

2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 OVERVIEW AND PROJECT BACKGROUND

This Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared to evaluate environmental impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements (proposed project) in the City of Long Beach (City). The City is the “public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving the project” and, as such, is the “Lead Agency” for this project under the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) (*State CEQA Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA Section 15367*). CEQA requires the Lead Agency to consider the information contained in the EIR prior to taking any discretionary action. This Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document to be considered by the City and the Responsible Agencies during deliberations on the proposed project. The anticipated project approvals associated with the proposed project are described in Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed project began in 2015. Prior to preparation of the Draft EIR, the *Initial Study* (LSA Associates, Inc. [LSA], May 2015) (provided in Appendix A of the Draft EIR) determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment and that an EIR would be required to more fully evaluate potential adverse environmental impacts that may result from development of the proposed project. Consequently, a Draft EIR was prepared and circulated for public review for an extended period of 78 days, from September 1, 2016, to November 18, 2016.

Based on comments received during the Draft EIR public review period, changes were made to the project design to address concerns related to height, density, additional housing units, and traffic (refer to Chapter 3.0, Project Description, for further discussion related to the proposed changes included as part of the project). Refer to Subsections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4 for a description of the Original Draft EIR and a discussion of the basis for recirculating the Draft EIR.

2.2 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21000, et seq., requires that a public agency prepare an EIR when the public agency finds substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment (PRC Section 21080 (d)). The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

1. Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
2. Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced;
3. Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and
4. Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved.

In compliance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City has taken steps to maximize opportunities for the public and other public agencies to participate in the environmental review process. The City conducted the scoping process, issued a Notice of Preparation for the proposed project, and determined that an EIR was required to evaluate the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed project and related actions. In addition, a public scoping meeting was held, as discussed further below.

2.2.1 Initial Study and Notice of Preparation

The City, as the Lead Agency, originally prepared an Initial Study (IS) and issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on an EIR for the original project on May 18, 2015, which was distributed via the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH issued a project number for the EIR (SCH No. 2015051054). The primary purpose of preparing the Initial Study was to scope the environmental analysis and evaluate potential environmental impacts that may result from project approval. The Initial Study was also used to scope out environmental issues that were determined to be “less than significant” or “no impact.”

In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15082, the NOP was circulated to responsible agencies and individuals for a period of 30 days, during which time written comments were solicited pertaining to environmental issues and topics that the EIR should evaluate.

Responses to the IS/NOP were received from the following agencies:

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 7
- County of Los Angeles Fire Department
- County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (LACSD)
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
- State of California, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR)

The following individuals submitted written comments on the NOP:

- Anne Proffit
- Marilyn Surakus

Key environmental issues and concerns raised in response to the IS/NOP scoping process or at the scoping meeting included:

- **Air Quality:** Concerns were expressed regarding project-related impacts on air quality in the South Coast Air Basin.
- **Land Use and Planning:** Concerns were expressed as to whether or not the full scope of the project was necessary to be consistent with applicable land use documents, including SCAG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies. Concerns were also expressed 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 throughout the City.

- **Traffic/Circulation:** Concerns were expressed regarding potential project-related conflicts with applicable traffic plans, ordinances, and/or policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and potential project-related impacts to Caltrans facilities.
- **Utilities:** Concerns were expressed regarding the ability of the City to provide water to accommodate new development allowed under the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040).

2.2.2 Scoping Meeting Summary

The City held a public scoping meeting on May 27, 2015, to present the original project and to solicit input from interested individuals regarding environmental issues that should be addressed in the Draft EIR. Key environmental issues and concerns raised in the response to the IS/NOP scoping process or at the scoping meeting included:

- **Aesthetics:** Concerns were expressed that the development of the proposed project would result in significant increases in allowable building heights and density within the Downtown area, thereby resulting in a change to the aesthetic character of this area.
- **Recreation:** Concerns were expressed regarding the potential loss of open space and recreational resources resulting from project implementation.

Please note that these are not exhaustive lists of areas of controversy, but rather key issues that were raised during the scoping process. The 2016 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. Appendix A includes the IS/NOP and copies of written comments received in response to the IS/NOP, as well as written comment cards received in response to the Public Scoping meeting.

2.2.3 Original Draft EIR

Preparation of an EIR for the proposed project began in June 2015. The City determined that the proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment, and a Draft EIR was required to fully evaluate the potential adverse environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project. As previously stated, a Draft EIR was prepared and circulated for public review for an extended period of 78 days (33 days longer than the required 45-day public review period), from September 1, 2016, to November 18, 2016. The NOP, the NOP distribution list, and comment letters are provided in Appendix A.

