



City of Long Beach
Omnibus Zoning Code Amendment
(December 2019)

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND 16-19

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

This page intentionally left blank.

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:

City of Long Beach Omnibus Zoning Code Amendments – December 2019

Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach
411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:

Jennifer Ly, Planner
(562) 570-6368

Project Location:

City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:

City of Long Beach, Long Beach Development Services
c/o Patricia Diefenderfer
411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6261

General Plan:

The proposed Zoning Code Amendments would cover all General Plan Land Use Districts that apply to any zoning district, Specific Plan area, or Planned Development (PD) district in the City of Long Beach.

Zoning:

The proposed Zoning Code Amendment would cover all zoning districts and all Planned Development districts in the City of Long Beach.

Project Description:

The proposed Zoning Code Amendments – December 2019 (Project) would consist of changes categorized henceforth in this document by 'development standards', 'land use' and 'administrative procedures', collectively referred to as the "Project." The specific extent of the changes to Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) are described as follows:

- 1) Development Standards – Make the following changes to existing development standards:
 - a. Eliminate prohibitions on storage attics within accessory structures in residential zoning districts;
 - b. Exempt satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses from change of use parking requirements when proposed in existing buildings

- on commercially zoned properties located within one-half mile of public transit;
- c. Exempt certain non-permanent fabric canopies covering rooftop usable open space from height limitations.
- 2) Land Use – Update land use regulations to:
- a. Clarify use regulations for the remnant CO (Office Commercial) and CH (Highway Commercial) commercial zones that were phased out in 1992;
 - b. Clarify in which industrial zones personal storage and commercial storage/personal storage uses are permitted;
 - c. Allow aerospace manufacturing uses by-right in certain industrial areas and Planned Development Districts/Specific Plans that are industrial in character;
 - d. Create a process to allow temporary uses for community benefit projects on vacant lots;
 - e. Allow interim housing, such as emergency shelters and bridge or transitional housing, by-right in select commercial, industrial and institutional zoning districts; allow permanent supportive housing by-right in industrial and institutional zoning districts; and establish or revise related definitions, as appropriate; and
- 3) Administrative Procedures –
- a. Add Zoning Code provisions that identify how new uses and unspecified development standards are applicable in specific plans and planned development districts.

Surrounding land uses and settings:

The City of Long Beach is adjacent to the following municipalities: City of Los Angeles (Wilmington, Port of Los Angeles), Carson, Compton, Paramount, Bellflower, Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos and Seal Beach. It is also adjacent to the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez and Rossmoor. In addition, the City of Signal Hill is completely surrounded by the City of Long Beach.

Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach Planning Commission (recommend City Council adopt Negative Declaration 16-19 and approve the Omnibus Zoning Code Amendments – December 2019)

Long Beach City Council (adopt Negative Declaration 16-19 and adopt the Omnibus Zoning Code Amendments – December 2019)

California Coastal Commission (find that the Omnibus Zoning Code Amendments – December 2019 are in conformance with the City's Certified Local Coastal Program)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Jennifer Ly
 Planner

12/31/19

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are supported adequately by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration; Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (per Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effect were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures

which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not result in substantial adverse effects to any scenic vistas. The City topography is relatively flat, with scenic vistas of the ocean to the south and Palos Verdes to the west. In addition, distant views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north, as well as the Santa Ana Mountains to the east are occasionally available to the public on days of clear visibility (primarily during the winter months).

The Project involves amendments to Title 21 of the City’s Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance). The purpose of the proposed code amendments is to streamline and clarify development standards across multiple subsections of the City code (refer to the Project Description on pages 1-2 for the “Development Standards” amendments); make changes in land use and provide clarification to land use standards (refer to the Project Description on pages 1-2 for the “Land Use” amendments); and add Zoning Code provisions that identify how new uses and unspecified development standards are applicable in specific plans and planned development districts (refer to the Project Description on pages 1-2 for the “Administrative Procedures” amendment).

