II. Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections

II. Revisions, Clarifications, and Corrections to the Draft EIR

This section of the Final EIR provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to revise, clarify, or correct the environmental impact analysis for 100 E. Ocean (the Project). Such changes are a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or additional information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. The changes described in this section do not result in the Project creating any new or increased significant environmental impacts.

This section is divided into two parts: Section III.A, Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices and Section III.C, Effect of Corrections and Revisions.

A. Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

Several changes have been made to the Draft EIR as a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. Deletions are shown in ~~strikethrough text~~ and additions are shown in <u>underlined text</u>. Such changes are presented by EIR section.

I. Executive Summary

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-37, revise the last sentence of Mitigation Measure HIS-1 as follows:

> The Secretary of the Interior's Standards monitoring may be performed in conjunction with the construction monitoring required pursuant to Mitigation Measure ~~CUL~~ <u>HIS</u>-2.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-41, amend the first sentence of the first full paragraph as follows:

As shown in Table IV.C-5 in Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would result in a total of ~~2,060~~ 2,015 $MTCO_2e$ per year, which accounts for a 61-percent reduction in mobile source emissions when taking into account the Project's specific characteristics, including the measures accounted for in the Traffic Study.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-42, amend the paragraph under subsection (3) Combined Construction and Operational Impacts as follows:

As shown in Table IV.C-5, when taking into consideration implementation of the Project's GHG reducing measures provided throughout this Draft EIR, including the requirements set forth in the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance and the full implementation of current state mandates, the GHG emissions associated with the Project would equal 64 $MTCO_2e$ per year during construction and ~~4,220~~ 4,175 $MTCO_2e$ per year during operation, for a combined total of ~~4,284~~ 4,239 $MTCO_2e$ per year. The Project's emissions of ~~4,284~~ 4,239 MTCO2e would be approximately 45 percent below the emissions that would be generated by the Project without implementation of GHG reducing features and strategies.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-43, amend the first paragraph as follows:

As discussed above and as shown in Table IV.C-5, the Project would result in ~~4,284~~ 4,239 $MTCO_2e$ annually. The breakdown of emissions by source category shows approximately less than 1 percent from area sources; ~~47~~ 48 percent from energy consumption; 48 percent from mobile sources; less than 1 percent from stationary sources; 1.5 percent from solid waste generation; 2 percent from water supply, treatment, and distribution; and 1.5 percent from construction activities.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-52, amend bullet point a. of Project Design Feature GHG-1 as follows:

a. Meeting or exceeding Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code baseline standard requirements by 10 percent for energy efficiency, based on the ~~2016~~ 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards requirements.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-75 and I-76, amend the first two paragraphs of subsection (g) Parking as follows:

> As previously discussed, LBMC Chapter 21.41 and the PD-6 Ordinance set forth parking requirements for development projects based on land use type(s) and floor area. The ordinance recognizes the need for reductions in parking requirements due to the unique transportation characteristics in the Project area. A strict application of the LBMC parking requirements would require ~~891~~ 1,052 parking spaces for the Project. However, since the hotel's parking demand would peak at different times of the day or week, strict application of the LBMC parking requirements would result in an oversupply of parking.
>
> The Project would provide 151 parking spaces within the on-site garage. The shared parking study presented in the Parking Memo provided in Appendix E.2 of this Draft EIR determined that 151 spaces would not be sufficient capacity for Project guests. As such, the Applicant has arranged for off-site parking at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage located at 300 Seaside Way, which would provide 280 overflow spaces. According to the shared parking analysis, the scenario with the greatest estimated parking demand would be a worst-case weekend event entailing full occupancy of the hotel, restaurant, and event space. During a worst-case weekend event, the estimated parking demand would be ~~395~~ 304 spaces, which includes 48 spaces for employees, resulting in a need for ~~347~~ 256 guest spaces. Accounting for a 20-space parking buffer required by the City, ~~216~~ 125 off-site parking spaces would be required. Accordingly, a surplus of ~~64~~ 155 parking spaces would remain available at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage. Furthermore, as set forth in Project Design Feature TRA-2, the Project's TDM Plan would reduce vehicular trips, which in turn would reduce parking demand. Relevant TDM measures would include bike facilities, the availability of transit passes, parking unbundling, and a guaranteed ride home program for employees, among others.