A total of 108 letters commenting on the proposed project were received during the public review period or immediately thereafter. Comments were received from State and local agencies and organizations, as well as interested individuals. Comments that address environmental issues were responded to thoroughly in the Final EIR for the project, which was released for public review in January 2017.

Due to extensive public input provided to the City in the form of written comments on the Draft EIR, oral testimony at public hearings and community meetings, and direction from the City Council to revise the PlaceTypes Maps in the Land Use Element (LUE), the City subsequently revised the proposed project in March 2018. The project changes were determined to constitute potentially significant new information, thereby requiring recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15088.5. Changes associated with the revised project are described in further detail in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.4 Recirculated Draft EIR

As described further in Chapter 3.0, Project Description (refer to Section 3.5.3, Changes from 2016 LUE to 2018 LUE, and Section 3.5.5, Changes from 2016 UDE to 2018 UDE), changes to the project were made in response to public input received on the originally proposed project (refer to Appendix H for the revised LUE and UDE). As such, this Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts associated with the proposed changes to the project in accordance with CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines* (CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). This Recirculated Draft EIR also complies with procedures established by the City for the implementation of CEQA.

This Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared to evaluate environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the revised project. As the Lead Agency, the City has the authority for preparation of this Recirculated Draft EIR and, after the comment/response process, certification of the Final Recirculated EIR and approval of the proposed project as described in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

The City and Responsible Agencies have the authority to make decisions on discretionary actions relating to development of the proposed project. As previously stated, this Recirculated Draft EIR is intended to serve as an informational document to be considered by the City and Responsible Agencies during deliberations on the proposed project. This Recirculated Draft EIR evaluates and mitigates a reasonable worst-case scenario of potential impacts associated with the proposed project, which is programmatic in nature.

2.2.4.1 Type of EIR

This Recirculated Draft EIR will serve as a Program EIR pursuant to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15168. According to Section 15168 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Program EIR is appropriate for a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:

- (1) Geographically,
- (2) As logical parts in the chain of contemplated actions,
- (3) In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program, or

- (4) As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.

The use of a Program EIR provides an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than otherwise would be practical under a Project EIR. However, subsequent activities occurring as a result of program/project approval and certification of a Program EIR must be further evaluated in light of the Program EIR to determine whether or not an additional environmental document must be prepared. If an agency finds that no new effects could occur and that no new mitigation would be required, then the agency can determine that subsequent activities are covered under the Program EIR and no further environmental documentation would be required. Conversely, an agency may determine that future projects could require the preparation of a new Initial Study, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or new EIR. If new environmental documentation is required, a Program EIR can be used to focus the scope of the subsequent environmental document (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15168).

The proposed project includes the adoption of the proposed LUE and Urban Design Element (UDE), which are intended to guide the future development patterns and the aesthetic character of the City through the implementation of goals, policies, and implementation strategies. The proposed project would be implemented over the next 21 years, through the year 2040. This Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR for the following reasons:

- The proposed project would be implemented over a 21-year period.
- The proposed project would be implemented over a large geographic area, which is defined as the total area within the City limits (approximately 50 square miles).
- Development plans and details have not been developed for new projects that could be facilitated by project approval.

Although finalized plans for future projects facilitated by project approval have not yet been prepared, citywide growth projections with respect to population, housing, and employment were used throughout this Recirculated Draft EIR to analyze impacts associated with the anticipated General Plan build out scenario (2040). Please refer to Chapter 3.0, Project Description, for additional information on socioeconomic projections associated with the proposed project.

This Recirculated Draft EIR (which is programmatic in nature) re-examines project-related impacts with respect to those topics that were evaluated in the 2016 Draft EIR in light of the proposed changes to the Project Description. Based on a review of the proposed changes, no revisions were made to the significance determinations for environmental topics that were previously found to be less than significant in the Initial Study prepared for the original project (refer to Section 2.3, Effects Found Not to be Significant, below).

According to Section 15152 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, "tiering" involves the following: (1) using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR (such as this programmatic Recirculated Draft EIR) in order to analyze subsequent environmental documentation (including EIRs, Mitigated

Negative Declarations, and Negative Declarations) on narrower projects; (2) incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR; and (3) concentrating the subsequent environmental documentation solely on the issues specific to the later project.