Of the proposed code amendments, one of the proposed “Development Standards” amendments would exempt certain non-permanent fabric canopies covering rooftop usable open space from height limitations. This amendment would improve the usability of rooftop usable open space to address quality-of-life considerations by facilitating the temporary creation of shade. The City of Long Beach has already experienced an increased number of extreme heat days and is anticipating the number of days to grow due to climate change. The amendment allowing non-permanent canopies on rooftop usable open space could help residents adapt to these growing number of extreme heat days by reducing indoor air temperatures and thereby potentially facilitate reduced energy demand for air conditioning. The amendment would allow additional height above the established height limits; however, the increase in height would be for non-permanent fabric canopies and would have negligible impact, thus not affecting scenic vistas. Another one of the proposed “Development Standards” amendments would eliminate prohibitions on storage attics within accessory structures in residential districts; however, this amendment does not change the existing 13-foot height limit on accessory structures and would have no effect on scenic vistas.

While every future development scenario cannot be anticipated at this time, the Project is not anticipated to result in negative impacts to the City’s visual environment. Therefore, no further analysis of this environmental issue is necessary.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

There are no designated scenic highways located within the City. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged due to Project implementation. There would, therefore, be no impact to any scenic resource and no further analysis is required.

c. In nonurbanized areas, 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project applies to all properties within the City of Long Beach, which is an urbanized area, and is surrounded by other urbanized areas. As discussed in I.a. and I.b., the Project is not anticipated to degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views and is not in conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

All future developments and land use activities would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance). The “Land Use” amendments pertaining to aerospace

manufacturing, interim housing (e.g. emergency shelters and transitional housing) and permanent supportive housing, and temporary uses for community benefit projects on vacant lots do no change any of the development standards for the zones in which any future projects or land use activities would be located. Title 21 includes development standards that prevent and reduce light and glare and such projects would be required to comply with these standards. Because of existing development standards that address light and glare, no impacts are anticipated, and no further analysis is required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For Sections II. a., b., c., d. and e. - There are no agricultural zones within the City of Long Beach, which is an urbanized community, surrounded by other urbanized areas. Given that there are no agricultural zones in the City, the Project would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or within the County.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to some of the worst air pollution in the nation, attributable to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, large population base, and dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric forces such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, determine how air pollutant emissions affect air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds

carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are produced mostly by sources other than automobile exhaust.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which it is located, it is consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP. The purpose of the proposed code amendment is in part to update and reconcile sections of the Zoning Code that are outdated or incongruent with current planning practices and to better align development regulations in the City with current land use trends and to better implement adopted policies. For example, the proposed “Land Use” amendments clarify regulations for the remnant Office Commercial and Highway Commercial zones that have been phased out and clarify in which industrial zones commercial/personal storage uses are permitted. Additionally, the proposed “Administrative Procedures” amendment includes provisions that identify how new uses and unspecified development standards are applicable in specific plans and planned development districts.

The Project would generally better align development regulations in the City with current land use trends and facilitate more efficient land use patterns. The proposed “Land Use” amendments would permit interim housing by-right to commercial, industrial, and institutional zoning districts and permanent supportive housing in industrial and institutional districts and also allow by-right aerospace manufacturing in industrial zones and Planned Development Districts/Specific Plans that are industrial in character. This better aligns development regulations with areas of the City around the Long Beach Airport that have historically hosted aerospace manufacturing uses. Overall, the Project does not introduce uses that are materially different from those otherwise permitted in the respective zoning

districts. The Project does not change allowable density, intensity, or height in existing zoning districts. Furthermore, limitations are placed on the uses that reduce potential impacts and include performance standards that ensure compatibility of proposed uses with surrounding uses. For example, the proposed amendment that would permit temporary use of vacant lots for uses that provide a community benefit places limits on the types of uses that are permitted on a temporary basis; limits applicants to those that have a partnership with the City (i.e. limits exclusively for-profit, commercial activities); and requires clean-up and maintenance of the lots on which they are located for the duration of the use. Furthermore, the uses are only permitted by an action of the Zoning Administrator who has the authority to place conditions on the uses to ensure their compatibility and to revoke such uses if they become a nuisance or violate conditions. Additionally, temporary activating uses are not permanent and are subject to time limitations.