II. Project Description

No corrections or additions have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

IV.A. Air Quality

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-32, amend Project Design Feature AIR-1 as follows:

Project Design Feature AIR-1: In accordance with South Coast Air Quality Management District Rule 403, the Project shall incorporate fugitive dust control measures at least as effective as the following measures:

- Use watering to control dust generation during the demolition of structures such that visible dust plumes are not generated;
- Clean-up mud and dirt carried onto paved streets from the site daily;
- Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- All haul trucks would be covered or would maintain at least 6 inches of freeboard;
- All materials transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of spillage or dust;
- Suspend earthmoving operations or additional watering would be implemented to meet Rule 403 criteria if wind gusts exceed 25 mph;
- The owner or contractor shall keep the construction area sufficiently dampened to control dust caused by construction and hauling, and at all times provide reasonable control of dust caused by wind. All unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be wetted at least ~~twice~~ three times daily during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust emissions; and
- ~~An~~ Prior to demolition or ground disturbing activities, an information sign shall be posted at the entrance to the construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive information about the construction project or to report complaints regarding excessive fugitive dust generation. A construction relations officer shall be appointed to act as a community liaison concerning on-site activity, including investigation and resolution of issues related to fugitive dust generation.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-36, amend the first full paragraph as follows:

> Maximum on-site daily construction emissions of NO_X, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ were calculated using CalEEMod and compared to the applicable SCAQMD LSTs for SRA 4 based on a construction site area of one acre. As discussed above, the nearest sensitive receptors to Project construction activities are proposed residential uses (related project located at 110 West Ocean Boulevard) located west of the site (approximately ~~450~~ 100 feet or roughly ~~150~~ 30 meters). ~~However, this analysis conservatively assumes an approximately 100-meter or 328-foot receptor distance.~~

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-37, replace Table IV.A-4 with Revised Table IV.A-4 below.

Revised Table IV.A-4
Estimate of Localized Project Construction Emissions (Mitigated)
(pounds per day)

Construction Year	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
2020	17	20	1	1
2020 Mat Foundation	22	24	1	<1
2021	13	19	<1	<1
2022	13	19	<1	<1
Maximum Daily Localized Emissions	22	24	1	1
SCAQMD Localized Significance Thresholds[a]	~~**40**~~ **32**	~~**1,180**~~ **627**	~~**29**~~ **6**	~~**10**~~ **3**
Over/(Under)	~~**(18)**~~ **(10)**	~~**(1,156)**~~ **(603)**	~~**(28)**~~ **(5)**	~~**(9)**~~ **(2)**
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[a] *The SCAQMD LSTs are based on Source Receptor Area No. 4 (SW Coastal LA) for a 1-acre site with a ~~100-meter (328-foot)~~ 30-meter (100 foot) receptor distance.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2019~~ 2020.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-38, replace Table IV.A-5 with Revised Table IV.A-5 on page II-6.

Revised Table IV.A-5
Project Regional Operational Emissions—Project Buildout (2022)
(pounds per day)

Emission Source	VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_X	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area	11	<1	1	<1	<1	<1
Energy (Natural Gas)	<1	4	3	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	7	~~30~~ 29	~~51~~ 47	<1	9	2
Stationary (Emergency Generator)	<1	1	1	<1	<1	<1
Project Emissions	**19**	**35**	**~~56~~ 52**	**<1**	**9**	**3**
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	**55**	**55**	**550**	**150**	**150**	**55**
Over/(Under)	**(36)**	**(20)**	**~~(494)~~ (498)**	**(150)**	**(141)**	**(52)**
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2019~~ 2020.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-39, replace Table IV.A-6 with Revised Table IV.A-6 below.

Revised Table IV.A-6
Project Localized Operational Emissions—Project Buildout (2022)
(pounds per day)

Emission Source	NO_X	CO	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Area	<1	1	<1	<1
Energy (Natural Gas)	4	3	<1	<1
Stationary (Emergency Generator)	1	1	<1	<1
Project Emissions	**6**	**5**	**<1**	**<1**
SCAQMD Significance Threshold[a]	**~~40~~ 32**	**~~1,180~~ 627**	**~~7~~ 1**	**~~3~~ 1**
Over/(Under)	**~~(34)~~ (26)**	**~~(1,175)~~ (622)**	**~~(7)~~ (1)**	**~~(3)~~ (1)**
Exceed Threshold?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

[a] *The SCAQMD LSTs are based on Source Receptor Area No. 4 (SW Coastal LA) for a 1-acre site with ~~100-meter (328-foot)~~ 30-meter (100-foot) receptor distance.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2019~~ 2020.

