
<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1.0 Executive Summary	1-1
1.1 Introduction	1-1
1.2 Project Location and Setting.....	1-1
1.3 Project Description.....	1-2
1.4 Areas of Controversy	1-3
1.5 Summary of Environmental Impacts.....	1-5
1.6 Alternatives to the Project.....	1-6
1.6.1 No Project Alternative	1-6
1.6.2 Alternative 1 – Development According to Existing Land Use Designations	1-6
1.6.3 Alternative 2 – Reduced RV Storage	1-7
1.7 References	1-25

TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1-1 Summary of Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Level of Significance	1-9

EXHIBITS

<u>Exhibit</u>	<u>Follows Page</u>
No table of figures entries found.	

APPENDICES

Appendix

SECTION 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section provides a summary of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Pacific Place Project (Project). This section provides a summary of the Project, areas of known controversy and issues to be resolved, a summary of project alternatives, and a summary of all Project impacts, associated mitigation measures, and ultimate level of significance after mitigation is applied.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This EIR has been prepared by the City of Long Beach (City) to evaluate potential environmental effects that would result from development of the Project. This EIR has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended), implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.), and the County of Orange Local CEQA Procedures Manual. The County is the lead agency under CEQA.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

Project Location

The Project Site is located at 3701 North Pacific Place in the City of Long Beach in Los Angeles County, California. The Project Site is located at the north end of North Pacific Place, which is immediately north of the I-405 Freeway and east of the I-710 Freeway and Los Angeles River. The City of Long Beach is located in south Los Angeles County and is surrounded by the City of Paramount to the north, the County of Orange to the east, the City of Carson to the west, and the San Pedro Bay to the south. Regional access to the site is provided via the Interstate (I) 405 Freeway, which is located less than 0.25 miles south of the Project Site. Local access is provided via North Pacific Place. The Project Site is identified as Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) 7140-014-034.¹

The Project Site has a General Plan PlaceType (land use designation) of Neo-Industrial (NI) and a zoning designation of Light Industrial (LI). The NI land use designation allows for light industrial; clean manufacturing and offices, commercial uses accessory to creative business endeavor(s); and repurposed buildings with live/work artist studios. The NI PlaceType allows a maximum of 36 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) based on lot size and floor area ratio (FAR) between 0.50 and 1.00. The LI zoning designation allows for a variety of land uses, such as urban agriculture uses; manufacturing uses; wholesale trade uses; laundry, cleaning, and garment services; and professional office and institutional uses. IL zoning development standards require a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet (sf); a maximum lot coverage of 55%; a maximum building height of 4 stories or 60 feet (ft), whichever is more restrictive; and a maximum non-building structure height of 45 ft.

Project Setting

The approximate 14.20-acre Project Site is currently undeveloped; unpaved, and pervious; however, the site, including adjoining properties, have been historically used for oil development activities including oil production wells, evaporation and treatment ponds (sumps), and above

¹ One of the approvals associated with the MND was a lot merger, which was rescinded in compliance with the Court Ruling. Prior to the City rescinding the Prior Project approvals, the County Assessor processed a Certificate of Compliance for the prior merger, and this caused the Assessor to create and issue a new single APN for the entirety of the Project Site. The Assessor has not withdrawn the new APN that was issued, so this new APN remains is the most accurate identifier for the Project Site.

ground storage tanks (ASTs). In addition to the above-mentioned uses, the Project Site has historically been illegally used for driving off-road vehicles, and was also used as a golf driving range in the mid-2000's. The Project Site has since been fenced and measures have been taken to prevent trespassing and all other prohibited uses.

The Project Site is bounded to the south by a California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintenance station; the I-405 freeway; a ramp from North Pacific Place to the northbound I-405 freeway; and the transition road from the northbound I-405 to the northbound I-710 freeways. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) A Line (formerly Blue Line) light rail tracks are located east of the Project Site. Beyond the Metro A Line tracks are Los Cerritos Park, Los Cerritos Elementary School, and single-family residential uses. Vacant land owned by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District (LACFCD), runs along the western boundary of the Project Site. West of the LACFCD property is the Los Angeles River (LA River), which exists as an engineered concrete channel. West of the LA River are a stormwater detention basin and an equestrian club. The site is bounded to the north by undeveloped land.

No public sidewalks are present around or through the Project Site, and no public transit services are available on or directly adjacent to the site. As described in detail in Section 3.0, Project Description, the Project Site contains a Surcharge Pile from previous Project-related investigations. The Surcharge Pile is approximately 18-feet tall and occupies approximately 60,000 sf of the Site within the footprint of the proposed self-storage building. The Site is disturbed with a predominance of non-native vegetation and some sparse native plants.

Regional Setting

The Project Site is in the South Coast Air Basin and under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management (SCAQMD). The Project is located within the Coastal Plain of Los Angeles Groundwater Basin (West Coast Subbasin) and would be subject to the requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and County of Los Angeles. The Project Site is located within the USGS Long Beach, 7.5-minute Topographic Map (USGS 2015).