Subsequent activities associated with implementation of the proposed project that would require approval of a discretionary action (e.g., Tentative Tract Maps) would require a project-specific analysis of environmental impacts associated with implementing those maps, plans, and approvals. When reviewing future projects, the City would utilize the tiering provisions in CEQA to determine whether, in the light of project specific circumstances, the Recirculated Draft EIR prepared for the proposed project would still provide an adequate description of the broad effects of future projects as they are considered. Although environmental impacts of future individual projects occurring as a result of project approval will be analyzed under and compared against the analysis set forth in this Program EIR, a site-specific analysis will be required under CEQA. For example, a new EIR may be required for future specific development plans, as indicated in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

Pursuant to Section 15105(a) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the City will circulate the Recirculated Draft EIR for the proposed project for public review and comment for a period of 60 days. As described further in Section 15088.5(f) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a Lead Agency may choose to evaluate and respond to comments in one of two ways: (1) require reviewers to submit new comments when an EIR is substantially revised and the entire document is recirculated (in such cases, a Lead Agency need not respond to comments received during an earlier comment period); or (2) request that reviewers limit their comments to only the revised chapter or portions of the Recirculated EIR. Since the Recirculated Draft EIR has been substantially revised, the City is requiring that reviewers submit new comments on the revised project addressed in the Recirculated EIR (Section 15088.5(f)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*). As such, the City is not required to respond to comments received during the previous comment period for the original project and EIR. During the public review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the document may be submitted by interested agencies and members of the public to:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802
Attention: Alison Spindler, Project Manager
LBDS-EIR-Comments@longbeach.gov

Comments will only be accepted in written form via e-mail and/or hardcopy letter delivered to the above-referenced e-mail and mailing addresses, respectively. After the public review and comment period, written responses to all comments received pertaining to environmental issues will be prepared as part of the Final EIR. As required by CEQA, responses to comments submitted by responsible public agencies will be distributed to those agencies for review at least 10 days (in accordance with Section 15088 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*) prior to consideration and approval of the Final EIR by the Planning Commission and City Council. Upon completion of the Final EIR and other required documentation, the City Council may certify the Final EIR, adopt findings relative to

the proposed project's environmental effects after implementation of mitigation measures, and approve or deny the project.

2.2.4.2 *Senate Bill 1000*

Senate Bill (SB) 1000 was approved by Governor Jerry Brown on September 24, 2016. SB 1000 requires that general plans include goals, policies, and objectives pertaining to environmental justice. Environmental justice refers to the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, religion, origin, income or sexual orientation with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. The purpose of SB 1000 is to identify disadvantaged communities and to put forward strategies to reduce unique or compounded health risks to these communities, identify objectives and policies to promote civil engagement in the public decision-making process, and identify objectives and policies that prioritize improvements and programs that address the needs of disadvantaged communities.

The proposed LUE identifies environmental justice communities within the City (refer to Map LU-6 in the proposed LUE), including several Westside Long Beach neighborhoods that are located near the Port of Long Beach (POLB) and the Port of Los Angeles (POLA), as well as neighborhoods near major transportation routes and rail yards that handle the majority of port-related truck and train traffic. These environmental justice communities identified by the City are subject to environmental and air pollution impacts from ship, port, rail and truck operations. The proposed LUE discusses programs and strategies initiated by the POLB and POLA aimed at improving air quality in the vicinity of the ports and improving local neighborhoods through air-filtration systems and educational health outreach programs. In addition, the City addresses environmental justice issues by prioritizing investments in underserved communities through planned improvements to parks and open space, active transportation infrastructure, and social and environmental programming to address health disparities. The proposed LUE also includes the following goals, strategies, and policies related to environmental justice: Goal No. 6, Strategies No. 14, 15, and 16, and LU Policies 14-1 through 14-8, 15-1 through 15-4, and 16-1 through 16-12. Although there is not a designated section devoted to environmental justice in the Recirculated Draft EIR, issues related to environmental justice are addressed throughout the document where relevant.

2.2.4.3 *Updates to the State CEQA Guidelines*

In January 2018, OPR submitted a proposal for comprehensive updates to the State CEQA Guidelines to the California Natural Resources Agency. The submittal included proposed updates related to the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, energy, transportation impacts pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743, and wildfires, as well as revisions to Section 15126.2(a) in response to the California Supreme Court's decision in *California Building Industry Association v. Bay Area Air Quality Management District* (2015) 62 Cal. 4th 369. On December 28, 2018, during preparation of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the updated State CEQA Guidelines went into effect. As such, the Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared in compliance with the updated State CEQA Guidelines. Effects Found Not to Be Significant

As required by *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15128, this Recirculated Draft EIR must identify the effects of the proposed project determined not to be significant. The scoping process for this Recirculated Draft EIR included the preparation of an Initial Study. Per *State CEQA Guidelines*

Section 15063, the City prepared an Initial Study to determine whether the project could have a significant effect on the environment. The City determined that the proposed project may have a significant impact on the environment and issued an NOP soliciting comments from Responsible and Trustee Agencies and other interested parties, including members of the public. In addition to identifying potentially significant impacts of the project that required additional study, the Initial Study also identified effects determined not to be significant consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063(c)(3)(B). The analysis determined that the proposed project would result in no impacts to agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, mineral resources, recreation, and wildfires.