Section IV.A, Air Quality, page IV.A-47, amend Mitigation Measure AIR-1 as follows:

> **Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** *Tier 4 Final Construction Equipment.* The Project shall utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meets or exceeds CARB and USEPA Tier 4 Final off-road emissions standards for excavators and loaders during Project excavation and grading activities. To the extent possible, pole power shall be made available for use with electric tools, equipment, lighting, etc. These requirements shall be included in applicable bid documents and successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply such equipment. A copy of each unit's BACT documentation (certified tier specification or model year specification), and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit (if applicable) shall be ~~available upon request~~ provided to the City at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.

IV.B. Cultural Resources—Historic

Section IV.B, Cultural Resources—Historic, page IV.B-14, revise the last bullet of Mitigation Measure HIS-1 as follows:

> - The historic architect or preservation professional shall participate in period monitoring of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards compliance during construction to completion. The monitoring shall include field notes, photographs, and other documentation of the Project as it relates to Jergins Trust Tunnel. The Secretary of the Interior's Standards monitoring may be performed in conjunction with the construction monitoring required pursuant to Mitigation Measure ~~CUL~~ HIS-2.

IV.C. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-23 and IV.C-24, amend subsection *(ii) California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24, Part 6)* as follows:

> California's Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings, located at Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) and commonly referred to as Title 24, were established in

1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. Title 24 requires the design of building shells and building components to conserve energy. The standards are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods.[55] The CEC adopted the ~~2016~~ 2019 Title 24 standards, which became effective on January 1, ~~2017~~ 2020, and are applicable to the Project.[56] The ~~2016~~ 2019 standards continue to improve upon the ~~2013~~ 2016 Title 24 standards for new construction of, and additions and alterations to, residential and non-residential buildings.[57] The 2019 Title 24 Standards represent "challenging but achievable design and construction practices" that represent "a major step toward meeting the Zero Net Energy (ZNE) goal." Single-family homes built with the 2019 standards will use about 7 percent less energy due to energy efficiency measures versus those built under the 2016 standards. Once rooftop solar electricity generation is factored in, homes built under the 2019 standards will use about 53 percent less energy than those under the 2016 standards. This will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 700,000 metric tons over three years, equivalent to taking 115,000 fossil fuel cars off the road. Nonresidential buildings will use about 30 percent less energy due mainly to lighting upgrades.[57a]

[57a] *CEC, 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, Fact Sheet.*

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-24, amend subsection *(iii) California Green Building Standards (CALGreen Code)* as follows:

The most recent update to the California Green Building Standards Code (CCR Title 24, Part 11), commonly referred to as the ~~2016~~ 2019 CALGreen Code, went into effect on January 1, ~~2017~~ 2020. Most of the mandatory measure changes in the ~~2016~~ 2019 CALGreen Code relative to the previous ~~2013~~ 2016 CALGreen Code were related to definitions and to the clarification or addition of referenced manuals, handbooks, and standards. For example, several definitions related to energy that were added or revised affect electric vehicle chargers and hot water recirculation systems. For new multi-family dwelling units, the residential mandatory measures were revised to provide additional electric vehicle charging space requirements, including quantity, location, size, single EV space, multiple EV spaces, and identification.[58] For non-residential mandatory measures, the table (Table 5.106.5.3.3) identifying the number of required EV charging spaces has been revised in its entirety.[59] Compliance with the 2019 CALGreen Code is enforced through the building permit process.

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-30, amend the first full paragraph as follows:

> ~~Workshops are currently being held to gather public input on the CAAP, with adoption expected by the end of 2019 early 2020.~~A draft CAAP was released in June 2019 and adoption is anticipated by the end of 2020.

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-44, amend bullet point a. of Project Design Feature GHG-1 as follows:

> a. Meeting or exceeding Title 24, Part 6, California Energy Code baseline standard requirements by 10 percent for energy efficiency, based on the ~~2016~~ 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards requirements.

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-48, replace Table IV.C-5 with Revised Table IV.C-5 on page II-10.

