

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

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

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

1.2 SUMMARY OF LOCATION AND SETTING

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

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

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

1.3 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

In December 2019, the Long Beach City Council approved the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (approved project) as an update to the City's General Plan intended to guide growth and future development through the horizon year 2040. As part of the approved project, the City Council also certified a Recirculated Draft EIR prepared for the project (referred to as the 2019 Certified Program EIR). The proposed Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) was included in the 2019 Certified Program EIR as Mitigation Measure (MM) GHG-1 in order to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with General Plan buildout.

This Draft SEIR has been prepared to evaluate the environmental impacts that may result from implementation of the proposed CAAP and Safety Element Update (proposed project). The proposed CAAP is a comprehensive planning document providing a framework to reduce future GHG emissions in the City of Long Beach through climate action strategies and lessen the impacts of climate change on the City through climate adaptation strategies. As a qualified climate action plan pursuant to the CEQA, the proposed CAAP provides the framework to achieve the City's GHG emissions reduction targets, and the CAAP Consistency Review Checklist (CAAP Checklist) would be used as the basis for future assessments of consistency with this plan in lieu of a project-specific GHG CEQA analysis for future discretionary projects subject to CEQA pursuant to Section 15183.5 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. CEQA review of subsequent plans and projects that are consistent with the GHG emission reduction strategies and targets in the proposed CAAP may take advantage of CEQA streamlining for project-level GHG analysis on a project-by-project basis. The proposed Safety Element Update builds from the CAAP and is designed to address recent State legislation requiring cities to include goals, policies, objectives, and feasible implementation measures in the Safety Element that place a greater emphasis on climate change impacts, including increased risks related to wildfires and flooding. The proposed amendments would bring the Safety Element up to date and into compliance with a number of State laws including relating to climate change and resiliency. This Draft SEIR constitutes the environmental review of the proposed CAAP and Safety Element Update as planning documents. Neither the proposed CAAP nor the Safety Element Update proposes physical improvements, and approval of these planning and policy documents would not constitute approval of any physical development. Any development or physical improvements incorporating features of the proposed project would be subject to project-specific CEQA review.

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

1.4 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe significant impacts that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. The purpose of the CAAP is to implement a range of actions to reduce GHG emissions and adapt to climate change impacts. The CAAP was developed to help implement the Land Use Element (LUE) in the most sustainable way possible. The GHG reduction goals of the CAAP were informed by the development assumptions of the adopted LUE and the General Plan buildout conditions. Because the proposed CAAP would not alter the land use designations or development assumptions of the adopted LUE, the proposed project would not alter the significance conclusions identified in the 2019 Certified Program EIR.

The proposed project also includes text changes to the Safety Element to bring the Safety Element up to date and into compliance with a number of State laws including relating to climate change and resiliency. These text amendments to the Safety Element represent a planning action intended to comply with State law, and as such, would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in environmental impacts.

Therefore, as determined in this Draft SEIR, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts.

1.5 ALTERNATIVES

The City considered several project alternatives, including an alternative planning area, a smart growth alternative, and a reduced project alternative, but rejected these alternatives from further analysis in this Draft SEIR because they were determined to be infeasible, or they would not meet the basic Project Objectives. The reasons for dismissal of these alternatives are discussed further in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives. The proposed project would not result in any significant impacts. Therefore, there are no alternatives that would reduce significant impacts of the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative was evaluated, as required by CEQA.

1.5.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the No Project Alternative assumes no adoption of the proposed CAAP and continued implementation of the existing General Plan Safety Element (2002) instead of the updates of the proposed project. The existing General Plan Safety Element would continue to guide and regulate the City's policies related to public safety and no planning or policy document would be adopted to provide strategies and actions to reduce the City's GHG emissions, reach its GHG emissions reduction targets and lessen the impacts of climate change on the City. In addition, no CAAP Consistency Checklist would be implemented for future discretionary projects to utilize in lieu of a project-specific GHG emissions analysis to ensure consistency of future development with the City's GHG emissions reductions goals. Further, MM GHG-1 from the 2019 Certified Program EIR would not be implemented as required.

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

1.6 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123, this Draft SEIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the City or that were raised during the scoping process. Major issues and concerns raised at the scoping meeting held via video conference on September 1, 2021, include the following:

- Concerns that the project would have direct impacts related to biological resources from the loss of sensitive habitat and open space from introduction of non-native, invasive plant species through landscaping, fuel modification areas, and grading.

- Concerns related to potential impacts to specific biological resources including Monarch butterfly habitat, jurisdictional waters and associated vegetation, significant ecological areas (SEAs), nesting birds, and bats.
- Recommendations that this Draft SEIR consider all facilities maintained by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District have the capacity consistent with the approved growth identified by the Southern California Association Governments (SCAG) in their regional growth forecast.
- Recommendations that the CAAP and Safety Element Update are analyzed for consistency with SCAG's adopted 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), also known as Connect SoCal.
- Recommendations to include Environmental Justice related goals and policies per Senate Bill (SB) 1000.
- Recommendation to review Caltrans policies, plans, and guidance strategies related to climate change impacts.
- Recommendation to engage in consultation with Native American tribes that are tribally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project pursuant to the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and SB 18.