Additional existing setting descriptions are provided in the topical environmental sections (4.1 through 4.17) that are relevant to the specific environmental topic.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project proposes a Conditional Use Permit, General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Zoning Text Amendment, Site Plan Review, and a Lot Merger/Lot Line Adjustment to allow the construction of a four-story, 206,756-sf self-storage building consisting of approximately 1,681 self-storage units on four levels; and 551 rentable recreational vehicle (RV) parking stalls, 27 standard automobile parking stalls, and 5 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible automobile parking stalls.

In addition, the Project would also include the development of a 1,450-sf private car/RV wash for exclusive use by property owner or tenants, site improvements, landscaping, off-site improvements along North Pacific Place Road, and dedication of an easement for future development of a publicly accessible trail and trailhead. A more in-depth description of the Project, including information on architectural style, floor plans, lighting, landscaping, utilities, and construction activities are provided in Section 3.5, Project Elements.

As explained in more detail in Section 3.0 (Project Description), surcharge activities were undertaken from September 2020 to January 2021 (Surcharge Activities), which included grading, movement of onsite soil from the northern to southern portion of the Project Site, import of certified

clean soil from offsite, and creation of a large soil stockpile (Surcharge Pile) from the onsite and imported soils. These Surcharge Activities are included in this EIR as an element of the Project.

The Project is proposed to meet the following objectives:

- OBJ-1: Provide a state of the art, secure storage solution that would meet the increased demand in the Long Beach area, especially for secure, RV storage.
- OBJ-2: Develop the Project Site in an environmentally sensitive manner, including through the implementation of current codes and building standards that require water efficiency and energy efficiency, as well as through the implementation of water quality best management practices, native drought tolerant landscaping, and other water conservation standards.
- OBJ-3: Develop the Project Site in a manner that improves existing site conditions through the implementation of a Response Plan, under the California Land Reuse and Revitalization Act of 2004 (CLRRRA), to address historical site contamination from metals, total petroleum hydrocarbons, and volatile organic compounds, which includes the preparation of a Soil Management Plan and construction of an engineered surface cap to prevent future exposure to hazardous materials, installation of building protection systems under the Project's buildings and installation of subsurface venting systems (passive with the capability of making active) beneath the Project's buildings and parking areas to mitigate potential exposure to methane and soil vapor, and installation of groundwater monitoring wells and perimeter soil vapor probes to monitor subsurface conditions.
- OBJ-4: Construct and operate a self-storage building and self-storage units in order to adequately serve the increased demand in the Long Beach area.
- OBJ-5: Locate the Project near the I-405 freeway in order to provide adequate vehicular access to the Project Site and to reduce vehicular travel through residential neighborhoods or heavily trafficked City roadways.
- OBJ-6: Provide sufficient parking to accommodate long-term RV storage stalls and an onsite private car wash for the recreational vehicles and other customer vehicles.
- OBJ-7: Provide short-term and long-term employment opportunities and generate tax and other revenue for the City.
- OBJ-8: Develop the Project Site with a project that is economically feasible.

1.4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This DEIR is prepared in accordance with the decision issued by the Los Angeles Superior Court (Court) in the matter of *Riverpark Coalition and LA Waterkeeper v. City of Long Beach*, Case No. 21STCP01537, dated October 19, 2022 (Court Ruling), which granted in part and denied in part the claims raised by Riverpark Coalition and LA Waterkeeper (Petitioners) alleging that the City violated CEQA when it approved an earlier version of the Project with a Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH No. 2020100290) (MND). The project analyzed in the MND is referenced in this DEIR as the "Prior Project," to distinguish between it and the current Project. A copy of the Court Ruling is provided in Appendix B-2 to this DEIR.

The Court Ruling stated that the MND prepared for the Prior Project and, approved by the City on April 13, 2021, failed to comply with CEQA because: (1) the City did not undertake adequate analysis of the Prior Project's environmental impacts on land use plans and policies; (2) substantial evidence supported a fair argument the Prior Project, (including its pre-approval Surcharge Activities) may have had a significant impact on biological resources, specifically on southern tarplant; and the mitigation measures (in particular mitigation measure BIO-1 from the

MND) may be inadequate to mitigate the potential impacts to the southern tarplant species; (3) the City did not undertake an adequate analysis of the Prior Project's environmental impacts on air quality; and (4) substantial evidence supported a fair argument the Project may have a significant impact on transportation safety. The Court denied the Petitioners' claims regarding: (1) the project description, (2) hazardous materials and water quality impacts and mitigation measures related thereto, (3) water resources and public utilities, (4) aesthetic impacts, and (5) recreational impacts. The Court also denied a challenge to the City's grant of a height variance for the Prior Project. No challenges were made related to greenhouse gas emissions, population/housing, wildfire, agriculture resources, cultural resources, mineral resources, public services, tribal cultural resources, mandatory findings of significance, and noise. The Court ordered the City to void, vacate, and set aside the MND and Prior Project approvals. Following the Court Ruling, and the Court's entry of judgment on December 13, 2022, the City voided, vacated, and set aside the MND and Prior Project approvals on February 7, 2023.