The Project will not increase development potential, rather some of the amendments are more protective of the environment. For example, the proposed “Development Standard” amendment that would exempt changes of use to satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses from parking requirements when proposed in existing buildings on commercially zoned properties located within one-half mile of public transit would facilitate reuse of existing vacant storefront and discourage driving to these uses in areas with viable public transportation options, which can reduce vehicle trips. Overall, it is anticipated that the Project will facilitate more efficient land uses and thereby less pollution. For example, under the proposed “Development Standard” amendment, certain non-permanent fabric canopies covering rooftop usable open space would be exempt from height limitations, assisting residents in adapting to the effects of climate change by creating shade structures that could be an alternative to the use of air conditioning and help the City meet state greenhouse gas reduction goals and facilitate adaptation.

The total amount of future development was contemplated in the General Plan, SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and the resulting AQMP which was based on the RTP/SCS. Build-out consistent with the projections within the AQMP does not create impacts beyond those already analyzed in the RTP/SCS and AQMP. Since this Project does not propose any specific developments or increase the height, density, or intensity of land uses in a matter that would conflict with the SCAG growth forecasts, it would be consistent with the AQMP and therefore no further analysis is required.

b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

- Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation
 Less Than Significant Impact
 No Impact

Implementation of the Project would not lower air quality standards or contribute to an air quality violation. The purpose of the proposed code amendment is to a) modernize existing development standards (Development Standards amendments); b) update regulations for certain land uses (Land Use amendments); and c) clarify the application of unspecified development standards and new uses in specific plans and planned development districts (Administrative Procedures amendments). This code amendment allows uses similar to those permitted in the Zoning Code and that already exist within the City, and does not increase the allowable density, intensity, or height. Therefore, Project would not impact air quality and no further environmental analysis is required.

c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- Potentially Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation
 Less Than Significant Impact
 No Impact

The [CEQA Air Quality Handbook](#) defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, elderly and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including, schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City. Generally, the proposed land use provisions clarify use regulations and the zones to which they are applicable and do not introduce new uses that vary significantly from those already found within the City and that are permitted in the respective zones. More specifically, the Project establishes or revises definitions and regulations pertaining to interim housing, such as emergency shelters and bridge or transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing, which are facilities that may serve children and seniors, people with existing health conditions, among others. Any future discretionary project within the City would be evaluated individually and may incorporate conditions including site planning conditions or mitigation measures as appropriate. Any future development projects would also subject to operating standards and conditions specific to their uses and are not generally anticipated to generate substantial pollutants nor increase exposure by sensitive receptors. The proposed “Land Use” amendment that would facilitate aerospace manufacturing restricts these uses to industrial zoning districts in the City. Please see Sections III.a. and b. above for further discussion.

d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Potential sources of odors during construction include use of architectural coatings and solvents, and diesel-powered construction equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and solvents, which lowers odorous emissions. The Project would not allow operations that could directly or indirectly result in any significant adverse odors or intensification of odors beyond those typically associated with construction activities. The proposed “Land Use” amendments pertaining to aerospace manufacturing limit these activities to industrial areas of the City, and are not anticipated to impact surrounding residential uses. Additionally, any future discretionary project would include project-specific conditions of approval that minimize its impact on surrounding areas. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project?

a. Have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Wildlife habitats within the City are generally limited to parks, nature preserves, and water body areas. The Project would not promote activities that would remove or impact any existing or planned wildlife habitats. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Implementation of the Project would occur in established urbanized areas and would not remove or impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No further environmental analysis is required.

c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Future implementation of the Project would occur in established urbanized areas and would not promote or involve alteration of any protected wetland areas. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or

migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed involves zoning code amendments, and no development project is proposed at this time. Project implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not alter or adversely impact any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors, or nursery sites. No further environmental analysis is required.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Project implementation would be consistent with the General Plan and in conformity with all local policies and regulations. It would not alter or eliminate any existing or future policy or ordinance protecting biological resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not have any adverse effects on any existing or future habitat conservation plans. Please see Sections IV.a. through e. above for further discussion.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The City of Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties within the City (except for areas such as protected park lands) have been previously disturbed and/or developed. The Project would not promote, encourage, or enable activities that could remove, degrade, or in any way adversely impact local historic resources. Instead, the proposed Development Standards amendments related to eliminating prohibitions on storage attics within accessory structures in residential districts would better protect any existing historic resources by allowing greater storage capacity within an accessory structure instead of potentially adding bulk and mass that can negatively impact historic resources, if additional square footage is constructed. Additionally, the amendment involving exempting parking requirements for change of use satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses facilitates the use of existing vacant structures which can in some instances have the added benefit of preserving cultural resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Implementation of the Project would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore is not anticipated to affect or destroy any archaeological resources due to its geographic location. The proposed zoning code amendments do not lessen existing legal protections of archaeological resources nor tribal consultation requirements on individual projects. Please see Section V.a. above for further discussion.

