because the proposed project is a citywide policy action that would facilitate future development throughout the entire City, the proposed project itself is cumulative in nature.</p> <p>Under the anticipated General Plan (2040) build out scenario, the project would result in potentially significant traffic impacts to vehicle LOS at intersections in Long Beach, intersections in neighboring cities, Caltrans intersections, and freeway facilities. Of the 120 intersections included in the study area, 48 of them (40 percent) would be significantly impacted by traffic volume increases between existing and future conditions. Potential physical improvements at each impacted location was considered against potential constraints, such as the intersection being located outside of the City’s jurisdiction, which eliminates the City’s authority to compel physical improvements or physical improvements being located outside of the existing right-of-way, which could be infeasible or result in increased environmental impacts. Furthermore, the effect of the Implementation Measures in the Mobility Element in reducing traffic volume cannot be guaranteed to reduce impacts. Because measures to increase vehicle capacity or reduce vehicle volume cannot be guaranteed and may not be feasible, the impacts identified above are considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable for the horizon year of 2040.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure MM T-1, above.</p>	<p>Significant and Unavoidable.</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
4.9: UTILITIES		
<p>Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded <u>water</u>, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.9.2: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed project does not include any physical improvements or development, future development projects facilitated by the proposed project’s approval would result in an increased water demand. The project-related increase in water demand in 2040 would be 59,105 acre-feet, or less than one percent of the Long Beach Water Department’s (LBWD) total projected water supply for the horizon year 2040. As such, water supplies will be sufficient to meet all demands through the horizon year 2040 during normal, single dry year, and multiple dry year hydrologic conditions. It should also be noted that the project-related increase in demand for water may not directly correlate with the increase in housing units since the majority of anticipated new units is needed to alleviate overcrowding of existing residences that are already using water.</p> <p>The proposed project would comply with water conservation measures, including pertinent provisions of CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) regarding the use of water-efficient fixtures. Policies and programs outlined in</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and the proposed LUE would reduce water consumption and wastewater flow during operation, which will decrease the overall burden on existing water facilities and decrease the number of facilities that would need to be constructed or expanded. Additionally, under AB 610, a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) would be required for certain projects. Individual projects occurring under the proposed project would be required to prepare a WSA if they meet any of the requirements under AB 610. Because future development that may occur with implementation of the proposed project has been determined to be consistent with water demands in the 2015 UWMP and because the LBWD has identified a surplus water supply to serve the projected water demands through the horizon year 2040, the future project-related demand for water would be consistent with the City’s UWMP. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the need for additional water infrastructure that would result in a significant impact. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, <u>wastewater</u> treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.9.3: Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitment</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Less Than Significant Impact. Short-term demand for wastewater treatment services may occur during construction activities associated with future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project. Sanitary services during construction of future projects would likely be provided by portable toilet facilities, which would transport waste off site for treatment and disposal. The demand for wastewater treatment services during construction would be temporary and would generate minimal wastewater compared to the demand for wastewater treatment services associated with the anticipated General Plan build out scenario. Therefore, construction activities are expected to result in less than significant impacts on the wastewater treatment and collection system, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Following the anticipated General Plan build out, the estimated wastewater flow would be approximately 43 million gallons per day (mgd), which would represent approximately 4 percent of the remaining capacity of existing County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD) facilities. This projection is anticipated to be conservative and representative of a “worst-case scenario” because the majority of new housing units to be developed as part of the project are required to alleviate overcrowding of existing housing units with current Long Beach residents who are already generating wastewater. In addition, new units are likely to use significantly less water and thereby generate less wastewater due to building codes requiring reduced water consumption and reduced landscaping associated with proposed multi-family residential units, which account for the majority of new residential development under the proposed project. Therefore, the projected future increase in wastewater flows associated with development that may occur with implementation of the proposed project would not exceed the treatment requirements of the Regional Water</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Quality Control Board (RWQCB) for the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) and the Long Beach Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) of the LACSD.</p> <p>Future development projects facilitated by project approval would be reviewed by the City on a project-by-project basis and would be required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including sewer capacity considerations as part of the City development review and approval process. Improvements and upgrades to sewer lines would continue to be prioritized based on need and would occur throughout the planning period.</p> <p>Project impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant. In addition, project implementation would not necessitate the construction of wastewater supply or conveyance facilities. No mitigation would be required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or <i>storm water drainage</i>, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Future development facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with the provisions of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), or any other subsequent applicable permits. The Construction General Permit requires preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to identify construction BMPs in order to reduce impacts to water quality, including those impacts associated with soil erosion, siltation, spills, and increased runoff. Furthermore, as future individual projects are proposed, the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>City would review grading plans and construction documents to identify project features aimed at reducing construction impacts to storm drain facilities. Where necessary, the City would identify project conditions to ensure the adequate capacity and operation of the storm drain system during construction activities. Therefore, construction activities associated with implementation of the project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new stormwater drainage systems, where the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts.</p> <p>Development of future projects could increase impervious surface area, which could reduce infiltration and increase runoff. Future projects would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis and would need to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including payment of Development Fees to fund future improvements to the City’s stormwater infrastructure. Such improvements are outlined in the City’s 2019 Capital Improvement Program and include upgrades related to storm drain pipelines, pump stations, and stormwater monitoring equipment.</p> <p>Depending on the size and nature of the projects, a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) would be developed to address post-construction urban runoff and stormwater pollution from new development and significant redevelopment projects. Future projects would also be required to comply with goals and policies outlined in the proposed LUE that are aimed at reducing stormwater runoff and mitigating off-site impacts related to pollutants entering natural water bodies. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities, and no mitigation would be required.</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or <i>telecommunications facilities</i>, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with future projects would not increase the demand for telecommunications facilities, and thus would not require or result in the construction of new or the relocation of existing telecommunication facilities. However, future development facilitated by the proposed project could result in the need for new or relocated telecommunications facilities. Similar to existing market conditions, Spectrum Communications, Frontier Communications, and AT&T U-Verse would extend existing services to meet the increased demand for telephone, internet, and cable services as future developments are proposed. Where necessary, infrastructure improvements would be made to existing telecommunications facilities in order to meet customer demands. Environmental impacts associated with future improvements to telecommunications facilities are anticipated to be minimal, as these facility areas would have previously been disturbed through association with past infrastructure improvements. In addition, any major improvements to telecommunications facilities would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis, and would comply with any applicable regulations in place at the time such development is proposed. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or relocation of existing telecommunications facilities, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.9.4: Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Construction of future projects facilitated by the proposed project would generate demolition waste. Construction waste would be recycled pursuant to Chapter 18.67, Construction and Demolition Recycling Program, of the City’s Municipal Code. Under the Municipal Code, projects requiring demolition or building permits are required to divert at least 60 percent of all construction and demolition material from landfills. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to solid waste generation during construction, and no mitigation measures regarding construction debris are required.</p> <p>Solid waste generated by operations associated with future development under the proposed project would be collected by the City’s Environmental Services Bureau and hauled to the Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF). With the proposed project, the City is forecast to generate approximately 1.62 million pounds of solid waste in 2040, or an increase of approximately 193,744 pounds (lbs) per day. There is sufficient landfill capacity in the region to serve solid waste generated by the proposed project. In addition, all future projects facilitated by the proposed project would be required to comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts related to solid waste generation would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Utility Impacts</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Wastewater. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis for wastewater treatment is defined as the City and LACSD. The future anticipated General Plan build out is not anticipated to generate wastewater above LACSD’s current capacity. However, compliance with applicable federal and State regulations along with specific jurisdictional ordinances, as well as further CEQA review for projects requiring discretionary approvals, would reduce cumulative impacts related to potential wastewater treatment violations to a less than significant level. The proposed project would result in a population consistent with the growth projections for the City provided in the SCAG 2016–2040 RTP/SCS. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to wastewater generation in the LACSD service area would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Water. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of water infrastructure includes the service territory of the LBWD. According to the City’s 2015 UWMP, future water supplies are reliable through the horizon year (2040) of the project. In addition, LBWD projects that there are sufficient groundwater supplies to meet any future demand requirements in the City. Further, the current 2015 UWMP accounts for the proposed project’s transition from traditional land uses to PlaceTypes and has demonstrated that the LBWD has the ability to serve the project-related increase in water demand through the horizon year 2040. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to water demand would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Solid Waste. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to solid waste disposal capacity is the County of Los Angeles. Development associated with the proposed project</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>and other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the County would contribute to an increase in demand for landfill capacity and solid waste services for the County. As stated previously, the SERRF, a refuse-to-energy transformation facility, serves the planning area and does not have a scheduled closure date. It is expected that the SERRF will continue to operate at its current permitted daily capacity through 2027. The SERRF currently does not exceed its daily maximum permitted disposal capacity. Solid waste considered unprocessable by SERRF would be taken to landfills in Orange, San Bernardino, and Riverside Counties. There is currently sufficient permitted capacity within the LACSD system serving Los Angeles County to provide adequate future capacity for the County’s solid waste needs. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively significant impact on waste disposal capacity at LACSD facilities.</p> <p>Telecommunications. The geographic area for cumulative analysis of cable, telephone, and internet services consists of the service territory for Spectrum Communications, Frontier Communications, and AT&T U-Verse. These services are not operating above capacity; however, these service providers are anticipated to extend current facilities to meet project service demands on an as-needed basis, as is the case under existing market conditions. Therefore, the proposed project’s impacts related to cable, telephone, and internet services would not be cumulatively significant. No mitigation would be required.</p>		