Revised Table IV.C-5
Annual GHG Emissions Summary (Year 2019)[a]
(metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent [$MTCO_2e$])

Scope	Project Without Reduction Measures	Project With Reduction Measures	Percent Reduction from Measures (Buildout)[b]
Area[b]	<1	<1	N/A
Energy[c]	2,096	2,015	4%
Mobile	~~5,255~~ 5,119	~~2,060~~ 2,015	61%
Stationary[d]	1	1	0%
Solid Waste[e]	206	64	69%
Water/Wastewater[f]	98	80	18%
Construction	64	64	0%
Total Emissions	**~~7,721~~ 7,584**	**~~4,284~~ 4,239**	**45%**

[a] *CO_2e was calculated using CalEEMod and the results are provided in Section 2.0 of the Operation CalEEMod output file within Appendix B of this Draft EIR.*

[b] *Area source emissions are from landscape equipment.*

[c] *Energy source emissions are based on CalEEMod default electricity and natural gas usage rates.*

[d] *Stationary source emissions are from an on-site emergency generator.*

[e] *Solid waste emissions are calculated based on CalEEMod default solid waste generation rates.*

[f] *Water/Wastewater emissions are calculated based on CalEEMod default water consumption rates.*

Source: Eyestone Environmental, ~~2019~~ 2020.

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-49, amend last paragraph as follows:

> As shown in Revised Table IV.C-5 on page II-10, Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would result in a total of ~~2,060~~ 2,015 $MTCO_2e$ per year, which accounts for a 61-percent reduction in mobile source emissions when taking into account the Project's specific

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-51, amend 2nd paragraph as follows:

> As shown in Table IV.C-5, when taking into consideration implementation of the Project's GHG reducing measures provided throughout

this Draft EIR, including the requirements set forth in the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance and the full implementation of current state mandates, the GHG emissions associated with the Project would equal 64 $MTCO_2e$ per year during construction and ~~4,220~~ 4,175 $MTCO_2e$ per year during operation, for a combined total of ~~4,284~~ 4,239 $MTCO_2e$ per year. The Project's emissions of ~~4,284~~ 4,239 MTCO2e would be approximately 45 percent below the emissions that would be generated by the Project without implementation of GHG reducing features and strategies.

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-51, amend last paragraph as follows:

As discussed above and as shown in Table IV.C-5, the Project would result in ~~4,284~~ 4,239 $MTCO_2e$ annually. The breakdown of emissions by source category shows approximately less than 1 percent from area sources; ~~47~~ 48 percent from energy consumption; 48 percent from mobile sources; less than 1 percent from stationary sources; 1.5 percent

Section IV.C, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.C-54, in Table IV.C-6, amend the consistency analysis for CCR Title 24, Building Standards Code as follows:

Consistent. Consistent with regulatory requirements, the Project would comply with mandatory standards included in the CalGreen Code. The ~~2016~~ 2019 Title 24 standards are more efficient than the 2020 Projected Emissions under Business-as-Usual in the 2008 Scoping Plan. The standards offer builders better windows, insulation, lighting, ventilation systems and other features that reduce energy consumption in homes and businesses. The Project would meet or exceed Title 24 energy efficiency requirements and implement other sustainability features, thus reducing overall energy usage compared to baseline conditions. Thus, the Project has incorporated energy efficiency standards that are substantially more effective than the measures identified in the 2008 Scoping Plan to reduce GHG emissions.

IV.D. Noise

Section IV.D., Noise, page IV.D-26, amend the second sentence of the first full paragraph as follows:

~~As discussed above in Section 5, Cultural Resources, the~~ The Jergins Trust Tunnel is an underground pedestrian walkway located below Ocean Boulevard and Victory Park, just east of and parallel to Pine Avenue.

IV.E. Transportation/Traffic

Section IV.E, Transportation/Traffic, page IV.E-1, amend the third sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

> This section is based in part on the *100 E. Ocean Boulevard Transportation Impact Study* (Traffic Study) prepared for the Project by Fehr & Peers in July 2019, the *Shared Parking Study for 100 E. Ocean Boulevard Memorandum* (Parking Memo) prepared for the Project by Fehr & Peers in ~~December~~ May 2020, and the *100 E. Ocean Boulevard Transportation Demand Management Plan* (TDM Plan) prepared for the Project by Fehr & Peers in August 2018.