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not propose any activities that would involve extensive excavation that could result in the disturbance of any designated cemetery or other burial ground or place of interment. Please see Sections V.a. through b. for further discussion.

VI. ENERGY. Would the project:

a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves Zoning Code amendments; no development project is proposed at this time. The project includes amendments to existing regulations to permit increased height to accommodate non-permanent fabric canopies covering rooftop, usable open space. This facilitates the creation of shade, potentially reducing indoor air temperatures as well as mitigating urban heat island conditions. This could reduce energy demand from air conditioning, and thereby greenhouse gas emissions helping reduce the impacts of climate change. Any future development projects and land use activities subject to the provisions of this Project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Code Title 21 (Long Beach Zoning Ordinance) and Part 6 (California Energy Code) of Title 24 (California Building Standards Code). Since Project implementation would not directly or indirectly result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation, no further analysis is required.

b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy efficiency?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency—see Section VI.a. above.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Per Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the most significant fault system in the City is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City. The Project involves amendments to the City's zoning code and does not involve any construction.

All land uses subject to the provisions of this Project would be required to comply with applicable building codes that account for the possibility of seismic events. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed project involves Zoning Code amendments; no development project is proposed at this time. The Newport-Inglewood fault zone could create substantial ground shaking if a seismic event occurred along that fault. Similarly, a strong seismic event on any other fault system in Southern California has the potential to create considerable levels of ground shaking throughout the City. However, numerous variables determine the level of damage to a specific location. Given these variables, it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. All land uses must conform to all applicable State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Per Plate 7 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of the City is in areas of either minimal or low liquefaction potential. The only exceptions are in the southeastern portion of the City, where there is significant liquefaction potential, and the western portion (most of the area west of Pacific Avenue and south of the 405 freeway), where there is either moderate or significant liquefaction potential. The proposed Project involves Zoning Code amendments and does not propose a development project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

iv) Landslides?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Per the Seismic Safety Element, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The State Seismic Hazard Zone map of the Long Beach Quadrangle indicates that the lack of steep terrain (except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill) results in only about 0.1 percent of the City lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for this quadrangle. Therefore, no impact would be expected and no further environmental analysis is required. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed Project involves Zoning Code amendments. No development is proposed at this time. Future development projects would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best management practices to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section VII.b. above for discussion. All land uses subject to the regulations of the Project would be constructed in compliance with all applicable building code requirements regarding soil stability.

d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Sections VII.b. and c. above for explanation.

e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The entire City is served by an existing sewer system and therefore, has no need for septic tanks or any other alternative wastewater disposal systems. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves amendments to the City's zoning code and does not propose any excavation or construction and, as such, is not expected to adversely impact any paleontological resources or geologic features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project?

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide per year. Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit over the next century. Methane is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The Project would not result in direct or indirect GHG impacts. The Project would not result in any new construction, nor does it increase development potential in the City. By expanding the range of allowable uses and clarifying the applicability of development regulations in Specific Plans and Planned Development Districts, the proposed amendments have the potential to encourage more efficient use of the City's existing commercial, industrial, and institutional zones. This could allow more people to both live and work within the City and potentially contribute to an overall reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). For example, the "Land Use" amendment involving aerospace manufacturing uses encourages the restoration of aerospace manufacturing uses in areas surrounding the Long Beach Airport, potentially creating local jobs as well as supporting the efficient movement of goods, thereby potentially helping reduce VMTs. Likewise, the "Land Use" amendment pertaining to reduced parking requirements related to satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses located within one-half mile of public transit may also result in decreased VMT, because it would facilitate reuse of existing vacant storefronts and could discourage driving to these uses in areas with viable public transportation options. Finally, the proposed "Development Standards" amendments would facilitate the use of non-permanent fabric canopies to shade rooftop usable open space, potentially resulting in a reduction of indoor air temperatures and thus fewer emissions from energy use that would otherwise be needed for air conditioning. No further environmental analysis is needed.