In accordance with the Court Ruling, a new application for the Project was filed on February 8, 2024, and this DEIR was subsequently prepared. Public Resources Code section 21168.9 does not authorize a trial court to split a project's environmental review across two types of environmental review documents. (*Farmland Protection Alliance v. County of Yolo* (2021) 71 Cal.App.5th 300, 308-312.) As such, a full Draft EIR has been prepared for the Project. For those issues identified in the Court Ruling as failing to comply with CEQA, noted above, this DEIR specifically addresses the analytic deficiencies raised by the Court. For issues where the Court found that the MND's analysis complied with CEQA and issues which were not raised in the litigation, this DEIR incorporates analysis and findings from the MND which are still relevant with updates to the technical information and analysis as needed to confirm the continuing validity of the MND's conclusions.

The discussions in Section 4.0 adhere to the general document structure and sequence presented in the MND. The analysis, however, has been expanded to include the required contents of an EIR as detailed in Article 9 of the State CEQA Guidelines, codified at California Code of Regulation (CCR), Title 14, Sections 15000 et. seq (CEQA Guidelines). This DEIR is based on a simple format in which each topical area contains (in addition to the sections and impact analysis required in an EIR) a summary of the previous analysis contained in the MND; for each topical area deemed inadequate by the Court Ruling, the Court's finding is specifically discussed in the summary of previous analysis. The DEIR analysis and findings for each topic are then directly compared to the findings identified in the MND and new analysis and findings are included as needed to confirm the continuing validity of the MND's conclusions or to document the updated analysis of the Project's potential impacts. The MND is included in its entirety as Appendix B of this DEIR. The analysis in this document relies on all relevant information in the MND, its appendices and errata, as well as the new or additional sources of information identified herein.

Notice of Preparation and Project Scoping

As part of the EIR process, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was released on June 7, 2023 (Appendix A), beginning the 30-day public scoping period for the EIR. During the 30-day scoping period, as well as during the months following leading up to publication of this Draft EIR, the City received 22 comment letters and email comments in response to the NOP. Copies of these NOP comment letters are provided in Appendix A of this EIR. This EIR has taken into consideration the comments received from the public and various agencies in response to the NOP and the prior MND. Written comments received during the scoping period are contained in Appendix A. Environmental issues that have been raised during opportunities for public input regarding the project are summarized below and are addressed in each relevant issue area analyzed in Section 4.1 through Section 4.17 of this Draft EIR. The primary issues identified during the comment period for the prior MND and the NOP process include the following:

- Requests for preparation of an EIR;
- Analysis of a park alternative
- Southern Tarplant impacts
- Change in views from the surrounding neighborhoods
- Potential conflicts with land use plans and policies
- Potential impacts to public services
- Potential impacts to utilities and service systems
- Potential impacts to hydrology/water quality
- Adequate piping and pump capacities for additional storm water and waste water generated by the Project
- Public noticing of the Project
- Description of the history and existing setting of the Project Site
- Content and depth of on-site contaminated soil
- RV turning radiuses
- Environmental Justice
- Concerns related to potential tribal cultural resources
- The history of the Project Site as an oil dumping ground
- Spatial extent of release in to air and/or groundwater of lead, arsenic and TPH during construction
- Potential homeless individuals living in RVs/Storage Units
- The Project Site's proximity to a school and park
- On-Site electric vehicle chargers
- Multi-modal access and regional connectivity for cyclists
- Load of the existing Surcharge pile on the underground pipe
- Concerns related to the request for a zone change for the Project

1.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This EIR has been prepared to assess the potentially significant effects on the environment that could result from implementation of the Project. For a detailed discussion regarding potential significant impacts, please see Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis, of this EIR.

For each environmental topic, Table 1-1 includes applicable mitigation measures that are identified for impacts determined to be potentially significant. As shown in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures for the following topical areas evaluated in this EIR:

- Air Quality;
- Biological Resources;
- Cultural Resources;

- Geology and Soils;
- Hazards and Hazardous Waste;
- Noise; and
- Tribal Cultural Resources

As described below, no significant and unavoidable were identified for the Project.

As required by CEQA, a summary of the Project's impacts is provided in Table 1-1 below. Also provided in Table 1-1 is a list of the proposed mitigation measures that are recommended in response to the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, as well as a determination of the level of significance of the impacts after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

1.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires consideration and discussion of alternatives to the Project in an EIR. Two alternatives are discussed and evaluated in Section 5.0 of this EIR and are summarized below.

1.6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would continue to exist under existing conditions, which involve continued use as undeveloped land. As discussed in more detail in Section 2.0, Introduction, and Section 3.0, Project Description, a 60,000-sf Surcharge Pile was created on the Project Site using 12,000 cubic yards (cy) of imported clean soil. The creation of this Surcharge Pile, including earth disturbance and use of construction equipment, is assumed as part of the No Project Alternative. Under operation of the No Project Alternative, the Project Site would remain as it currently exists under existing conditions; the Surcharge Pile would remain in place and no future remediation activities as detailed in the RP would occur.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives. The No Project Alternative is feasible as it involves no change to the Project Site; however, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives that are outlined above.

Comparison of the Effects of the No Project Alternative to the Proposed Project

The No Project Alternative, when compared to the Project, would result in reduced impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, GHG, noise, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems; and increased impacts related to biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, and recreation.