Section IV.E, Transportation/Traffic, page IV.E-25, amend Project Design Feature TRA-1 as follows:

> **Project Design Feature TRA-1:** Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant shall prepare a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, including haul routes and a staging plan, and submit it to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau for review and approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions to reduce resulting effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:
>
> - Traffic control for any street/lane closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.
> - Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Project Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project.
> - Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets.
> - Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant

shall clean adjacent streets daily, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

- Hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends or federal holidays.
- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.
- Construction-related parking and staging of vehicles shall occur on-site to the extent possible, but may occur on nearby public and/or private parking lots/garages, as approved by the City Engineer prior to use.
- Appropriate signage and facilities shall be installed to ensure safety and direct pedestrians in the event of any temporary sidewalk closure or the temporary relocation of any bus stop. Any temporary relocation of a bus stop shall be coordinated with Long Beach Transit.
- The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall meet standards established in the current *California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD)* as well as City of Long Beach requirements.

Section IV.E, Transportation/Traffic, page IV.E-26, amend Project Design Feature TRA-2 as follows:

Project Design Feature TRA-2: In compliance with LBMC Section 21.64.030(B) 1, 2, and 3, the Project shall implement transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage the use of public transit and other alternative modes of transportation. These measures shall include, but not be limited to: bicycle parking, bicycle rental, end-of-trip bicycle facilities, an active transportation-oriented ground floor, wayfinding signage, car share parking, car share membership, guaranteed ride home program, pre-loaded transit cards/bike share passes, unbundled parking, hotel confirmation with multi-modal information, in-room

information regarding transportation options, website transit and commute information, and designation of a Transportation Coordinator. Details of the proposed TDM Plan are set forth in *100 E. Ocean Boulevard Transportation Demand Management Plan* prepared by Fehr & Peers, provided in Appendix E.3 of the Draft EIR. The TDM Plan shall be verified prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

Section IV.E, Transportation/Traffic, page IV.E-37 and 38, amend the first two paragraphs of subsection (g) Parking as follows:

As previously discussed, LBMC Chapter 21.41 and the PD-6 Ordinance set forth parking requirements for development projects based on land use type(s) and floor area. The ordinance recognizes the need for reductions in parking requirements due to the unique transportation characteristics in the Project area. A strict application of the LBMC parking requirements would require ~~891~~ 1,052 parking spaces for the Project. However, since the hotel's parking demand would peak at different times of the day or week, strict application of the LBMC parking requirements would result in an oversupply of parking.

The Project would provide 151 parking spaces within the on-site garage. The shared parking study presented in the Parking Memo provided in Appendix E.2 of this Draft EIR determined that 151 spaces would not be sufficient capacity for Project guests. As such, the Applicant has arranged for off-site parking at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage located at 300 Seaside Way, which would provide 280 overflow spaces. According to the shared parking analysis, the scenario with the greatest estimated parking demand would be a worst-case weekend event entailing full occupancy of the hotel, restaurant, and event space. During a worst-case weekend event, the estimated parking demand would be ~~395~~ 304 spaces, which includes 48 spaces for employees, resulting in a need for ~~347~~ 256 guest spaces. Accounting for a 20-space parking buffer required by the City, ~~216~~ 125 off-site parking spaces would be required. Accordingly, a surplus of ~~64~~ 155 parking spaces would remain available at the Terrace Theater Parking Garage. Furthermore, as set forth in Project Design Feature TRA-2, the Project's TDM Plan would reduce vehicular trips, which in turn would reduce parking demand. Relevant TDM measures would include bike facilities, the availability of transit passes, parking unbundling, and a guaranteed ride home program for employees, among others.

V. Alternatives

No corrections or additions have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

VI. Other CEQA Considerations

Section VI, Other CEQA Considerations, page VI-20, revise the last full sentence on the page as follows:

> The Project would generate an estimated average flow of ~~77,137~~ 80,493 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater and a peak flow of 154,710 gpd of wastewater, which would represent ~~0.05~~ 0.06 and 0.11 percent of the available capacity at the JWPCP, respectively.

VII. References

Section VII, References, page VII-4, amend the fourth item as follows:

> California Building Standards Commission. ~~2016~~ 2019 California Green Building Standards Code, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11, Chapter 4—Residential Mandatory Measures, effective January 1, ~~2017~~ 2020.

Section VII, References, page VII-4, amend the seventh item as follows:

> California Energy Commission. ~~2016~~ 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards, ~~www.energy.ca.gov/title24/2016standards/, accessed June 19, 2019~~ www.energy.ca.gov/programs-and-topics/programs/building-energy-efficiency-standards/2019-building-energy-efficiency, accessed January 17, 2020.