b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section VIII.a. above for discussion. The Project would not permit any land use operations that would conflict with any plans, policies or regulations related to the reduction of GHG emissions. No further environmental analysis is needed.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Any future land uses or activities subject to the provisions of this Project that involve the handling and disposal of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be required to fully comply with Long Beach Municipal Code Sections 8.86 through 8.88, as well as all existing State safety regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section IX.a. above for discussion.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section IX.a. and IX.b. above for discussion. The “Land Use” amendments pertaining to aerospace manufacturing do not change the

underlying zoning regulations that would apply to any future land uses. These activities continue to be restricted to industrial areas of the City that are generally zoned to be separate from schools, and would be subject to existing operational standards designed to reduce impacts from hazardous emissions.

d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Any future land uses that would be regulated by the provisions of this Project would not be permitted to create any significant hazards to the public or the environment by operating at a location included in the Cortese List. Please see Section IX.a. above for further discussion.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City, just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The Project would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. All future development near the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The Project would encourage the establishment of aerospace manufacturing uses in industrial zones and in the Planned Development Districts immediately surrounding the Long Beach Airport, as such uses would be compatible with the airport and appropriate in industrial zones in the City and those Planned Development Districts that are industrial in nature. Please see Section IX.a. above for further discussion.

f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not encourage or otherwise set forth any policies or recommendations that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further environmental analysis is required.

g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The City is a highly urbanized community and there are no properties located adjacent to wild lands and there is no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No further environmental analysis is required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has produced a series of Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) designating potential flood zones (based on the projected inundation limits as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers).

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed “Land Use” amendments pertaining to aerospace manufacturing, interim and permanent supportive housing, and temporary uses for community benefit projects on vacant lots remain subject to the regulations of their respective zoning districts, are comparable to the types of uses and intensities typically found in that zoning district, and do not change the development potential. The Project does not introduce uses that are materially different those otherwise permitted in the respective zoning districts. The Project does not change allowable density, intensity, or height in existing zoning districts. The Project would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the

Conservation Element. activities subject to the provisions of this Project would be required to be in full compliance with all applicable federal, State, and local water quality standards and regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section X.a. above for discussion. The City is a highly urbanized community with the water system infrastructure fully in place to accommodate future development consistent with the General Plan.

c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not encourage or enable any alterations to existing draining patterns or to the course of streams or rivers. Please see Section X.a. above for discussion.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Sections X.a. and c. above for discussion. Future development will continue to be subject to all applicable regulations that require new development and redevelopment projects that create, add, or replace 500 square feet or more to comply with Low Impact Development (LID) to manage stormwater runoff.

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial sources of polluted runoff; or

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Sections X.a. and c. above for discussion. The City's existing storm water drainage system is adequate to accommodate runoff from any future land uses subject to the provisions of this Project. The Project would not adversely affect provisions for retention and infiltration of stormwater consistent with the City's LID policies.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section X.a. and c. above for discussion.

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of Long Beach is not within a zone susceptible to tsunami run up or seiche and strong currents. Potential tsunami hazards would be limited to properties and public improvements near the coastline, while harbor and channel areas would be susceptible to seiche and strong currents. While the identified areas can be susceptible to inundation associated with such natural events, any future development project would be subject the regulations of the zoning district where it is located. Development standards are in place to help mitigate flood risk for development projects located in flood zones, such as measuring height from Base Flood Elevation. The Project itself, which consists of regulatory changes that include a) modernizing existing development standards ("Development Standards" amendments); b) updating regulations for certain land uses ("Land Use" amendments); and c) adding provisions that identify how new uses and unspecified development standards are applicable in specific plans and planned development districts ("Administrative Procedures" amendments) across multiple

subsections of the City code, would not risk release of pollutants due to project inundation; therefore, no further environmental analysis is required.