1.6.2 ALTERNATIVE 1 – DEVELOPMENT ACCORDING TO EXISTING LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Alternative 1 would involve the maximum allowable development under the existing land use designations. The Project Site has a General Plan PlaceType (land use designation) of Neo-Industrial (NI) and a zoning designation of Light Industrial (IL). The NI General Plan land use designation allows for light industrial, clean manufacturing and offices; commercial uses accessory to creative business endeavor(s); and repurposed buildings with live/work artist studios. While a maximum height of 65 feet (ft) is allowed within the NI land use designation, MAP LU-8, Heights, within the City's General Plan Land Use Element identifies the maximum height of

the existing Project Site as 40 ft (City of Long Beach 2019). IL zoning allows for a variety of land uses, including but not limited to urban agriculture uses, manufacturing uses, wholesale trade uses, laundry, cleaning and garment services, and professional office and institutional uses. A detailed description of all uses allowed within areas of the City zoned for IL can be found in Chapter 21.33.060 of the City's Municipal Code. Among other requirements, IL zoning development standards impose a minimum lot size of 15,000 square feet (sf); a maximum lot coverage of 55%; a maximum building height of 4 stories or 60 ft, whichever is more restrictive; and a maximum non-building structure height of 45 ft.

Under Alternative 1, the Project Site would be developed with up to 618,552 sf of light industrial uses in a maximum four-story structure that would not exceed 55% coverage, or 7.81 acres of the Project Site.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives. Alternative 1 would support the majority of the identified Project Objectives; however, Alternative 1 would not specifically meet the identified demand for general storage or RV storage. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not support the following objectives:

- OBJ-1: Provide a state of the art, secure storage solution that would meet the increased demand in the Long Beach area, especially for secure, RV storage.
- OBJ-4: Construct and operate a self-storage building and self-storage units in order to adequately serve the increased demand in the Long Beach area.
- OBJ-6: Provide sufficient parking to accommodate long-term RV storage stalls and an onsite private car wash for the recreational vehicles and other customer vehicles.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 1 to the Project

Overall, when compared to the Project, Alternative 1 would not result in reduced impacts related to any of the resources categories; and increased impacts related to air quality, energy, GHG, operational noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems.

1.6.3 ALTERNATIVE 2 – REDUCED RV STORAGE

Alternative 2 would involve development of the self storage building and associated parking lot, similar to the Project, but a reduced RV parking component. Alternative 2 would involve development of a four-story, 206,756-sf self-storage building consisting of approximately 1,681 self-storage units on four levels, same as for the Project. Ancillary uses would include one lobby, approximately 900 sf of leasing office, and two unisex restrooms on the first floor. Parking would include 27 standard automobile parking stalls and 5 ADA compliant stalls. Alternative 2 would develop the balance of the site with 350 RV parking spaces, approximately 65% of the spaces proposed by the Project, to increase the ease of circulation throughout the site as compared to the Project. All RV spaces would be pull-through and the spaces and drive aisles would be wider than the Project. No car wash would be developed as part of Alternative 2.

Ability to Meet Project Objectives. Alternative 2 would support the majority of the identified Project Objectives; however, Alternative 2 would not specifically meet the identified demand for RV storage to the same extent as the Project. Specifically, Alternative 1 would not support the following objectives to the same extent as the Project:

- OBJ-1: Provide a state of the art, secure storage solution that would meet the increased demand in the Long Beach area, especially for secure, RV storage.

- OBJ-6: Provide sufficient parking to accommodate long-term RV storage stalls and an onsite private car wash for the recreational vehicles and other customer vehicles.

Comparison of the Effects of Alternative 1 to the Project

Overall, when compared to the Project, Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts related to air quality, energy, GHG, noise, transportation, and utilities and service systems.