The City's Initial Study and Environmental Checklist Form are discussed in Chapter 4.0 of this document, and a copy of the Initial Study and Environmental Checklist for the proposed project are included in Appendix A of this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.5 Agricultural Resources

The planning area is almost entirely developed and is not used for agricultural or forestry purposes. No properties within the planning area are designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance nor are there areas zoned for agricultural or forestry uses. Further, there are no areas protected by a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in environmental changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Furthermore, the proposed LUE encourages the creation of small-scale agricultural uses (e.g. community gardens, edible gardens, and small urban farms) (LU Policy 11-3, LU Policy 18-3, LU-M-40, and LU-M-88). Therefore, project-related impacts with respect to agricultural and forestry resources are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.6 Biological Resources

In its existing setting, the planning area is almost entirely developed and is located in an urban area of Los Angeles County. These urban areas do not contain mapped habitat for any sensitive biological species as identified on local/regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Although the majority of the planning area is urban in nature, the City contains a number of open space areas (e.g., El Dorado Regional Park, the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, Los Cerritos Wetlands, beaches along the Pacific Ocean Shoreline, rights-of-way, marinas, bays, and wetlands) that have the potential to support sensitive biological resources. In order to preserve open space areas and protect sensitive biological resources, the proposed LUE aims to promote compact infill development on underutilized parcels located throughout the City (LU Policy 1-5, LU Policy 7-11, and Major Area of Change No. 7). The majority of parcels proposed for infill development are either paved or developed with uses that would be redeveloped as part of the proposed project. As such, these areas have previously been heavily disturbed and do not support sensitive biological resources. Furthermore, the proposed LUE would establish the Open Space PlaceType, which would encourage the preservation of existing wildlife habitat areas and would protect existing water bodies and habitat areas with known sensitive biological resources (Major Area of Change No. 8, LU

Strategy No. 20, and LU Policies 20-1 through 20-4). Therefore, the proposed LUE would protect and retain open space areas and would not have a substantial adverse effect on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations by the CDFW or the USFWS, nor would the LUE have a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities, or federally protected wetlands.

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to interference with the movement of species within wildlife corridors or create conflicts with the City's tree preservation policy. Specifically, the LU Policy 20-12 in the proposed LUE requires that future development projects in the City comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (Title 33, United States Code, Section 703 et seq., see also Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 10 and Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code), which makes it illegal to take any migratory bird, nests, or eggs of such a bird except under the terms of a valid federal permit. For example, future development projects would avoid impacts to migratory birds during construction activities by limiting such activities to outside of the nesting season and/or by conducting nesting bird surveys prior to any tree removal. The proposed LUE also encourages the establishment of wildlife movement corridors between urban areas, wetlands, and the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers (LU Policy 20-7 and LU Policy 21-5). LU Policy 20-12 also requires future projects to comply with Chapter 14.28 of the Long Beach Municipal Code to ensure consistency with the City's tree preservation policy.

The UDE is intended to shape the aesthetics of the urban environment by preserving the character of existing neighborhoods while allowing for the continued evolution and improvement of the City in areas targeted for new development. The proposed UDE does not include any changes to land use types in the City that would impact biological resources. Rather, the UDE outlines goals and strategies that would guide the aesthetic character of new development within PlaceTypes proposed in the LUE. Therefore, implementation of the proposed UDE would not result in any physical impacts that would result in impacts to biological resources.

There is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Communities Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other local or regional conservation plan covering the planning area. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts to an adopted HCP/NCCP. However, the proposed project includes land use changes within the California Coastal Zone, which is regulated by the California Coastal Act (CCA). The CCA aims to protect Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas (ESHAs) within the Coastal Zone from impacts associated with new development. Please refer to Appendix C for an analysis of the project's consistency with the CCA and potential impacts related to ESHAs.

For the reasons outlined above, project-related impacts with respect to biological resources are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.7 Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

Implementation of the proposed project would not cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical, archaeological, or tribal cultural resource.