e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not directly or indirectly conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan—see Section X.a. above.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves zoning code amendments to Title 21 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Long Beach Municipal Code. No development is proposed at this time. As such, the Project would not directly or indirectly divide any established community. Overall, the Project does not introduce uses that are materially different from those otherwise permitted in the respective zoning districts. The Project does not change allowable density, intensity, or height in existing zoning districts. Furthermore, regulations are placed on the uses that are intended to reduce potential impacts. The “Land Use” amendments include limitations and performance standards that ensure compatibility of uses with surrounding uses. For example, the “Land Use” amendment dealing with temporary uses for community benefit projects on vacant lots creates a process in which the Zoning Administrator has the authority to place conditions on temporary uses as appropriate and can revoke a permit if there is a violation of conditions. Additionally, temporary activating uses are subject to time limitations throughout which conditions may be modified to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|

See Section XI.a. above for discussion. The Project would not conflict with the City’s General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or any other applicable land use plans and policies. Rather, the Project is consistent with goals and objectives in the existing Land Use Element, specific policies in the Mobility Element pertaining to efficient movement of goods and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction, as well as short-term extreme heat adaptation strategies contained in the City’s draft Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). By updating and clarifying allowable land uses, the proposed amendments have the potential to encourage more efficient use of the City’s existing commercial, industrial, and institutional zoning districts, potentially generating local jobs and facilitating more people both living and working within the City, and thereby, contribute to an overall reduction in VMT. Additionally, the “Development Standards” amendment that involves exemption from parking requirements satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses that are located within one-half mile of public transit may facilitate reuse of existing vacant storefront and discourage driving to these uses in areas with viable public transportation options, which can reduce vehicle trips. Finally, the proposed amendments would facilitate the use of non-permanent fabric canopies for shade in rooftop usable open space, potentially resulting in decreased urban heat island conditions and thus fewer emissions from energy consumption for air conditioning. Impacts to existing local regulations would, therefore, be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

Historically, the primary mineral resources within the City of Long Beach have been oil and natural gas. However, oil and gas extraction operations have diminished over the last century as the resources have become depleted. Today, extraction operations continue but on a reduced scale compared to past levels.

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not propose any alteration of local mineral resource land uses, and there are no mineral resource activities that would be altered or displaced by Project implementation. No further discussion is required.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XII.a. above for discussion.

XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

a. Generation of 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves amendments to the City’s Zoning Code and does not propose any construction projects at this time. New land uses that would be permitted as a result of the Project are accompanied by operational performance standards and use limitations that are intended to reduce potential impacts of these uses. For example, for the “Land Use” amendment dealing with temporary activating uses, the use is permitted with the approval of the Zoning Administrator who may place conditions on the use as appropriate to address potential impacts, such as noise.

Future construction activities related to the provisions of this Project could involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, earth-moving equipment, and paving equipment. However, all construction activities and land use operations must be performed in compliance with the City’s Noise Ordinance. Project implementation would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or exempt any future land uses or improvements from local noise controls. The local Noise Ordinance would continue to regulate all future land use construction and operational noise levels. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XIII.a. above for discussion. Project implementation would occur in compliance with local noise and vibration controls.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. All future development near the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The Project would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County. At the time of the 2000 Census, Long Beach had a population of 461,522, which was a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census. The 2010 Census reported a total City population of 462,257.

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves various changes to Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to a) modernize existing development standards (Development Standards amendments); b) update regulations for certain land uses (Land Use amendments); and c) add provisions that identify how new uses and unspecified development standards are applicable in specific plans and planned development districts (Administrative Procedures amendments). The proposed “Land Use” amendments allow interim housing in select commercial, industrial and institutional zoning districts and permanent supportive housing in industrial and institutional zoning districts. This Zoning Code amendment does not induce population growth, but rather responds to an existing need for interim and permanent supportive housing to accommodate the existing population and increased homelessness resulting from a well-documented and chronic housing shortage that exists in the City and the region. Otherwise, the Project does not change the development potential of the City’s zoning, nor does it represent an increase in density or an intensification of use. Modifications to allow or clarify uses such as aerospace manufacturing, and personal storage will allow uses that are similar to those already permitted in industrial zones. As appropriate the modified land use regulations are accompanied by performance standards and use limitations to minimize potential impacts and also require a discretionary approval in some cases, to further ensure harmony among new and existing development. As such, the Project is not expected to directly or indirectly induce population growth. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not set forth or encourage any policies, activities or implementation measures that would directly or indirectly displace existing residential units in the City. Rather, the “Land Use” amendment that expands the range of zoning districts in which interim and permanent supportive housing are permitted aim to better accommodate the housing needs of the City and low-income residents by facilitating the development of low-income and transitional housing. No further environmental analysis is required.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