Please note that these are not exhaustive lists of areas of controversy, but rather key issues that were raised during the scoping process. The Draft SEIR addresses each of these areas of concern or controversy in detail, examines project-related and cumulative environmental impacts, and identifies significant adverse environmental impacts. There were no identified potentially significant impacts and, therefore, no mitigation measures were required.

1.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.1 identifies the potential environmental impacts and level of significance associated with implementation of the proposed project. Table 1.1 also identifies cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project. As stated above, no mitigation measures were required as all impacts were determined to be less than significant or no impact was identified.

Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not directly propose or entitle any physical improvements or new development. The GHG reduction goals of the CAAP were informed by the development assumptions of the adopted LUE and the General Plan buildout conditions. As the proposed CAAP would not alter the land uses designations or development assumptions of the adopted LUE, the proposed project would not result in impacts greater than those anticipated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR.

All CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions would be reviewed at the project level and under CEQA as applicable. Therefore, the analysis in this Draft SEIR focuses on the potential impacts from the measures included in the CAAP Checklist for future discretionary projects and the potential impacts of the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions at a programmatic level.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.1: AESTHETICS		
<p>Threshold 4.1.1: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute approval of any physical development or grant any entitlements for development. All future discretionary projects will be reviewed in accordance with CEQA and for consistency with the goals and policies of the City of Long Beach’s (City) General Plan and development standards. The proposed project would also be consistent with the policies and goals of the adopted Land Use Element (LUE) and Urban Design Element (UDE) aimed at guiding the aesthetic character of new development in a manner that would not significantly inhibit or obstruct scenic vistas in the planning area. Future development and discretionary projects that would help implement CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions through the CAAP Consistency Checklist, including implementation of required CAAP Actions related to Building and Energy, Transportation, and Waste would be anticipated and required to comply with standards established under the 2019 Certified Program EIR and are not anticipated to impact scenic vista. Implementation of the proposed CAAP would help achieve the goals and policies of the adopted LUE. There is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that may be needed to implement the proposed framework of Adaptation Actions in the CAAP, as specific projects and locations are unknown. Additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and projects at specific locations, and future improvements would be analyzed on a project level pursuant to CEQA and for consistency with policies and standards in the adopted LUE and UDE. Therefore, potential impacts of future development or discretionary projects on scenic vistas would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to scenic vistas. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.1.2: Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. According to the Caltrans Scenic Highway Mapping System, there are no State-designated scenic highways in the planning area; however, PCH is considered to be an Eligible State Scenic Highway. Also, the City’s existing General Plan adopted UDE designated local scenic routes which include Ocean Boulevard and Livingston Drive and future expansions. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute approval of physical development or grant any entitlements for development. Future development and discretionary projects that would implement the CAAP through the CAAP Consistency Checklist, including implementation of required CAAP Actions related to Building and Energy, Transportation, and Waste would be anticipated and required to comply with standards established under the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements EIR. The CAAP also</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>identifies Adaptation Actions related to extreme heat, air quality, drought, and sea level rise/flooding; there is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that are suggested as Adaptation Actions in the CAAP, and additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and projects at specific locations.</p> <p>Therefore, impacts related to substantial damage of scenic resources within a State-designated highway would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to scenic resources within a State-designated scenic highway. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.1.3: In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The planning area is currently characterized as a built-out urban environment. The CAAP Actions of the proposed project would be implemented with future discretionary projects and may result in changes to visual character or to public views within the planning area. However, the proposed project does not constitute approval of physical development or grant any entitlements for development, and all applicable CAAP Actions would be included in future discretionary projects in order to demonstrate consistency with the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. Future discretionary projects within the City would be required to be consistent with the City’s design requirements, and thus, impacts related to the visual character would be less than significant in regard to CAAP Actions. The CAAP also identifies Adaptation Actions related to extreme heat, air quality, drought, and sea level rise/flooding; there is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that are suggested as Adaptation Actions in the CAAP, and additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and projects at specific locations. All future projects to implement the CAAP will be analyzed pursuant to CEQA as required.</p> <p>Therefore, impacts related to scenic quality and visual character would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to visual character of the planning area, or conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.1.4: Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. There are existing sources of light in the project vicinity as well as lighting associated with several regional serving uses such as the Port of Long Beach, the Long Beach Airport, and the Pike at Rainbow Harbor. Adjacent residential areas, public facility uses, commercial uses, and industrial uses also emit light and glare. Future discretionary projects that implement CAAP Actions would have the potential to introduce new sources of light to the City typical of development projects. CAAP Actions that would occur in low-density residential areas have a very minimal effect on nighttime lighting. Conversely, the largest nighttime lighting would occur in areas proposed for commercial, industrial, or high-density mixed-uses. All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets would be reviewed under CEQA and would be required to comply with the design standards established in the adopted UDE and the City’s Municipal Code. Additionally, policies are intended to improve the overall visual character of the City through new development projects that would shape the urban environment of the City, while preserving existing development that defines its unique aesthetic character. There is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that are suggested as Adaptation Actions in the CAAP, and additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and projects at specific locations.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed project’s impact related to light and glare would be less than significant. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts from light and glare. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. CAAP Actions required for future discretionary projects, including measures related to Building and Energy, Transportation, Waste, as well as the Adaptation Actions, would not substantially alter the visual character of the planning area, as compared to existing conditions. The site design, landscaping, and architectural design of future discretionary projects would be required to be consistent with goals, policies, strategies, and development standards established by the adopted UDE, which are intended to avoid, reduce, offset, or otherwise minimized identified potential adverse impacts of the proposed project or provide significant benefits to the community and/or to the physical environment. Additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and future discretionary projects would be analyzed on a project level for consistency with policies and standards in the adopted</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>LUE and UDE. CAAP Actions that would introduce more lighting would be implemented consistent with the lighting and development standards in the City’s Municipal Code. The proposed project does not constitute approval of physical development or grant any entitlements for development and would therefore not cumulatively have a significant adverse impact related to scenic vistas, scenic resources within a State scenic highway, visual character or quality of public views, or light and glare. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts from light and glare. No mitigation is required.</p>		
4.2: AIR QUALITY		
<p>Threshold 4.2.1: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed CAAP was included as Mitigation Measure (MM) GHG-1 in the 2019 Certified Program EIR. As a programmatic planning document that does not constitute approval for any physical improvements or development and does not alter the land use designations or development assumptions of the General Plan buildout condition, the proposed project would not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations, cause or contribute to new violations, or delay timely attainment of the AAQS or emission reductions in the AQMP. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the air quality plans prepared by SCAQMD to attain State and national air quality standards or violate any air quality standard. As such, the proposed CAAP would result in a less than significant impact related to a conflict or obstruction of implementation of applicable air quality plans. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would conflict or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.2.2: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The Basin is currently designated nonattainment for the federal and State standards for ozone (O₃), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size (PM_{2.5}), as well as the particulate matter less than 10 microns in size (PM₁₀) standard, which is attributed to the region’s development history. The proposed CAAP does not include physical improvements or development. All future discretionary projects that implement CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions or utilize the CAAP Checklist for GHG streamlining would implement measures to support the CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets, which would also serve to reduce air quality emissions. Therefore,</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>the potential program-level operational impacts of the CAAP to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard would be less than significant. Additionally, all future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be reviewed under CEQA as required. Thus, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or State ambient air quality standard. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.2.3: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not constitute approval for any physical improvements or development that would result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. The SCAQMD recommends the evaluation of localized air quality impacts to sensitive receptors such as residential land uses in the immediate vicinity of the project site as a result of construction activities through the use of Localized Significance Thresholds (LSTs). However, the LSTs are not applicable to programmatic documents, such as the proposed CAAP. Additionally, all future discretionary projects implementing CAAP Actions would be reviewed in accordance with CEQA and would require further evaluation to demonstrate that emissions would not exceed SCAQMD’s LSTs. Therefore, the proposed CAAP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.2.4: Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Although the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development, CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions implemented with future discretionary projects could generate new sources of odors. However, all future discretionary projects would be subject to project-level CEQA review to determine if impacts related to odors would occur and if project-specific mitigation is required. Therefore, for these reasons and because the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development, impacts associated with odors would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Air Quality Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Cumulative growth within the City could increase pollutant concentrations and contribute to existing air pollution in the Basin. The proposed project does not include physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes that future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. Future development and discretionary projects that would implement CAAP Actions related to Building and Energy, Transportation, and Waste would be subject to CEQA and demonstrate consistency with local, State, and federal air quality standards that are intended to protect air quality. In addition, future development facilitated by the proposed CAAP would be required to comply with California Air Resources Board (CARB) motor vehicle standards, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulations from stationary sources and architectural coatings, and Title 24 energy efficiency standards. Where there is the potential for cumulative impacts, they would be addressed through project-level environmental review and permitting. As such, the CAAP as a program-level document would not cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant impacts. Therefore, the Safety Element Update would not cumulatively contribute to air quality impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>4.3: ENERGY</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.3.1: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed CAAP does not include physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. The CAAP Actions for Building and Energy included on the Consistency Checklist include actions that encourage the construction or installation of new facilities aimed to increase access to renewable energy and increase use of solar panels. As the CAAP Actions related to Building and Energy are largely improvements to existing facilities or operational programs to reduce emissions, these CAAP Actions would not result in wasteful or inefficient energy use during construction or operation of future discretionary projects. In addition, by incorporating sustainability elements with existing and proposed facilities, the proposed CAAP would result in a beneficial effect to the City’s overall energy demand and would not result in any wasteful or inefficient energy usage.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets would be reviewed in accordance with CEQA and would require further evaluation to demonstrate that such projects would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. There is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that are suggested as Adaptation Actions in the CAAP, and additional analysis will be needed to develop specific adaptation approaches and projects at specific locations. Therefore, potential impacts of the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, would be less than significant. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development and, as such, would not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. No mitigation required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.3.2: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Energy usage during construction would be temporary in nature and all future discretionary projects would be reviewed in accordance with CEQA to demonstrate that construction activities would not result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Additionally, CAAP Actions would support energy conservation and renewable energy, encourage alternative transportation, promote mixed-use development, reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and foster energy efficiency, supporting the goals of the City’s Sustainable City Action Plan. Further, the proposed CAAP identifies Adaptation Actions that prioritize the locations and types of future projects that may be needed to lessen climate change. There is not sufficient information at this time to analyze potential future physical improvements that are suggested as Adaptation Actions in the proposed CAAP; however, it is not expected that these Adaptation Actions would generate substantial energy demand and any future projects would undergo project-level CEQA review as required.</p> <p>The proposed CAAP would result in both a decrease in energy demands overall and an increase in renewable energy production. Therefore, potential impacts of the CAAP Actions to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project operation, would be less than significant, and implementation of the CAAP would not conflict with or obstruct the City’s Sustainable City Action Plan or any other State plans related to energy efficiency. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>or entitle any physical development and, as such, would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Energy Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not constitute approval for any physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. CAAP Actions support energy conservation and renewable energy, encourage alternative transportation, promote mixed-use development, and encourage recycling compliance and expanded organic waste collection. Further, the proposed CAAP identifies Adaptation Actions that prioritize the locations and types of future projects that may be needed to lessen climate change. However, it is not expected that these adaptations strategies would generate substantial energy demand. Therefore, implementation of CAAP Action and Adaptation Actions would promote energy efficiency and not cumulatively contribute to energy impacts. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant energy impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
4.4: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
<p>Threshold 4.4.1: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not constitute approval for any physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. CAAP Actions are proposed for the sectors of Building and Energy (BE), Transportation (T), and Waste (W). Additional analysis will be needed to determine the potential impacts of how CAAP Actions will be implemented at specific locations, and future improvements would be analyzed at the project level and would be subject to CEQA as required. The proposed project would reduce the City’s impact on climate change by reducing future GHG emissions and would result in a less than significant impact related to construction and operational GHG emissions. In addition, implementation of the Adaptation Actions would not have a significant impact on the environment as a result of GHG emissions. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.4.2: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of greenhouse gases?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>CARB 2017 Scoping Plan: The proposed CAAP would meet the GHG emissions reduction targets for 2030, which align with the adopted targets for the 2017 Scoping Plan. The proposed project would comply with existing State regulations adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the AB 32 Scoping Plan, and Executive Order (EO) B-30-15, Senate Bill (SB) 32, and AB 197 and would be consistent with applicable State plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG RTP/SCS: The 2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) contains transportation projects to help more efficiently distribute population, housing, and employment growth, as well as forecast development that is generally consistent with regional-level general plan data. The CAAP is designed to help implement the land use strategies of the Long Beach LUE, which is based on land use strategies of the RTP/SCS. Implementing SCAG’s RTP/SCS would greatly reduce the regional GHG emissions from transportation, helping to achieve statewide emissions reduction targets, and the project would not conflict with the stated goals of the RTP/SCS. Additionally, the intent of the proposed Adaptation Actions is consistent with the goals of the RTP/SCS. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHG emissions, and impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>City of Long Beach Sustainable City Action Plan: The Sustainable City Action Plan is a City-adopted plan to guide the City in becoming more sustainable. The proposed CAAP includes various policies that are and would be consistent with these goals and initiatives of the Sustainable City Action Plan to reduce solid waste, improve transportation, and address climate change. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with this adopted plan, and impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emission of GHGs. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes that future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. The CAAP Actions would reduce the City’s impact on climate change by reducing future GHG emissions. In addition, implementation of the Adaptation Actions would not have a significant impact on the environment as a result of GHG emissions. Thus, the proposed project would have a beneficial impact on GHG emissions and would not have a cumulatively significant impact. No mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant GHG impacts. Therefore, the Safety Element Update would not cumulatively contribute to GHG impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>4.5: LAND USE AND PLANNING</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.5.1: Would the project divide an established community?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The planning area is almost entirely developed and is characterized by a mix of PlaceTypes. The proposed CAAP is a policy-level planning document that does not include physical improvements or development that would have the potential to divide an established community or have any direct physical impacts. However, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement applicable CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. CAAP Actions include measures related to Building and Energy, Transportation, Waste, and would not physically divide an established community. Implementation of small-scale building and energy and waste improvements are anticipated to be included with future development projects and are not anticipated to involve construction of large buildings or structures of a scale that would divide an established community. Future discretionary projects for new transit facilities and increased residential, commercial, and mixed-use development that may result in the development of structures would be evaluated for consistency with the adopted LUE and UDE, and the Mobility Element. The CAAP also identifies Adaptation Actions related to extreme heat, air quality, drought, and sea level rise/flooding; future discretionary projects would be analyzed on a project level under CEQA and for consistency with policies and standards in the adopted LUE and UDE. Therefore, impacts relating to division of established communities would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would physically divide a community. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.5.2: Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact.</p> <p>California Coastal Act: The proposed project would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development within the Coastal Zone, and adoption of the CAAP would not require any CDPs from the CCC. Additionally, the intent of Adaptation Actions is consistent with goals of the CCA to preserve and maintain coastal resources, and thus impacts would be considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Local Coastal Program Consistency: The City’s Local Coastal Program (LCP) outlines provisions related to the following general policies: Transportation and Access; General Housing Policy; Park Dedication Policy; and Strand Use and Access. The proposed project would be consistent with applicable provisions of the LCP related to all these general policies. Additionally, as the City updates zoning in each specific area as part of its comprehensive zoning update, the City will also update the LCP and submit it to the California Coastal Commission (CCC) for review and approval. Therefore, approval of these future LCP updates and amendments would reduce potential inconsistencies with the City’s LCP. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan: The CAAP was developed to help implement the LUE in the most sustainable way possible, and the LUE was designed to be consistent with the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) as described in the 2019 Certified Program EIR. The proposed CAAP Actions would encourage development along transit corridors, promote new housing and employment options along transit corridors, and would help the City meet its GHG reduction goals, thereby remaining consistent with the 2008 RCP goals. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG RTP/SCS Consistency: The CAAP Actions would ensure that future discretionary projects reduce GHG emissions through implementation of CAAP Actions for Transportation that are consistent with the goals of Connect SoCal. Further, Adaptation Actions would require a project-specific consistency analysis, the intent of these actions is consistent with goals of Connect SoCal to expanding transit access. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>General Plan, Specific Plan, Port Master Plan, and Airport Land Use Plan Consistency: Adoption of the CAAP and implementation of the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions would reduce GHG emissions and allow the City to adapt to climate change impacts consistent with the adopted goals and policies of the City’s General Plan. Future discretionary projects to incorporate measures to support the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions would also be reviewed for consistency with adopted land use plans currently regulating development in the City, such as adopted specific plans, the Port Master Plan, and the Airport</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Land Use Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would conflict with any adopted land use plans. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Because the proposed project is a citywide policy/planning action that includes strategies and measures that would apply to future discretionary projects throughout the entire City, the proposed project itself is cumulative in nature. As such, future discretionary projects to implement CAAP Actions would be subject to project-level CEQA review as required and General Plan consistency analysis and would be reviewed for consistency with all applicable adopted land use plans and policies. For this reason, cumulative impacts associated with inconsistency of future development with adopted plans and policies would be less than significant. The proposed CAAP would implement Mitigation Measure (MM) GHG-1 of the 2019 Certified Program EIR and ensure consistency with the policies of the adopted LUE. Therefore, land use impacts associated with the proposed project would be considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant land use or planning impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
4.6: NOISE		
<p>Threshold 4.6.1: Generate a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not include physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction targets. Construction of these future discretionary projects does not constitute the CAAP project, therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to short -term substantial increases in ambient noise levels. Further, discretionary projects that would implement CAAP Actions would be consistent with the adopted LUE as analyzed in the 2019 Certified Program EIR and would therefore, not result in additional impacts related to the exposure of sensitive land uses to noise. Therefore, implementation of the project would not expose persons to long-term noise levels above the City’s Municipal Code. Potential operational noise impacts of the Adaptation Actions would also be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
or entitle any physical development that would result in noise impacts. No mitigation is required.		
<p>Threshold 4.6.2: Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not constitute approval for any physical improvements or development, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in ground-borne vibration or noise. The CAAP Actions that would be implemented with future discretionary projects would not require construction methods that would generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels or result in an increase in the number of large trucks or add any sources of permanent operational ground-borne vibration. All future discretionary projects that would implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including the Noise Ordinance requirements limiting the operation of any device that creates vibration that is above the vibration perception threshold. As such, impacts of the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions related to excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in noise or vibration impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.6.3: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not constitute any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development. New solar, solid waste, mixed-use and transit-oriented development projects or other improvements or facilities incorporated into future discretionary projects to implement the CAAP Actions may generate a limited number of new employees and could generate a residential population that may be located in proximity to the Long Beach Airport, exposing people residing or working in these areas to excessive noise levels from aviation activities. Adoption of the CAAP as a policy action would not present additional impacts as it does not constitute or entitle any physical development, and all future discretionary projects would be required to undergo the Site Plan Review process to be compliant with federal, State, and local aviation safety regulations. With compliance with local and State regulations and requirements, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels from aircraft noise sources. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
or entitle any physical development that would result in noise impacts. No mitigation is required.		
<p>Cumulative Noise Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development; however, cumulative growth within the City could result in temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels throughout the City. Construction activities associated with future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance to ensure that noise impacts from construction sources are reduced. Additionally, the CAAP Actions would be implemented in part through future discretionary projects would be evaluated for consistency with the adopted LUE, and the proposed CAAP would not cause a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional noise conditions as it does not constitute or entitle any physical development. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is less than cumulatively significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant noise impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
4.7: POPULATION AND HOUSING		