The proposed project includes a number of goals and policies aimed at preserving and maintaining the integrity of existing historic resources located throughout the planning area. Specifically, the proposed UDE includes strategies aimed at the preservation of the aesthetic character of existing historic resources (UD Strategy No. 9, Policy UD 2-1, Policy UD 9-1, Policy UD 9-2, Policy UD 9-3, Policy UD 10-1, Policy UD 10-3, Policy UD 19-4, and Policy UD 20-5), while the proposed LUE aims to preserve existing historic structures and neighborhoods throughout the City (LU Goal No. 4, Strategy No. 3, LU-M-3, and LU-M-43) (Appendix H). Historic resources are further protected through regulation via the City's General Plan Historic Preservation Element (2010) and the City's Cultural Heritage Ordinance, which are contemplated and recognized in the LUE and UDE; the proposed project is consistent with these documents and does not modify either of them.

The proposed LUE also aims to minimize potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources, tribal cultural resources, and buried human remains through compliance with applicable federal, State, and local guidelines (as required by LU Policy 20-12). Specifically, the City would comply with Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which requires that notification be provided to Native American representatives¹ within 14 days of a decision to undertake a project or a determination that a project application is complete. All future projects requiring a General Plan or Specific Plan Amendment would also be required to conduct Native American consultation in compliance with SB 18. Compliance with policies in the proposed LUE, as well as applicable provisions of AB 52 and SB 18, would ensure that the proposed project would not result in impacts to cultural or tribal cultural resources. Therefore, impacts with respect to cultural or tribal cultural resources are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.8 Geology and Soils

Given the City's location in the seismically active area of Southern California, portions of the planning area are located within a Fault Zone, as designated by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) and United States Geological Survey (USGS). Future individual projects facilitated from approval of the proposed project would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires compliance with current building codes to reduce potential impacts associated with seismic hazards. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects related to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related failure (e.g., liquefaction or landslides).

The proposed project also includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future projects to comply with Chapter 18.05 of the City's Municipal Code, which itself requires applicants to prepare a soils engineering report and/or geology report and comply with applicable geology and soils engineering recommendations prior to issuance of a grading permit. Compliance with the Building Code in effect at the time future projects are proposed and preparation of site-specific geology and soils engineering studies would ensure that future projects would not result in impacts related to

¹ In compliance with AB 52, that City is required to provide notification to all tribes that have requested notification of projects in each tribe's area of traditional and cultural affiliation.

substantial soil erosion, unstable soils, expansive soils, or soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. LU Policy 20-12 also aims to minimize potential impacts to unknown paleontological resources through compliance with applicable federal, State, and local guidelines. Therefore, project-related impacts with respect to geology and soils are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials are chemicals that could potentially cause harm during an accidental release or mishap, and are defined as being toxic, corrosive, flammable, reactive, and an irritant or strong sensitizer.¹ Hazardous substances include all chemicals regulated under the United States Department of Transportation “hazardous materials” regulations and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) “hazardous waste” regulations. Hazardous wastes require special handling and disposal because of their potential to damage public health and the environment. The probable frequency and severity of consequences from the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is affected by the type of substance, the quantity used or managed, and the nature of the activities and operations.

Construction. Although the proposed LUE would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, approval of the proposed project would not include any physical improvements that could generate hazardous materials or create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. However, future individual projects resulting from project approval would result in construction activities that would potentially use a limited amount of hazardous and flammable substances/oils (e.g., fuels, lubricants, and solvents) typical during heavy equipment operation. The amount and use of hazardous chemicals during future construction activities would be regulated by existing government rules and regulations, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the California Code of Regulations (Title 22).

Operation. Future developments facilitated by project approval would result in long-term operational activities associated with varying land use types that could result in the use and storage of potentially hazardous materials. However, such materials would be required to be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. In addition, future projects would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires the preparation of predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs), lead-based paints (LBPs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and mold on properties where such materials have been identified and/or if there is a likelihood that these materials pose a hazard at a subject property. LU Policy 20-12 also requires future project applicants to prepare a Contingency Plan that would outline procedures to be followed should unknown hazardous materials be encountered on a subject property during construction activities. Therefore,

¹ A “sensitizer” is a chemical that can cause a substantial proportion of people or animals to develop an allergic reaction in normal tissue after repeated exposure to a chemical.

the proposed project would not create a significant hazard through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; create a significant hazard through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials; or be located on a hazardous materials site. Further, future projects subject to discretionary review would be required to evaluate the potential for the emission of hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school.