Fire protection would be provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 stations in the City. The Department is divided into bureaus of Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, the Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

Police protection would be provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into bureaus of Administration, Investigation, and Patrol. The City is divided into four Patrol Divisions: East, West, North and South.

The City of Long Beach is served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the City of Signal Hill, Catalina Island and a large portion of the City of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity during the past decade.

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 of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves changes to the City's Zoning Ordinance that are not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for fire protection services or fire protection facilities. All new development subject to the code changes will continue to be subject to fire code review during the building plan check process as well as subject to fire facilities impact fees. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Police protection?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Similar to Section XV.a. above, since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not significantly increase demands for police protection service, nor require provision of new police facilities. New development projects will continue to be subject to police facilities impact fees.

c. Schools?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not result in any significant increased demand for public school services or facilities. New development projects will continue to be subject to School Impact Fees.

d. Parks?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not generate any significant additional demand for provision of park services or facilities by the City. New development projects will continue to be subject to Park Impact Fees.

e. Other public facilities?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

No other impacts have been identified that would require the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities. New development projects will continue to be subject to sewer, transportation, and storm water impact fees and review by the applicable departments during the development review process to upgrade facilities, as necessary.

XVI. RECREATION

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not alter land use regulations related to population density or growth and is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for recreational facilities. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XVI.a. above. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project involves zoning code amendments to update code regulations consistent with current land use trends and best practices and will not conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. Overall, the Project allows for a wider array of uses in commercial, industrial, and institutional zoning districts, helping create more efficient land use patterns and a compatible mix of land uses that encourage opportunities for multi-modal transportation use by community members. For example, the “Land Use” amendment involving aerospace manufacturing uses encourages the restoration of aerospace manufacturing uses in areas surrounding the Long Beach Airport, potentially creating local jobs as well as supporting the efficient movement of goods which may help reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMTs). The “Development Standards” amendment that decreases the parking requirements for changes of use to satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses when proposed in existing buildings on commercially zoned properties located within one-half mile of public transit is limited to a narrow use to expand access to educational opportunities. Given this limited exemption, it is anticipated to have minimal impact and may help reduce VMT by reducing the distances students must travel for education, potentially making public transit and active transportation more viable transportation options. The Project is intended to implement the City’s Land Use strategies/policies, the Mobility Element, and strategies contained in the Sustainable City Action Plan. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XVII.a. for discussion. Since the Project would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth, there would be no significant impacts on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The proposed Zoning Code amendment will exempt changes of use to satellite publicly run, post-secondary educational uses when proposed in existing buildings on commercially zoned properties located within one-half mile of public transit, which may lead to a decrease in VMT and idling of local traffic. Generally, the Project would encourage more efficient land use patterns that allow a mix of uses that include housing and a wide array of neighborhood-serving commercial uses to locate on the City’s commercial corridors and to improve multi-modal access to such uses by City residents.

c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not create or encourage any hazardous transportation-related design features or incompatible uses. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Result in inadequate emergency access?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project does not propose or encourage any specific land uses or developments or transportation network modifications that would have the potential to result in deficient or inadequate emergency access routes. Additionally, any future land uses within the City would be evaluated individually and would comply with existing development standards that ensure emergency access. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a. 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, that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section V. (Cultural Resources) above. Project implementation would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore would not be anticipated to

significantly affect or destroy any Native American tribal cultural resources. The proposed “Land Use” amendments potentially involve changes of use within existing buildings and temporary use of vacant lots with the types of uses and intensities comparable to those found in the respective zoning districts. While the probability of encountering a tribal cultural resource or human remains is low, any occurrence or discovery is subject to existing protections under California law. No further environmental analysis is required.

