

**Findings of Fact and Statement of  
Overriding Considerations for  
The Globemaster Corridor  
Specific Plan Program EIR/EIS**

State Clearinghouse No. 2018091021

EIR-03-17

*Prepared for:*

**City of Long Beach**

Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau

411 West Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor

Long Beach, California 90802

*Contact: Scott Kinsey, AICP, Planner, Maryanne Cronin, Planner*

*Prepared by:*

**DUDEK**

38 North Marengo Avenue

Pasadena, California 91101

*Contact: Asha Bleier, AICP, Senior Project Manager*

**NOVEMBER 2020**



# Table of Contents

---

<b><u>SECTION</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE NO.</u></b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of CEQA Findings/Terminology .....	1
1.2 Draft PEIR/PEIS Process .....	2
<b>2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Proposed Project .....	3
2.2 Required Project Approvals.....	7
<b>3 PROJECT LOCATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>4 ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE PEIR/PEIS.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM/ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS REPORT .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SUPPORTING FACTS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
6.1 Air Quality .....	15
6.1.1 Air Quality Plan .....	15
6.1.2 Criteria Pollutants .....	20
6.1.3 Sensitive Receptors.....	21
6.1.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts .....	24
6.2 Cultural Resources .....	25
6.2.1 Historical Resources.....	25
6.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	27
6.3.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	27
6.3.2 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, Policy, Regulations .....	28
6.3.3 Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts.....	30
6.4 Transportation .....	30
6.4.1 Circulation Plan, Ordinance, or Policy.....	30
6.4.2 Cumulative Transportation Impacts .....	37
<b>7 FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS, REQUIRED MITIGATION MEASURES, AND SUPPORTING FACTS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
7.1 Aesthetics .....	39
7.1.1 Light and Glare.....	39
7.2 Air Quality .....	40
7.2.1 Other Emissions.....	40
7.3 Cultural Resources .....	41
7.3.1 Archaeological Resources .....	41

7.3.2	Human Remains .....	42
7.3.3	Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts .....	43
7.4	Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	44
7.4.1	Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal and Hazardous Upset/Accident .....	44
7.4.2	Listed Hazardous Site.....	46
7.4.3	Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts .....	46
7.5	Hydrology and Water Quality.....	47
7.5.1	Water Quality Standards .....	47
7.5.2	Groundwater Supplies .....	50
7.5.3	Erosion.....	50
7.5.4	Surface Runoff .....	51
7.5.5	Stormwater Drainage System Capacity .....	52
7.5.6	Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.....	53
7.6	Noise .....	54
7.6.1	Ambient Noise Levels .....	54
7.6.2	Groundborne Vibration or Noise .....	56
7.6.3	Airport Land Use Plan .....	57
7.6.4	Cumulative Noise Impacts .....	58
7.7	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	58
7.7.1	Public Resource Code Section 5024.1 .....	58
7.3.2	Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts.....	62
7.8	Utilities and Service Systems.....	62
7.8.1	Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Facilities .....	62
7.8.2	Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impacts.....	65
<b>8</b>	<b>EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT .....</b>	<b>67</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>FINDINGS REGARDING FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>69</b>
9.1	Alternative 1: No Project Alternative .....	69
9.2	Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative .....	70
<b>10</b>	<b>STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>73</b>
10.1	Statement of Overriding Considerations.....	73
10.1.1	Adoption of Overriding Considerations.....	73
10.1.2	Benefits of the Proposed Project.....	74
10.2	Conclusion .....	75

**TABLES**

1	Development Potential .....	5
2	Development Potential Comparison .....	70

# Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
ACM	asbestos-containing material
BMP	best management practice
CAAP	Climate Action and Adaption Plan
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of Long Beach
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub> e	carbon dioxide equivalent
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
GCSP	Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan
GHG	greenhouse gas
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
I	Interstate
IS	Initial Study
LID	low-impact development
LOS	level of service
MM	Mitigation Measure
MT	metric ton
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrous oxides
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PEIS	Program Environmental Impact Statement
PRC	California Public Resources Code
Proposed Project	Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan
SB	Senate Bill
SCAQMD	South Couth Air Quality Management District
SUSMP	Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TCR	tribal cultural resource
TRU	transport refrigeration unit
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WMA	Watershed Management Area