The Long Beach Airport is located in the central portion of the City, north of Interstate 405 (I-405) between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. In addition, portions of the western area of the City are within the influence area for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. Although project approval would allow for greater building heights and intensity, future developments would be required to comply with land use, noise, and height regulations outlined in the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) prepared for the Long Beach Airport and the Airport Environs Land Use Plan prepared for the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Base. Therefore, the project would not interfere with air traffic patterns, conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones, conflict with building height standards established by the FAA for structures on and adjacent to the Long Beach Airport, or result in the exposure of people residing in the area to excessive airport noise.

Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, future projects would be required to comply with policies set forth in the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1975) related to emergency preparedness and evacuation procedures. Furthermore, since the planning area is generally built out, there are no properties adjacent to wildlands and there are no properties designated as being at risk for wildfires by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to emergency response activities or wildland fires. For these reasons, this issue is not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

Additionally, the proposed project includes the Neo-Industrial PlaceType, which is proposed for certain existing industrial land uses areas that are located within or adjacent to residential neighborhoods. The Neo-Industrial PlaceType encourages the location, evolution, and retention of lighter industrial activities that would involve cleaner industrial activities than those allowed in the existing Industrial land use classifications. The primary intention of the Neo-Industrial PlaceType is to transition from heavier, more polluting industrial uses, to cleaner industries, such as those associated with innovative start-up businesses and creative design offices in the arts, engineering, sciences, technology, media, education, and information industries, among others (LU Policy 7-2). Therefore, the Neo-Industrial PlaceType would provide a new land use designation that represents a shift away from more hazardous industrial industries and would also provide a buffer between sensitive receptors and the use and storage of potentially hazardous materials.

For the reasons outlined above, project-related impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, approval of the proposed LUE does not include any physical improvements that would result in the alteration of existing drainage patterns or alterations to the course of a stream or river. Further, project implementation would not result in impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

Construction. Although the proposed project would not include any physical improvements, the project would allow for future projects that could result in changes to impervious surfaces and drainage patterns on parcels proposed for development. As such, future developments located on properties over one acre in size would be required to obtain coverage under and comply with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. Project applicants would be required to provide the Waste Discharge Identification Number (WDID) to the City to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. Pursuant to the requirements of the Construction General Permit and LU Policy 20-12 in the proposed LUE, each project over 1 acre in size would be required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implement Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce potential sources of pollutant discharges that could adversely impact water quality in the City and surrounding area during construction of the future projects. In addition, all future projects that disturb soil would be required to submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan to the City for review and approval (required by LU Policy 20-12), which would identify BMPs to reduce construction-related pollutants. Therefore, construction activities of future projects would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

According to the *Long Beach Water 2015 Urban Water Management Plan* (adopted June 2, 2016), groundwater supply for the City is considered to be very reliable, even during multi-year droughts because extractions are strictly limited and because multiple forms of replenishment exist (e.g., recycled water is mixed with imported water and/or natural runoff and is allowed to percolate in the groundwater basin, and San Gabriel River stream flows are used to replenish the groundwater basin, etc.). However, depending on the depth to groundwater and the depth of excavation, groundwater may be encountered during construction of future projects, and groundwater dewatering may be required. Future projects requiring groundwater dewatering activities during construction would be required to comply with LU Policy 20-12, which requires that applicants obtain coverage under and comply with the provisions of the Groundwater Discharge Permit. Project applicants would be required to provide the WDID to the City to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Groundwater Discharge Permit. Pursuant to the requirements of the Groundwater Discharge Permit, dewatered groundwater would be tested and treated (as necessary) prior to release into surface waters so violations of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would not occur. In addition, in most cases, the duration of groundwater dewatering and the volume of groundwater extracted during construction would be small in volume compared to the overall size of the groundwater basin and would not result in the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

Operation. The proposed project places an emphasis on infill development projects that would be concentrated along transit corridors throughout the City and on parcels that are currently paved

and/or developed. As such, a majority of new projects facilitated by approval of the proposed project would be located in existing urban areas and would not result in impacts associated with the alteration of a stream or river or in the addition of substantial amounts of impervious surfaces. In addition, future applicants of new development or redevelopment projects (unless exempt) would be required to submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) and a Low Impact Development (LID) Plan (LU Policy 20-12). These plans would identify BMPs to be implemented during operation to control stormwater pollutants and runoff to minimize impacts related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and related to the alteration of existing drainage patterns. Further, because a majority of future projects would occur on already paved and developed sites, operational BMPs would be implemented where treatment BMPs likely currently do not exist, which would improve stormwater quality discharges from those sites. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts associated with the violation of water quality standards and/or waste discharge requirements or with the alteration of a stream or river or drainage patterns.