- ii. **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 significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XVIII.a. above. The City has no substantial evidence of any significant resource impacted by this change to the Zoning Code. During the discretionary review of development projects, the City will provide locational information to potentially impacted tribal officials and will conduct formal consultation, as may be required. No further environmental analysis is required at this time.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- a. **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?**

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

- b. **Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?**

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For Sections XIX.a. through e.: The Project does not change the development potential of the City’s zoning, nor does it represent an increase in density, intensity or height. Land uses such as aerospace manufacturing, personal storage, and interim and permanent supportive housing are similar to those permitted in the respective zoning districts in which they will be permitted. Overall, the Project does not introduce uses that are materially different from those otherwise permitted in the respective zoning districts. Furthermore, performance standards and use limitations are placed on the uses that are intended to ensure compatibility of proposed uses with surrounding uses and thus reduce potential impacts. For example, the “Land Use” amendment dealing with temporary uses for community benefit projects on vacant lots requires approval by the Zoning Administrator who has the authority to place conditions on temporary uses as appropriate and to revoke a permit if there is a violation of conditions. Additionally, temporary activating uses are subject to time limitations. Overall, the Project is not be expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system.

The City of Long Beach is an urbanized setting with all utilities and services fully in place. Future demands for utilities and service systems have been anticipated in the General Plan goals, policies, and programs for future growth. Additionally, any future discretionary project would be evaluated individually and as appropriate, would require project-specific utilities and service systems modifications. The City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) anticipates a level of population growth in excess of the General Plan, therefore the buildout of the General Plan, including any future development projects, will result in water demand equal to or less than that already anticipated in the UWMP. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XX. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For Sections XX.a. through d.: The City of Long Beach has not been identified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Project by CAL Fire, nor is the City in or near a State Responsibility Area. The Project involves a) modernizing existing development standards (Development Standards amendments); b) updating regulations for certain land uses (Land Use amendments); and c) clarifying the application of unspecified development standards and new uses in specific plans and planned development districts (Administrative Procedures amendments) across multiple subsections of the City’s Zoning Code, and would not be expected to impair emergency plans, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire place. The Project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Lastly, as discussed in Section VII.iv. above, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The Project would not be expected to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

As determined in Section IV. Biological Resources and Section V. Cultural Resources, the Project would have no significant adverse impacts on biological or cultural resources. The Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, impact any natural habitats, effect any fish or wildlife populations, threaten any plant or animal communities, alter the number or restrict the range of any rare or

endangered plants or animals, or eliminate any examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not contribute to any cumulative growth effects beyond what is anticipated for the City’s future in the General Plan.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Project would not directly or indirectly cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings. For this reason, the City has concluded that this Project can be implemented without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.

REFERENCES

- Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2019. State Responsibility Area Viewer. <https://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/projects-and-programs/state-responsibility-area-viewer/> (accessed November 22, 2019).
- California Building Standards Code. 2019 Triennial Edition of Title 24.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2019. Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map. <https://osfm.fire.ca.gov/divisions/wildfire-prevention-planning-engineering/wildland-hazards-building-codes/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps/> (accessed November 22, 2019).
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2019. <https://dtsc.ca.gov/dtscs-cortese-list/> (accessed November 22, 2019).
- City of Long Beach. 2019. Draft Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. May.
- City of Long Beach. 1973. General Plan Conservation Element. April.
- City of Long Beach. 1990. General Plan Land Use Element. March.
- City of Long Beach. 2013. General Plan Mobility Element. October.
- City of Long Beach. 1988. General Plan Seismic Safety Element. October.
- City of Long Beach. 1980. Local Coastal Program (LCP). February.
- City of Long Beach. 2010. Sustainable City Action Plan. February.
- City of Long Beach. 2016. Urban Water Management Plan. June.
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code. Section 18.74. Low Impact Development Standards.
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code. Section 8.80. Noise Ordinance.
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code. Section 8.86. Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory.
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code. Section 8.88. Hazardous Materials—Cleanup.
- South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. April 1993, currently being revised).

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2012. Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) 2012-2035.

State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.