<p>Threshold 4.7.1: Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions to achieve the City’s greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not induce population growth beyond what was anticipated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR, and all future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be reviewed under CEQA for consistency with the General Plan. Further, it should be noted the GHG reduction goals of the CAAP were informed by the development assumptions of the adopted LUE and the General Plan buildout conditions. The 2019 Certified Program EIR concluded that the LUE would result in less than significant impacts related to unplanned population growth. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts with respect to the inducement of substantial unplanned population growth in an area. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in impacts related to substantial unplanned population growth. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4.7.2: Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or grant any entitlements for development that would displace housing or people. Adoption of the CAAP and future discretionary projects that implement CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people because the CAAP would not change local land use plans, and future facilities supported by the CAAP Actions would be reviewed for consistency with the General Plan. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the need for replacement housing elsewhere. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would displace housing or necessitate additional housing. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute physical improvements or grant any entitlements for development. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively significant population or housing impact and the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would not result in future development that would induce growth in areas where growth was not previously anticipated. Also, the text amendments to the Safety Element would not constitute or entitle any development that would result in impacts to increased population or housing or induced growth within the City. The proposed project’s contribution to impacts on population and housing would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>
<p>4.8: PUBLIC SERVICES</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.8.1: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.8.2: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute any physical improvements or grant any entitlements for development that would result in the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAPP Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions targets. The CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE and UDE, and thus there would be no increase in service demands beyond those already contemplated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR. All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions targets would be reviewed under CEQA as required. Additionally, all future development projects would be subject to applicable local regulations, requirements, and development impact fees, as well as State and federal laws, including the payment of the adopted fire facility impact fees. Therefore, impacts to fire protection or police protection services and facilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to police or fire services. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.8.3: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for public schools?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.8.5: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any other public facility?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development that would result in the demand for public schools or any other public facilities. The CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE and UDE, and thus service demands would not exceed those already contemplated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR. All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>City’s GHG emissions targets would be reviewed under CEQA as required, Additionally, all future development projects would be subject to applicable local regulations, requirements, and development impact fees, as well as State and federal laws, including the payment of the adopted school impact fees as required. Therefore, impacts to schools would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to public schools or facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.8.4: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for parks?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development that would result in increased demand or performance impacts for parks. The CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE and UDE, and thus service demands would not result in impacts beyond those already contemplated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR. All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions targets would be reviewed under CEQA and would be required to undergo the Site Plan Review process. Additionally, all future development projects would be subject to applicable local regulations, requirements, and development impact fees, as well as State and federal laws, including the payment of any required park fees. Therefore, impacts to parks would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to public services including parks. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Cumulative Public Services Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The GHG reduction goals of the CAAP were informed by the development assumptions of the adopted LUE and the General Plan buildout conditions. Because the proposed CAAP would not alter the land uses designations or development assumptions of the adopted LUE, the CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE and would not result in a population increase greater than projected for the buildout of the adopted LUE because the CAP would not change local land use plans. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to fire, police protection, school, parks, and other public facility impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
result in cumulatively significant public services impacts. No mitigation is required.		
4.9: RECREATION		
<p>Threshold 4.9.1: Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.9.2: Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development that would include the construction of recreational facilities or result in the increased use of existing parks or other recreational facilities. Because the proposed CAAP would not alter the land uses designations or development assumptions of the adopted LUE, the CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE. Future discretionary projects would be subject to review under CEQA and consistency with the adopted LUE. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the increased use of existing parks or other recreational facilities and the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to parks or recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Cumulative Recreation Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development that would include recreational facilities or result in the increased use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. Because the proposed CAAP would not alter the land uses designations or development assumptions of the adopted LUE, the CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE. Future discretionary projects would be subject to review under CEQA and consistency with the adopted LUE. Therefore, the proposed project's contribution to parks and recreational facility impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. No mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant recreation impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.10: TRANSPORTATION		
<p>Threshold 4.10.1: Would the project conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not constitute approval of or entitle any physical improvements or development; however, project implementation assumes future discretionary projects would implement CAAP Actions and applicable Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions targets and could involve energy efficiency improvements, sourcing of clean electricity, new transit and waste facilities, and changes to the existing streetscape such as expanded bicycle and pedestrian networks. Construction of these facilities may temporarily disrupt traffic flows on area roadways from the use of heavy-duty construction vehicles and could temporarily disrupt alternative modes of transportation by blocking bicycle or pedestrian pathways or public transit lanes or result in lane closures. However, these future improvements are not a part of the proposed CAAP, and all future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be reviewed under CEQA. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to conflicts with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in conflicts with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to the transportation circulation system. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.10.2: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b)?