As stated above, groundwater supply for the City is considered to be very reliable, even during multi-year droughts because extractions are strictly limited and because multiple forms of replenishment exist. In addition, because the proposed project places an emphasis on infill development projects on parcels that are currently paved and/or developed, the project would not substantially increase impervious surface areas in a manner that would substantially decrease infiltration. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge.

According to Figure LU-1 in the proposed LUE, most of the City is located in areas that are not within Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood zones, with the exception of areas near the Port of Long Beach, Downtown, and Naples Island. As such, the proposed LUE includes LU Policy 20-12, which requires future applicants to obtain development permits from the City's Floodplain Administrator for projects proposed in FEMA special flood hazard areas to minimize flooding impacts to people and structures. Therefore, project implementation would not result in impacts related to flooding.

According to the City's Seismic Safety Element (1988) and the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA), the majority of the City is not located within a zone of seiche areas. Similarly, the majority of the City is located outside of the Tsunami Inundation Zone, with the exception of the Port of Long Beach and in areas along the coastline and Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers. However, in the event of a tsunami, the City has established response procedures as described in the City of Long Beach Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in flood hazards associated with inundation as a result of a tsunami or seiche.

For the reasons outlined above, project-related impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.11 Mineral Resources

According to the City's General Plan Conservation Element (1973), the mineral resources within the City have historically consisted of oil and natural gas. However, over the last century, oil and natural

gas extractions have diminished as the resources have become increasingly depleted. Although extraction operations continue, they are on a reduced scale as compared to past historic levels. Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped parcels with higher-density development, approval of the proposed LUE and UDE does not include any physical improvements that would result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State. Further, the proposed LUE aims to transition heavy industrial uses, including uses targeting oil extraction, to green industrial activities and/or natural green areas and park uses (LU Policy 7-3 and LU Policy 20-6). For these reasons, project-related impacts with respect to mineral resources are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.12 Recreation

According to the proposed LUE, the planning area currently contains 100 public parks with 25 community centers, 2 tennis centers, 5 municipal golf courses, and a marina system. Overall, the citywide total of recreation uses is approximately 2,750 acres. Although the number of acres of existing open space and recreational uses currently falls short of the City's goal of providing 8 acres per 1,000 residents (as established in the 2002 General Plan Open Space Element), the proposed project aims to create additional open space and recreational uses to meet this goal. Specifically, the proposed LUE would establish the Open Space PlaceType that would preserve existing parks and recreational facilities, while also creating additional parks and urban open spaces to increase connectivity between these resources and surrounding neighborhoods. In addition, one of the primary goals of the proposed LUE is to "create, restore, and preserve open space" uses in the City, including parks and recreation uses. For example, LU Policy 18-7 calls for prioritizing the location of new parks in underserved or low-income communities with the lowest ratio of park space per thousand residents.

Additionally, the City's General Plan Open Space Element would remain an adopted element of the General Plan and would be unaffected by approval of the proposed project. The City will continue to pursue open space goals and a policy as set forth in the Open Space Element, which itself is consistent with the LUE and the UDE. As such, project implementation would not result in significant impacts related to increased use and deterioration of recreational facilities, nor would it include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, project-related impacts with respect to recreation are not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.2.13 Wildfire

In its existing setting, the planning area is almost entirely developed and is located in an urban area of Los Angeles County. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) publishes maps that predict the threat of fire in individual counties in the State; Local Responsibility Areas and State or Federal Responsibility Areas are classified as either very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) or non-VHFHSZ based on factors including fuel availability, topography, fire history, and

climate. The project area is not located in or near a State Responsibility Area and does not include land classified as VHFHSZ as defined by CAL FIRE.¹

Although the proposed project would allow for the intensification, redistribution, and development of currently undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels with higher-density development, future projects would be required to comply with policies set forth in the City's General Plan Public Safety Element (1975) related to emergency preparedness and evacuation procedures. In addition, approval of the proposed LUE does not include any physical improvements that would result in the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Furthermore, since the planning area is generally built out, there are no properties adjacent to wildlands and there are no properties designated as being at risk for wildfires by CAL FIRE. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in impacts related to emergency response activities or wildfire risks. For these reasons, this issue is not evaluated further in this Recirculated Draft EIR.

2.3 FORMAT OF THE EIR

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15120(c), this Recirculated Draft EIR contains the information and analysis required by *State CEQA Guidelines*, Sections 15122 through 15131. Each of the required elements is covered in one of the Recirculated Draft EIR chapters described below.