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# 1 Introduction

---

This statement of Findings of Fact addresses the environmental effects associated with the proposed Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project), as described in the joint Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) (State Clearinghouse No. 2018091021) and Program Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). These Findings of Fact are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.), specifically PRC Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6, and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), specifically Sections 15091 and 15093. The Draft PEIR/PEIS examines the full range of potential effects of construction and operation of the Proposed Project, and identifies standard mitigation practices that could be employed to reduce, minimize, or avoid those potential effects.

The Proposed Project provides a framework for the development and improvement of the GCSP land use districts and overlay zones. The GCSP area (Plan Area) totals 437 acres and is located in the north-central portion of the City of Long Beach on the west and south sides of the Long Beach Airport.

The applicant is the City of Long Beach (City). The City developed the GCSP as part of a comprehensive transition program in the wake of the closure of the C-17 Globemaster military aircraft production facility owned by Boeing Corporation (C-17 Site). The GCSP would build upon the work developed during phase one of the C-17 Transition Master Plan in 2016, and would provide a strategic planning framework for attracting quality industries and improving the character, design, and functionality of the Plan Area. The C-17 Site is located on the east side of Cherry Avenue, adjacent to the west side of the Long Beach Airport. The central portion of the Plan Area includes an approximately 93-acre site that consisted of former Boeing aircraft manufacturing facilities, and the remainder of the Plan Area includes industrial and commercial corridors and nodes along Cherry Avenue and Spring Street.

Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the GCSP aims to continue to attract and optimize new work opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise, and competitive economies of Long Beach Airport, the City of Long Beach, and the Southern California region. The GCSP represents the next step in the overall transition of the former Boeing C-17 Site and surrounding Plan Area. The GCSP assigns appropriate land use districts for land properties within the Plan Area, including six districts and two overlay zones. The GCSP establishes a land use and mobility plan, development regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure requirements, and implementation strategies necessary to becoming a flexible commercial and industrial district in the City. No residential component is included in the GCSP.

## 1.1 Purpose of CEQA Findings/Terminology

PRC Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 require that a lead agency, in this case the City, prepare written findings for identified significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 states, in part, the following:

- a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR [Environmental Impact Report] has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
  - 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

- 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15092(b) provides that no agency shall approve a project for which an EIR was prepared unless either:

1. The project approved will not have a significant effect on the environment, or
2. The agency has:
  - a. Eliminated or substantially lessened all significant effects where feasible as shown in the findings under Section 15091, and
  - b. Determined that any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable under Section 15091 are acceptable due to overriding concerns as described in Section 15093.

## 1.2 Draft PEIR/PEIS Process

An Initial Study (IS) was prepared by the City, as the lead agency, to determine if approval of the Proposed Project could have a significant impact on the environment. The analysis conducted as part of the IS determined that the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project would be addressed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and IS for the PEIR/PEIS was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, interested agencies, and groups on September 12, 2018. Pursuant to Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, recipients of the NOP and IS were requested to provide responses within 30 days after their receipt of the NOP. The 30-day NOP public review period ended October 11, 2018. The IS and NOP are contained in Appendix A-1, Initial Study; and Appendix A-2, Notice of Preparation, respectively, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS. Comments received during the NOP public review period were considered during preparation of the PEIR/PEIS. The NOP and IS comments are included in Appendix A-3, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS.