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Section 4.1 – Aesthetics					
Threshold 4.1a: Would the Project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.1b: Would the Project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.1c: 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?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.1d: Would the Project create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.2 – Air Quality					
Threshold 4.2a: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.	MM AIR-1 For construction activities that have already occurred (Surcharge Activities) onsite equipment shall be required to meet a minimum of Tier 3 or equivalent off-road engine emissions standards. For all future construction activities, prior to the issuance of each grading permit, the Applicant shall provide construction plans and specifications demonstrating that onsite equipment used for construction of the Project shall be required to meet a minimum of Tier 4 off-road engine emissions standards.	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.2b: Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	MM AIR-1 For construction activities that have already occurred (Surcharge Activities) onsite equipment shall be required to meet a minimum of Tier 3 or equivalent off-road engine emissions standards. For all future construction activities, prior to the issuance of each grading permit, the Applicant shall provide construction plans and specifications demonstrating that onsite equipment used for construction of the Project shall be required to meet a minimum of Tier 4 off-road engine emissions standards.	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.2c: Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.2d: Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.3 – Biological Resources					
Threshold 4.3a: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, 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	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM BIO-1a Prior to the initiation of construction on the Project Site, the Project applicant shall retain a qualified Biologist or Botanist to conduct focused rare plant surveys in accordance with California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (2018) protocols. The rare plant surveys	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			<p>shall be conducted at the proper time of year when the target rare species (southern tarplant, decumbent goldenbush) are both "evident" and identifiable, i.e., during bloom periods. If additional southern tarplant individuals or decumbent goldenbush individuals are found on the Project Site, the Project applicant shall consult with CDFW to determine appropriate off-site mitigation. If no decumbent goldenbush individuals are found, then the proposed Project would not have any impacts to this species and no mitigation measures would be necessary.</p> <p>MM BIO-1b The Project applicant shall implement an on-site restoration of southern tarplant using propagules (seeds, topsoil) that were collected on the Project Site in 2020. The restoration program shall be implemented within an approximately 0.5-acre area located in the northern and western portions of the Project Site that shall remain undeveloped. To the extent possible, the restoration program shall be implemented along the western boundary of the Project Site to provide a connection to the existing southern tarplant population located on the property owned by the County of Los Angeles west of the Project Site. The goal of the restoration program shall be replacement of 1,275 southern tarplants in this area to achieve a 1:1 ratio of lost to replaced plants. Prior to implementing the restoration effort, the applicant shall submit a Southern Tarplant Mitigation and Monitoring Plan to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) for review and approval that is prepared by a qualified Botanist or restoration Ecologist. The plan shall be submitted to CDFW within 6 months following issuance of a grading permit. The plan shall detail the identification of on-site areas for receiving southern tarplant propagules, methods for implementing site preparation and habitat restoration techniques, recommendations for timing of the restoration effort, clearly defined success criteria, a monitoring plan for assessing and reporting the success of the southern tarplant restoration program over a five-year period following implementation, and an adaptive management structure that allows for implementing measures such as collection of additional propagules from off-site locations, weed control, erosion control, or other appropriate actions if Success criteria are not met. The project applicant shall protect the restoration site in perpetuity under a protection mechanism (i.e., conservation easement, deed restriction, or restrictive covenant). Recordation of the protection mechanism shall occur prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy.</p> <p>MM BIO-2a If construction activities are initiated during the migration season for monarch butterflies (typically October 15 through February 15), a qualified Biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for roosting monarch butterflies within and adjacent to the construction area, including a 500-foot survey buffer, no more than 3 days prior to the start of construction activities in the construction area.</p> <p>MM BIO-2b If a monarch butterfly roost is detected during pre-construction surveys or at any point during the construction phase of the Project, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (as appropriate) shall be notified regarding the status of the roost. Furthermore, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the roost until the monarch butterflies have dispersed</p>		

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>from the roost or a qualified Biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal. Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 100 feet around a monarch butterfly roost) or alteration of the construction schedule.</p> <p>MM BIO-3 Crotch's Bumble Bee Surveys. Surveys for Crotch's bumble bee shall be implemented by a qualified Biologist. The surveys shall be conducted according to California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) protocol as described in the 2023 Survey Considerations for California Endangered Species Act (CESA) Candidate Bumble Bee Species. These protocols include reviewing database records for the species in the Project vicinity, conducting a habitat assessment on the Project Site, conducting a minimum of three site visits during the peak flight season for the species (March through September), photo documenting any observed Crotch's bumble bees, and documenting species of flowers visited by bumble bees. The results of the survey shall be reported to the CDFW with a copy to the City's Community Development Department. If Crotch's bumble bee is documented during the surveys, the Project applicant shall consult with the CDFW to determine the need for obtaining an Incidental Take Permit (ITP).</p> <p>MM BIO-4a Breeding season surveys shall be implemented by a qualified Biologist. Four breeding season survey visits shall be conducted: (1) at least one site visit between February 15 and April 15, and (2) a minimum of three survey visits, at least 3 weeks apart, between April 15 and July 15, with at least one visit after June 15. Each of the survey efforts will be conducted according to protocol defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2012 Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. The results of the breeding season surveys shall be reported to the CDFW with a copy to the City's Community Development Department. If the breeding season surveys are positive for burrowing owl occurrence, the Project applicant shall implement MM BIO-4b. If the breeding season surveys are negative for burrowing owls, the Project applicant shall implement MM BIO-1c.</p> <p>MM BIO-4b If the breeding season surveys determine that burrowing owl occupies the Project Site, the Project applicant shall consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine appropriate mitigation for the loss of burrowing owl habitat due to Project implementation. The outcome of the consultation shall determine the need for implementing a burrowing owl management and monitoring program, including the need for closing burrows, passively relocating owls, and/or constructing artificial burrows. The outcome of the consultation shall be included in a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan that shall be prepared by a qualified Biologist retained by the Project applicant (see MM BIO 4d).</p> <p>MM BIO-4c The Project applicant shall retain a qualified Biologist to perform a pre-construction burrowing owl survey to determine whether burrowing owl are present on-site within 30 days prior to construction activities, according to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) guidelines. If construction is delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the survey, the area shall be resurveyed. The pre-construction survey shall be completed on the Project Site and areas</p>		