SECTION 4.10: ENERGY		
<p>Threshold 4.10.1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Electricity. Energy would be consumed throughout construction and operation associated with future projects facilitated through approval of the proposed project. Energy would be required during construction for the transportation of building materials, manufacturing of building materials, and the actual construction of buildings and infrastructure improvements. Energy consumption during operation would be associated with building heating and cooling, use of consumer products, lighting, and vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The projected electricity demand in the City would be 1,950,216,130 kilowatt hours (kWh) in 2040 (approximately 117.18 percent greater than the existing electricity demand). However, many of the land uses as proposed under the project would replace existing uses that already utilize electricity resources. Furthermore, energy efficiency technologies would continue to improve through the life of the project (horizon year 2040). New facilities required to support the project-related demand for electricity would be constructed in accordance with the demand for the new service. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, because the City is largely built out, it is not anticipated that major new facilities would be necessary to serve new development facilitated by project approval at the horizon year of the General Plan build out (2040). Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Natural Gas. Future development occurring under the proposed project would generate a natural gas demand of 4,649,160,730 kBtu, or an approximately 16.34 percent increase in natural gas demand. This analysis assumes the full anticipated General Plan build out, which is a worst-case analysis, since it is unknown how much of the proposed residential and non-residential uses would actually be constructed. In addition, many of the land</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>uses as proposed under the project would replace existing uses that already utilize natural gas resources.</p> <p>Gas service will be added to the existing system operated and maintained by the Long Beach Energy Resources (ER) Department, as necessary, to meet the requirements of individual projects within the City. Because developments that would be considered under the proposed project have not yet been designed or proposed, the specific improvements to existing natural gas facilities that would need to be implemented to serve future developments are unknown at this time, as are the potential environmental impacts of such improvements. Potential environmental impacts would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis. However, because the City is largely built out, it is not anticipated that major improvements would be necessary to serve the City and new development facilitated by the project approval. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Gasoline. From 2018 to 2040, VMT per capita would decrease by approximately 9 percent, from 19.9 in 2018 to 18.2 in 2040, and VMT per household would decrease by 19 percent from 56.9 in 2018 to 46.1 in 2040. The decrease in VMT per capita and per household would likely result in an associated decrease in the demand for gasoline. Moreover, the fuel efficiency of vehicles is expected to continue to increase and improve throughout the life of the project as new fuel economy standards are established.</p> <p>Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in transportation-related energy uses, such that it would result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
required.		
<p>Threshold 4.10.2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact. Future projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project would be required to comply with the CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11) and the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), which includes provisions related to insulation and design aimed at minimizing energy consumption. Future projects facilitated by project approval would also be required to comply with goals, policies, and strategies outlined in the proposed LUE and UDE that are aimed at reducing energy consumption in the planning area. These goals, policies, and strategies have been developed in accordance with federal and State energy regulations, such as CALGreen Code building efficiency standards (Title 24, Part 11), the California Energy Code Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6), and SB 743, which are also aimed at reducing energy consumption. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable plans related to renewable energy and energy efficiency, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant
<p>Cumulative Energy Impacts</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p> <p>Electricity. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of electricity is the service territory of Southern California Edison (SCE). The anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) would represent approximately 1.3 percent of the extrapolated 2040 peak demand. SCE has identified adequate capacity to handle an increase in electrical demand, and any increase in electrical demand resulting from the proposed project would be incremental compared to an</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>increase in regional electrical demand. Therefore, it is anticipated that the electricity demand under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) would be within the forecasted electricity demand for the 2040 build out. The proposed project’s increased demand for electricity would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Natural Gas. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of natural gas is the service territory for the Energy Resources (ER) Department. The anticipated 2040 natural gas demand would represent 0.05 percent of the ER Department’s projected natural gas demand for the year 2040. Moreover, future development under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040) would be subject to Title 24 requirements and would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine the need for specific distribution infrastructure improvements. Where necessary, gas service would be added to the existing system by the ER Department to meet the requirements of individual development projects in the City. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative natural gas impacts would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Gasoline. The geographic area for the cumulative analysis of impacts to the provision of natural gas is the State of California, as there is no local or singular provider for gasoline. Although the proposed project would result in an increase in vehicular trips that would result in an increased demand for gasoline, new vehicles traveling within the planning area through 2040 would likely have improved fuel efficiency and would increasingly be comprised of electric, hydrogen, and diesel vehicles (consistent with historic and current trends). In addition, the proposed project would support land use patterns and travel modes that would reduce the number of VMTs traveled within the planning area (a 9 percent decrease from 2018 to 2040), which would</p>		

Table 1.A: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, and Compliance Measures	Levels of Significance After Mitigation
<p>further reduce the project-related transportation energy demand. Furthermore, the project-related demand for gasoline would be minimal compared to the statewide availability of gasoline. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to cumulative transportation energy impacts would be considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		

This page intentionally left blank