VIII. Acronyms and Abbreviations

Section VIII, Acronyms and Abbreviations, page VIII-3, add the following entry between GWPs and H_2S:

HAZWOPER	Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response

IX. List of Preparers

No corrections or additions have been made to this section of the Draft EIR.

Appendix A.1—Initial Study

Appendix A.1, page 36, amend Project Design Feature AES-1 as follows:

> **Project Design Feature AES-1:** Temporary construction fencing shall be placed around the perimeter of the Project Site to screen construction activity from views at street level. Temporary fencing shall adhere to the City of Long Beach's Graphic Guidelines for Temporary Fencing (06/2017).

Appendix A.1, page 36, amend Project Design Feature AES-2 as follows:

> **Project Design Feature AES-2:** The Applicant shall ensure through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways that are accessible/visible to the public and that such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period. Unauthorized postings shall be removed within 72 hours.

Appendix A.1, page 54, amend the first sentence of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 as follows:

> ~~The~~ A qualified Project archaeologist or archaeological monitor approved by the City shall monitor excavation and grading activities within native soils on the Project Site that have not been previously disturbed.

Appendix A.1, page 102, amend Mitigation Measure TCR-1 as follows:

> **Mitigation Measure TCR-1:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permit for the Project, the City of Long Beach Development Services Department shall ensure that the construction contractor provide unencumbered access for Native American monitoring during ground-disturbing activities. This provision shall be included on Project

plans and specifications. The Project Site shall be made accessible to any Native American tribe requesting to be present, provided adequate notice is given to the construction contractor and that a construction safety hazard does not occur. The monitor(s) shall be approved by a local tribal representative and shall be present on-site during the construction phases that involve any ground disturbing activities. The monitor(s) shall possess Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response (HAZWOPER) certification, which shall be submitted to the City for review. In addition, the monitor(s) shall be required to provide insurance certificates, including liability insurance, for any archaeological resource(s) encountered during grading and excavation activities pertinent to the provisions outlined in the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Division 13, Section 21083.2 (a) through (k). Neither the City of Long Beach, Project Applicant, or construction contractor shall be financially obligated for any monitoring activities. If evidence of any tribal cultural resources is found during ground-disturbing activities, the monitor(s) shall have the capability to halt construction in the immediate vicinity of the find in order to recover and/or determine the appropriate plan of recovery for the resource. The recovery process shall not unreasonably delay the construction process. On-site monitoring shall end when the Project grading and excavation activities are completed or when the monitor has indicated that the site has a low potential for tribal cultural resources and monitoring is no longer necessary.

Appendix B—Air Quality

Replace Draft EIR Appendix B with Revised Draft EIR Appendix B. Refer to Revised Draft EIR Appendix B of this Final EIR.

Appendix E.2—Parking Memo

Replace Draft EIR Appendix E.2 with Revised Draft EIR Appendix E.2. Refer to Revised Draft EIR Appendix E.2 of this Final EIR.

B. Effect of Corrections and Revisions

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires that an EIR which has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated whenever significant new information has been added to the EIR. The entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document.

The relevant portions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 read as follows:

> *(a) A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term "information" can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not "significant" unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:*
>
> *(1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.*
>
> *(2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.*
>
> *(3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.*
>
> *(4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com. (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)*

> *(b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.*

The additions and corrections above are limited to the correction of typographical errors and inadvertent omissions, minor revisions, and updates to the regulatory setting, including the adoption of the 2019 California Green Building Standards and Building Energy Efficiency Standards. These additions and corrections would not result in new significant impacts or increase the impacts of the Project. Therefore, the additions and corrections contained in this section and the information contained in Section II, Responses to Comments, of this Final EIR, clarify, amplify, or make insignificant changes to the Draft EIR. In addition, Section II, Responses to Comments, of this Final EIR, fully considers and responds to comments claiming that the Project would have significant impacts or more severe impacts not disclosed in the Draft EIR and demonstrates that none of these comments provided substantial evidence that the Project would result in changed circumstances, significant new information, considerably different mitigation measures, or new or more severe significant impacts than were discussed in the Draft EIR. Rather, the additions and corrections to the Draft EIR address typographical errors and inadvertent omissions, provide minor revisions, and/or augment the analysis of the Draft EIR and would not result in new significant impacts or an increase in any impact already identified in the Draft EIR or disclose a feasible alternative or mitigation measure that the Applicant has declined to adopt. Thus, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 are met, and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.