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>within 500 feet from the Project boundary (where possible and appropriate based on habitat). All occupied burrows shall be mapped on an aerial photo. The applicant shall provide a burrowing owl survey report and mapping to the City at least 15 days prior to the expected start of any Project -related ground disturbance activities or restart of activities. If the survey is positive for burrowing owls, the Project applicant shall implement MM BIO-4b and MM BIO-4d. If no burrowing owls are detected during the pre-construction survey, no further action is necessary.</p> <p>MM BIO-4d If the breeding season surveys or the pre-construction survey is positive for burrowing owl, the Project proponent shall retain a qualified Biologist to develop and implement a Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan. The Burrowing Owl Mitigation Plan shall contain the following elements (as outlined in the California Department of Fish and Wildlife [CDFW] 2012 guidelines) at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoidance of burrowing owl during construction, including establishment of a 160-foot radius around occupied burrows during the non-breeding season (September 1 through February 14) or a 200 to 500-meter radius around occupied burrows during the breeding season (February 15 through August 31), within which construction activities may not occur until a qualified Biologist has determined that (1) non-breeding season owls have dispersed from the area; or (2) breeding season owls have fledged their juveniles from the occupied burrows and the juveniles are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival or have dispersed from the area. A plan for implementing a passive relocation program for nonbreeding owls, should it be needed. The passive relocation techniques should be consistent with CDFW guidelines, including installation of artificial burrows at an off-site location and use of one-way exclusion doors to ensure owls have left the burrow(s). 		
Threshold 4.3b: Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.3c: Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.3d: Would the project 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?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM BIO-5a Nesting Bird Pre-construction Surveys. If ground-disturbing or vegetation-removing construction activities or tree removal is proposed during the breeding/nesting season for migratory birds (typically February 1 through September 15), a qualified Biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for special-status birds and other migratory birds within the construction area, including a 300-foot survey buffer, no more than 3 days prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities in the construction area.	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			MM BIO-5b Avoidance of Active Avian Nests. If an active nest is located during pre-construction surveys or at any point during the construction phase of the Project, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) (as appropriate) shall be notified regarding the status of the nest. Furthermore, construction activities shall be restricted as necessary to avoid disturbance of the nest until it is abandoned or a qualified Biologist deems disturbance potential to be minimal. Restrictions may include establishment of exclusion zones (no ingress of personnel or equipment at a minimum radius of 300 feet around an active raptor nest and a 50-foot radius around an active migratory bird nest) or alteration of the construction schedule.		
Threshold 4.3e: Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.3f: Would the conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Section 4.4 – Cultural Resources					
Threshold 4.4a: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	No impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.4b: Would the Project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM CUL-1 In the event that cultural (archaeological) resources are inadvertently unearthed during excavation activities, the contractor shall immediately cease all earth disturbing activities within a 100-foot radius of the area of discovery. The Project Applicant/Developer shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist, subject to approval by the lead agency, to evaluate the significance of the find and determine an appropriate course of action. If avoidance of the resource(s) is not feasible, salvage operation requirements pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines shall be followed. After the find has been appropriately avoided or mitigated, work in the area may resume. Upon completion of ground disturbance activities and evaluation, the archaeologist will prepare post-construction findings for the City.	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.4c: Would the Project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.5 – Energy					
Threshold 4.5a: Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.5b: Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Section 4.6 – Geology and Soils					
<p>Threshold 4.6a: Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p>(iv) Landslides?</p>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.6a: Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.6b: Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.6c: Would the project 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?</p>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Reduced
<p>Threshold 4.6d: Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1803.5.3 of the California Building Code (2010), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</p>	Less than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Reduced
<p>Threshold 4.6e: Would the project 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?</p>	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.6f: Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</p>	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<p>MM GEO-1 Prior to the issuance of any grading permit, the Project Applicant/Developer shall provide written evidence to the City of Long Beach that a qualified Paleontologist has been retained to observe grading activities and to salvage and catalog fossils as necessary. The Paleontologist shall be present at the pre-grade conference; shall establish procedures for paleontological resource surveillance; and shall establish, in cooperation with the Project Applicant/Developer, procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work to permit sampling, identification, and evaluation of the fossils. If the paleontological resources are found to be significant, the Paleontologist shall determine appropriate actions to ensure proper exploration and/or salvage.</p> <p>Upon completion of grading and excavation activities, the paleontologist shall submit a monitoring report to the City. The report</p>	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>shall include the period of inspection; a catalog and analysis of the fossils found; and the present repository of the fossils.</p> <p>The Project Applicant/Developer shall be responsible for making arrangements for the preparation of excavated material to the point of identification. In addition, the Project Applicant/Developer shall offer excavated finds for curatorial purposes to the City of Long Beach on a first refusal basis. The Project Applicant/Developer shall also be responsible for paying curatorial fees. These actions, as well as final mitigation and disposition of the resources, shall be subject to approval by the City.</p>		
Section 4.7 – Greenhouse Gases					
Threshold 4.7a: Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.7b: Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gas emissions?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.8 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
Threshold 4.8a: Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.8b: Would the project 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?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.8c: Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.8d: Would the project 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?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	MM HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit by the City of Long Beach, the applicant shall receive approval from DTSC of, and implement, a Response Plan (RP) prepared for the Project in accordance with CLRRRA, which outlines site remediation, engineering controls, future operation and monitoring (O&M) activities, and administrative controls to allow for commercial/industrial development of the site.	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.8e: 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Threshold 4.8f: Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.8g: Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.9 – Hydrology and Water Quality					
Threshold 4.9a: Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.9b: Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? And	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.9c: Would the project 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; or (iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; (iv) impede or redirect flows? 	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.9d: In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.9e: Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Section 4.10 – Land Use and Planning					
Threshold 4.10a: Would the project physically divide an established community?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.10b: 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?	No Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Section 4.11 – Noise					
Threshold 4.11a: Would the project result in 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?	Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<p>MM NOI-1 Prior to issuance of grading permits, the Project Applicant shall demonstrate that the contracts for the General Contractor and subcontractors, as appropriate, contain the following provisions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise-generating construction activities shall be limited to the hours specified in the Long Beach Municipal Code, Section 8.80.202. Equipment and material staging areas and vehicle maintenance areas shall be located on the western portion of the site as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. All construction equipment shall be equipped with manufacturer’s specified or better mufflers. Stationary construction equipment, such as generators, welders, and compressors, shall be oriented so that the loudest noise is directed away from sensitive receptors. Residents within 300 feet of the Project site and the Los Cerritos School shall be notified of the planned construction and construction schedule at least two weeks prior to the start of construction. The notice shall provide a contact for submitting complaints about any excessive construction noise. <p>MM NOI-2 Prior to approval of plans through plan check for the self-storage building, the Applicant shall provide evidence that the HVAC units noise levels comply with the requirements of Section 8.80.200 of the Long Beach Municipal Code.</p>	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.11b: Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.11c: For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Section 4.12 – Population and Housing					
Threshold 4.12a: Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Threshold 4.12b: Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Section 4.13 – Public Services					
Threshold 4.13a: 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 of the public services: (i) Fire Protection? (ii) Police Protection?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.13a: 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 of the public services: (iii) Schools? (iv) Parks? (v) Other Public Facilities?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Section 4.14 – Recreation					
Threshold 4.14a: 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?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Threshold 4.14b: Would the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent
Section 4.15 – Transportation					
Threshold 4.15a: Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
Threshold 4.15b: Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Threshold 4.15c: Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	No Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
Threshold 4.15d: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
Section 4.16 – Tribal Cultural Resources					
Threshold 4.16a: 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)?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Reduced
Threshold 4.16b: 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 significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	<p>TRIB CUL-1 The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both ancestrally affiliated with the Project Site and approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and is listed under the Native American Heritage Commission's (NAHC) Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. This list is provided by the NAHC. A Native American monitor shall be retained by the Lead Agency or owner of the Project to be on site to monitor all project-related, ground-disturbing construction activities (i.e., boring, grading, excavation, potholing, trenching, etc.). A monitor associated with one of the NAHC recognized Tribal governments which have commented on the Project shall provide the Native American monitor. The monitor/consultant will only be present onsite during the construction phases that involve ground disturbing activities. Ground disturbing activities are defined by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation as activities that may include, but are not limited to, pavement removal, pot-holing or auguring, grubbing, tree removals, boring, grading, excavation, drilling, and trenching, within the Project Site. The Tribal Monitor/consultant will complete daily monitoring logs that will provide descriptions of the day's activities, including construction activities, locations, soil, and any cultural materials identified. The onsite monitoring shall end when the project site grading and excavation activities are completed, or when the Tribal Representatives and monitor/consultant have indicated that the site has a low potential for impacting Tribal Cultural Resources.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-2 Upon discovery of any tribal cultural or archaeological resources, cease construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All tribal cultural and archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant. If the resources are Native American in origin,</p>	Less than Significant	Consistent