Chapter 1.0: Executive Summary

Chapter 1.0 contains the Executive Summary of the Recirculated Draft EIR, listing all significant project impacts, mitigation measures that have been recommended to reduce any significant impacts of the proposed project, and the level of significance of each impact following mitigation. A summary of effects found not to be significant and therefore not evaluated further in the Recirculated Draft EIR is also provided. The summary is presented in a matrix (tabular) format.

Chapter 2.0: Introduction

Chapter 2.0 contains a discussion of the purpose and intended use of the Recirculated Draft EIR; a background on project initiation, the NOP, and the original Draft EIR that was circulated for the project; and areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by the public. A summary discussion of effects found not to be significant and, therefore, not included in the Recirculated Draft EIR analysis is also included in this chapter.

Chapter 3.0: Project Description

Chapter 3.0 includes a discussion of the project's geographical setting, the history of the project site, a summary of the revisions included as part of the proposed project, and the project's goals, objectives, characteristics, and components.

¹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2011. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas. Los Angeles County. September 2011.

Chapter 4.0: Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

Chapter 4.0 includes an analysis of the proposed project's environmental impacts. It is organized into the following topical sections: aesthetics, air quality, GHG emissions, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, transportation/traffic, utilities and service systems, and energy. The environmental setting discussions describe the "existing conditions" of the environment in the planning area and in the vicinity of the site as they pertain to the environmental issues being analyzed (Section 15125 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*).

The project impact discussions identify and focus on the significant environmental effects of the proposed project. The direct and indirect significant effects of the proposed project on the environment are identified and described, giving due consideration to both the short-term and long-term effects, as necessary (Section 15126.2[a] of the *State CEQA Guidelines*).

Chapter 4.0 also includes a discussion of the cumulative effects of the proposed project within the analysis of each environmental topic when considered in combination with other projects, causing related impacts as required by Section 15130 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. Cumulative impacts are based on the anticipated General Plan build out scenario and surrounding area.

The discussions of mitigation measures identify and describe feasible measures that could minimize or lessen significant adverse impacts for each significant environmental effect identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR (Section 15126.4 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*). The levels of significance before and after mitigation are provided. Unavoidable adverse effects are identified where mitigation is not expected to reduce the effects to less than significant levels

Chapter 5.0: Alternatives to the Proposed Project

In accordance with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6, the alternatives discussion in Chapter 5.0 describes a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and that are capable of eliminating any significant adverse environmental effects or reducing them to a less than significant level. Alternatives analyzed in Chapter 5.0 include the No Project Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative. Alternatives that were considered during the environmental review process, but were ultimately rejected from further consideration include an Alternative Project Site Alternative, a Reduced Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Alternative/Transit-Oriented Alternative, and a Neighborhood-Serving Centers and Corridors Commercial-Only Alternative.

Chapter 6.0: Long-Term Implications of the Project

Chapter 6.0 includes CEQA-mandated discussions required by Section 15126.2 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* regarding: (a) significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the proposed project, (b) significant adverse environmental impacts for which either no mitigation or only partial mitigation is feasible, and (c) growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project.

Chapter 7.0: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

PRC Section 21081.6 requires that agencies adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program for any project for which findings have been made pursuant to PRC Section 21081. Chapter 7.0 provides a list of all proposed project mitigation measures, defines the party responsible for implementation of those measures, and identifies the timing for implementation of each control measure.

Chapter 8.0: Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Chapter 8.0 summarizes those significant environmental impacts of the proposed project for which either no mitigation or only partial mitigation is feasible and which would therefore remain significant impacts after mitigation (*State CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126(b)).

Chapter 9.0: Persons Contacted and Chapter 10.0: List of Preparers

Chapters 9.0 and 10.0 provide the organizations and persons contacted during preparation of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the preparers of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the technical report authors, and other experts included in the preparation of the document.

Chapter 11.0: References and Chapter 12.0: List of Acronyms

Chapters 11.0 and 12.0 provide the references and acronyms used in this Recirculated Draft EIR, respectively.

2.4 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

As permitted in Section 15150 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR may reference all or portions of another document that is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public. Information from the documents that have been incorporated by reference has been briefly summarized in the appropriate sections of this Recirculated Draft EIR, along with a description of how the public may obtain and review these documents. These documents include:

- City of Long Beach General Plan Elements (as amended) (website: http://www.lbds.info/planning/advance_planning/general_plan.asp)
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code and other titles referenced herein (website: https://www.municode.com/library/ca/long_beach/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=16115)
- Proposed Long Beach General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements (August 2016) (Appendix H) and also available at:
City of Long Beach
Development Services Department, Planning Bureau
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fifth Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

Documents that are incorporated by reference are available for review at the City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services, 333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach, California 90802.