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed CAAP would promote a reduction of VMT, and a CAAP Action is designed to ensure the City implements SB 743 (see T-9). To that end, the City adopted VMT guidelines in 2020 consistent with SB 743 and the proposed CAAP. The proposed project includes measures to support the CAAP Actions related to Building and Energy, which would be constructed within or on existing or proposed buildings (e.g., solar facilities on rooftops) and are not expected to result in additional VMT impacts. Measures to support the CAAP Actions related to Transportation include expansion of the bicycle and pedestrian network and other measures to reduce VMT, and increased housing and employment along major transit corridors and increased density and mixing of land uses. Development of housing and employment along transit centers would not result in additional impacts related to VMT beyond those anticipated in the adopted LUE and the 2019 Certified Program EIR; rather, the CAAP is designed to maximize GHG reduction, including through VMT reduction, as part of LUE implementation. In addition, future discretionary projects that implement measures to support the CAAP Actions related to increased transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities would also support reductions in VMT as analyzed in the</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>2019 Certified Program EIR. Measures to support the CAAP Actions for Waste include, but are not limited to, actions that encourage recycling compliance and expanded organic waste collection, which may result in new facilities for organic waste processing. However, such new facilities would be subject to their own project-level CEQA review. The proposed CAAP Actions implemented with future discretionary projects would result in a decrease in VMT from existing conditions and compared to the adopted LUE, and thus implementation of the proposed CAAP would have a less than significant impact related to <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> Section 15064.3 subdivision (b). No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in VMT impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.10.3: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in increased design hazards. Most of the CAAP Actions that would be implemented with future discretionary projects through the Consistency Checklist would not change the existing area roadways and would therefore not cause a substantial increase in hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. Additionally, with compliance with State and local regulations and design guidelines, roadways and transit improvements promoted by the CAAP would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses, and impacts related to potential hazards due to incompatible uses are considered to be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in potential hazards. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.10.4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Adoption of the proposed CAAP would not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in inadequate emergency access. All future discretionary projects that would implement measures to support the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to project-level review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Such future discretionary projects would also be reviewed on a project-by-project basis for compatibility with adjacent land uses, and mitigation would be identified during project-level review as appropriate. It should be noted that the construction of any future discretionary projects is not a part of the CAAP project; they are future projects that utilize the CAAP Checklist for GHG analysis streamlining. Therefore, impacts related</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>to emergency access would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in emergency access impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Transportation Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project does not facilitate or entitle any physical improvements or development. All future discretionary projects that would implement measures to support the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to project-level review under CEQA. In the event that the construction of a nearby project occurs at the same time as the construction of a project that would implement a CAAP Action or Adaptation Action, cumulative construction traffic effects could occur. However, these future projects are not a part of the CAAP policy document, which itself does not include any physical development. Further, once future project-specific details and locations are known, the potential for cumulative impacts would be addressed through project-level environmental review and permitting. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would be less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant transportation impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
4.11: TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES		
<p>Threshold 4.11.1(i): Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k)?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.11.1(ii): Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is: A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development that would disturb soils in the planning area. There are several CAAP Actions that would be implemented with future discretionary projects that would involve retrofits to existing buildings or may be sited in locations that would result in potential impacts to tribal cultural resources. Additional analysis will be needed to determine the potential impacts of how CAAP Actions will be implemented at specific locations, and future improvements would be analyzed at the project level and would be subject to CEQA as required. During the project-specific CEQA analysis, a review of the California Register would be conducted as well as review of any the City’s local registers of historical resources, as provided in the City’s Historic Preservation Element, and all future discretionary projects would be subject to the requirements of AB 52 for Native American consultation. Future discretionary improvements related to Adaptive Actions would be analyzed on a project level and project-specific tribal consultation pursuant to the requirements of AB 52 and/or SB 18 would be conducted. Therefore, potential impacts of the CAAP Actions and Adaptation Actions would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or entitle any physical development that would result in impacts to tribal cultural resources. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Cumulative growth within the City could result in potential impacts to tribal cultural resources at specific development sites throughout the City. However, the proposed project does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development. If multiple future discretionary projects used to implement CAAP Actions would result in impacts to tribal cultural resources, cumulative impacts to tribal cultural resources could occur. Where there is the potential for these cumulative impacts, they would be addressed through project-level CEQA review and permitting and would be subject to compliance with State law as well as the City’s standard requirements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
4.12: UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS		
<p>Threshold 4.12.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.12.2: Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is considered a policy/planning action and does not constitute or entitle any physical improvements or development. The proposed CAAP Actions include measures related to Building and Energy (BE), Transportation (T), and Waste (W). These CAAP actions would be developed consistent with the land uses and standards of the adopted LUE and resulting PlaceTypes and would be subject to CEQA review and would not result in significant population growth or additional water demand.</p> <p>All future discretionary projects that implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions to achieve the City’s GHG emissions targets would be reviewed under CEQA and would be required to undergo the Site Plan Review process, during which the City would identify potable water systems serving a project and would assess Plumbing Permit and Plan Check Fees. Payments of these fees would fund future upgrades to water facilities within the planning area. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in impacts related to water demand or water facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.