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation shall coordinate with the landowner regarding treatment and curation of these resources. Typically, the Tribe will request preservation in place or recovery for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the Project while evaluation and, if necessary, additional protective mitigation takes place (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 [f]). If a resource is determined by the qualified archaeologist to constitute a “historical resource” or “unique archaeological resource”, time allotment and funding sufficient to allow for implementation of avoidance measures, or appropriate mitigation, must be available. The treatment plan established for the resources shall be in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(f) for historical resources.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-3 Public Resources Code Sections 21083.2(b) for unique archaeological resources. Preservation in place (i.e., avoidance) is the preferred manner of treatment. If preservation in place is not feasible, treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource along with subsequent laboratory processing and analysis. All Tribal Cultural Resources shall be returned to the Tribe. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall be curated at a public, non profit institution with a research interest in the materials, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, they shall be offered to the Tribe or a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-4 Native American human remains are defined in PRC 5097.98 (d)(1) as an inhumation or cremation, and in any state of decomposition or skeletal completeness. Funerary objects, called associated grave goods in PRC 5097.98, are also to be treated according to this statute. Health and Safety Code 7050.5 dictates that any discoveries of human skeletal material shall be immediately reported to the County Coroner and excavation halted until the coroner has determined the nature of the remains. If the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the NAHC and PRC 5097.98 shall be followed.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-5 Upon discovery of human remains, the tribal and/or archaeological monitor/consultant/consultant will immediately divert work at minimum of 150 feet and place an exclusion zone around the discovery location. The monitor/consultant(s) will then notify the Tribe, the qualified lead archaeologist, and the construction manager who will call the coroner. Work will continue to be diverted while the coroner determines whether the remains are human and subsequently Native American. The discovery is to be kept confidential and secure to prevent any further disturbance. If the finds are determined to be Native American, the coroner will notify the NAHC as mandated by state law who will then appoint a Most Likely Descendent (MLD).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians—Kizh Nation is designated MLD, the Koo-nas-gna Burial Policy shall be 		

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>implemented. To the Tribe, the term “human remains” encompasses more than human bones. In ancient as well as historic times, Tribal Traditions included, but were not limited to, the preparation of the soil for burial, the burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains. The prepared soil and cremation soils are to be treated in the same manner as bone fragments that remain intact. Associated funerary objects are objects that, as part of the death rite or ceremony of a culture, are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later; other items made exclusively for burial purposes or to contain human remains can also be considered as associated funerary objects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the landowner shall arrange a designated site location within the footprint of the Project for the respectful reburial of the human remains and/or ceremonial objects. In the case where discovered human remains cannot be fully documented and recovered on the same day, the remains will be covered with muslin cloth and a steel plate that can be moved by heavy equipment placed over the excavation opening to protect the remains. If this type of steel plate is not available, a 24-hour guard should be posted outside of working hours. The Tribe will make every effort to recommend diverting the Project and keeping the remains in situ and protected. If the Project cannot be diverted, it may be determined that burials will be removed. The Tribe will work closely with the qualified archaeologist to ensure that the excavation is treated carefully, ethically, and respectfully. If data recovery is approved by the Tribe, documentation shall be taken which includes at a minimum detailed descriptive notes and sketches. Additional types of documentation shall be approved by the Tribe for data recovery purposes. Cremations will either be removed in bulk or by means as necessary to ensure completely recovery of all material. If the discovery of human remains includes four or more burials, the location is considered a cemetery and a separate treatment plan shall be created. Once complete, a final report of all activities is to be submitted to the Tribe and the NAHC. The Tribe does NOT authorize any scientific study or the utilization of any invasive and/or destructive diagnostics on human remains. • Each occurrence of human remains and associated funerary objects will be stored using opaque cloth bags. All human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects and objects of cultural patrimony will be removed to a secure container on site if possible. These items should be retained and reburied within six months of recovery. The site of reburial/repatriation shall be on the project site but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There 		

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological and Native American monitoring and excavation during construction projects will be consistent with current professional standards. All feasible care to avoid any unnecessary disturbance, physical modification, or separation of human remains and associated funerary objects shall be taken. Principal personnel must meet the Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology and have a minimum of 10 years of experience as a principal investigator working with Native American archaeological sites in southern California. The Qualified Archaeologist shall ensure that all other personnel are appropriately trained and qualified. <p>TRIB CUL-6 The Project shall engage a qualified and certified indigenous tribal member of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and a direct lineal descendant of the Project Site (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) section 10.14) to provide professional Native American Monitoring for all ground disturbing activity that is part of the Project. Ground disturbing activity includes of asphalt/cement/slurry, trenching, boring, excavation, auguring, grubbing, tree removal, grading, and drilling. The tribal monitor will only be required on-site when these ground disturbing activities occur.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-7 The Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council tribal monitor will observe all mechanical and hand labor excavation, including paddle scrapers, blade machines, front-end loaders, backhoes, boring and drill operations, and hydraulic and electric chisels. Monitoring also includes associated work using tools such as picks and other non-electric or gasoline tools not considered mechanical.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-8 Soils removed from the Project Site are considered culturally sensitive and are subject to inspection. Whether placed in a dump truck or spoil piles, these soils will be inspected. The tribal monitor will temporarily hold excavation until a determination is made on the soil's sensitivity. If the soils are sensitive, an archaeological monitor will verify the find and notify the site supervisor.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-9 The tribal monitor and archaeologist shall redirect construction activities 50 feet from any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural deposits discovered (including but not limited to artifacts of traditional cultural, religious, spiritual, or any other artifacts relating to the use of habitation sites). However, if grave-related artifacts are discovered, the site is treated as a cemetery, and the California State University (CSU) or University of California (UC) institution, which has repositories related to the findings, will be contacted.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-10 Archaeological and Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council monitors will collaborate to determine the significance of</p>		

**TABLE 1-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS, MITIGATION MEASURES AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Threshold of Significance	MND Significance Finding (Prior Project)	EIR Significance Finding (Project)	EIR Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	Comparison of Prior Project and Project Impacts
			<p>the culturally sensitive find, guide ground disturbances to avoid, and direct an alternative route from this area.</p> <p>TRIB CUL-11 Cultural resources within the Project Site that are not associated with burials are subject to data collection by the designated archaeologist for provenance and the creation of the NAHC site record. Data Collection will include GPS mapping and photography.</p>		
Section 4.17 – Utilities and Service Systems					
<p>Threshold 4.17a: Would the project require or result in the 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>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.17b: 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>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.17c: 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 commitments?</p>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Change in Impact Finding
<p>Threshold 4.17d: 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>	Less than Significant Impact	Less than Significant Impact	No Mitigation is required	Less than Significant	Consistent
<p>Threshold 4.17e: Would the project comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p>	No Impact	No Impact	No Mitigation is required	No Impact	Consistent

This page intentionally left blank

1.7 REFERENCES

U.S. Geological Survey. 2015. Long Beach Quadrangle, California-Los Angeles Co., 7.5-Minute Series. Reston, Virginia: USGS. <https://www.usgs.gov/core-science-systems/national-geospatial-program/topographic-maps>.

This page intentionally left blank