<p>Threshold 4.12.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, <u>wastewater</u> treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p>Threshold 4.12.3: Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitment?</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to utilities and service systems. These CAPP Actions would not result in additional population growth or the need for additional wastewater facilities. Additionally, the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be implemented through future discretionary projects that would be subject to review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including sewer capacity considerations as part of the City development review and approval process. For example, projects would be required to pay Sewer Capacity Fees to fund the construction, reconstruction, maintenance, and operation of existing and future improvements to the sanitary sewer system, including improvements outlined in the City’s 2021 Capital Improvement Program. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed project related to wastewater treatment, or the construction of wastewater supply or conveyance facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in impacts related to wastewater facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Y Threshold 4.12.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or <u>storm water drainage</u>, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to utilities and service systems. All future discretionary projects that would implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted, including requirements to comply with the provisions of the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit), or any other subsequent applicable permits. Furthermore, as future individual projects are proposed, the City would review grading plans and construction documents to identify project features aimed at reducing construction impacts to storm drain facilities. Therefore, potential impacts of the CAAP Actions related to the relocation or construction of new or expanded stormwater drainage facilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in impacts related to stormwater facilities. No</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
mitigation is required.		
<p>Threshold 4.12.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, <u>electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities</u>, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Section 4.3, Energy, for further discussion related to project-related impacts with respect to electric power and natural gas facilities. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to provision of electric power or natural gas. The CAAP Actions would not result in additional population growth or the need for additional natural gas or electricity facilities. All future discretionary projects that would implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. CAAP Actions are expected to promote energy efficiency in existing and new buildings, resulting in the reduction of electric power and natural gas demand. Where necessary, infrastructure improvements would be made to serve proposed projects subject to further environmental review depending on the extent and nature of those improvements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or relocation of existing electricity and natural gas facilities, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in increased demand for or impacts related to electricity and natural gas facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.12.1: Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or <u>telecommunications facilities</u>, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to telecommunications facilities. All future discretionary projects that would implement the CAAP Actions or Adaptation Actions would be subject to review under CEQA and required to comply with any requirements in effect when the review is conducted. Where necessary, infrastructure improvements would be made to existing telecommunications facilities in order to meet customer demands and achieve compliance with the City’s LUE goal of investing in telecommunications</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>infrastructure systems (LU-M-13). Most telecommunications facilities in the City are currently located within existing right-of-way areas and/or are located underground. As such, environmental impacts associated with future improvements to telecommunications facilities are anticipated to be minimal, as these facility areas would have previously been disturbed through association with past infrastructure improvements. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the construction or relocation of existing telecommunications facilities, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in increased demand or impacts related to telecommunications facilities. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p>Threshold 4.12.4: Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</p> <p>CAAP: Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to solid waste impacts. Additional analysis will be needed to determine the potential impacts of how CAAP Actions will be implemented at specific locations, and future improvements would be analyzed at the project level and would be subject to CEQA as required. The proposed CAAP would not in itself grant any entitlements for development that would result in changes to solid waste. One of the intentions of the CAAP is to reduce GHG emissions associated with solid waste generation, and the CAAP includes Quantified CAAP Actions for Waste that would increase solid waste diversion, reducing the amount of solid waste that would be in landfills through actions that ensure compliance with state law requirements for multifamily and commercial property recycling programs (W-1), and required expanded organic waste collection and processing (W-2, W-3, and W-4). Implementation of the CAAP would reduce solid waste generation in the City, and impacts would be beneficial. Any new facilities needed to support increased waste diversion (such as transfer facilities or composting facilities) would be reviewed under CEQA and required to comply with existing regulations for the handling of solid waste, including the applicable permitting requirements of CalRecycle. Therefore, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to the generation of solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure. No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Safety Element Update: No Impact. Text changes to the Safety Element would not constitute approval of or result in any physical development that would result in impacts related to solid waste. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less Than Significant Impact.

Table 1.1: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Compliance Measures, and Levels of Significance

Potential Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features and Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impacts.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed CAAP does not constitute or entitle any physical development of any buildings or structures, nor would it grant any entitlements for development. The proposed CAAP would be consistent with the adopted LUE, and thus any service demands from future new structures would not result in additional impacts beyond what was anticipated in the 2019 Certified Program EIR under the General Plan buildout (2040). Additionally, implementation of the CAAP would not result in a population increase greater than projected for the buildout of the adopted LUE because the CAAP would not change local land use plans, and the additional facilities supported by the CAAP would result in only minor employment increases and minimal, if any, population growth. Therefore, the proposed project’s contribution to impacts on utilities and service systems would not be cumulatively considerable, and no mitigation would be required.</p> <p>Text changes to the Safety Element would not facilitate or entitle any physical development that would result in cumulatively significant utilities or service systems impacts. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>

This page intentionally left blank