As determined by the analysis in the IS, the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project to be addressed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS were as follows:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Environmental Justice
- Energy



Additionally, the Draft PEIR/PEIS was required to include other CEQA substantive sections, including an Executive Summary, Introduction, Project Description, Cumulative Impacts (see impact analysis within each section of Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis), Other CEQA Considerations (see Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations), and Alternatives (see Chapter 4, Alternatives). The Draft PEIR/PEIS was circulated for a 45-day public review period (August 3, 2020 through September 17, 2020) in accordance with Section 15087 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Copies of the Notice of Availability were sent to approximately 200 interested parties, including agencies, environmental and public interest groups, Native American tribes, potentially affected landowners and other interested individuals and groups, County of Los Angeles entities, local unions, state offices, utilities, and libraries. The City received eight comment letters during the public review period. A list of the comments received, copies of the comment letters received, and responses to comments are included in Chapter 2, Responses to Comments, of the Final PEIR/PEIS.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# 2 Project Description

---

## 2.1 Proposed Project

The Proposed Project would involve implementation of the GCSP, which would serve as a planning and regulatory framework for the Plan Area. The GCSP would guide land uses for the approximately 437-acre Plan Area, and allow development within the Plan Area as defined in the GCSP. The GCSP creates a policy framework for development and improvement of the Plan Area into an employment district in an area adjacent to the Long Beach Airport, Port of Long Beach, Interstate (I) 405, and surrounding residential and business communities. Key components of the GCSP are as follows:

- **Summary.** This chapter provides a brief background and overview of the GCSP, and serves as a quick reference and summary of each chapter contained in the GCSP.
- **Context.** This chapter describes the location, history, and existing conditions of the Plan Area, along with a summary of community workshop meetings.
- **Vision and Goals.** This chapter describes the vision for the overall GCSP, as well as the goals and policies.
- **Land Use and Mobility.** This chapter describes recommended land use and transportation improvements to the Plan Area and its vicinity. It includes a street network plan and associated cross-sections, and identifies bicycle and pedestrian facilities and nearby transit. This chapter also describes the application of six development districts and two overlay zones proposed as part of the GCSP, as follows:
  - **Business Park (BP)** district is intended as a campus-style district that supports a range of employment uses, including professional office, research and development, light industrial, high cube warehousing, and aviation-related uses. Warehousing uses would be high-turnover and employment-generating warehousing subject to the authority of the Zoning Administrator to determine what constitutes a “high-turnover and employment-generating warehouse.” Development regulations are designed to achieve high-quality mid-rise structures served by a system of pedestrian pathways, passive and active open space areas, and amenities in a campus-style environment.
  - **Community Commercial (CC)** district supports medium-scale retail, hotel, and service uses intended to serve the entire community, including convenience and comparison shopping goods and associated services. Development regulations are designed to achieve a pedestrian-friendly environment where buildings face the sidewalk at the immediate intersections, and where mid-corridor streetscape enhancements provide a more inviting walking environment.
  - **Industrial Commercial (IC)** district supports a mix of auto-oriented commercial and light industrial uses, including research and development, flex space, warehousing, and small-scale incubator industries, as well as community-serving commercial uses. Land uses are designed to operate entirely within enclosed structures, which pose limited potential for environmental impacts on neighboring uses with respect to noise, hazardous materials, odors, dust, light, glare, traffic, air emissions, and hours of operation. It is anticipated that buildings housing these uses will be within low-scale, adaptively reused structures or part of modern industrial complexes in campus-like settings. Development regulations are designed to address the streetscape to achieve a more inviting walking environment.
  - **General Industrial (IG)** is preserved for traditionally heavy industrial and manufacturing uses, such as large construction yards with heavy equipment, chemical manufacturing plants, and food processing plants. The buildings that house these operations may be older industrial buildings retrofitted to accommodate the use or new state-of-the-art manufacturing plants. The focus of the General Industrial

(IG) district is on the operating characteristics of the use, rather than the particular product created. Development regulations are designed to provide adequate parking and address the streetscape to achieve a more inviting walking environment.

- **Airport (AP)** district is reserved for property that is part of the designated airfield of the Long Beach Airport, and adjacent properties under airport control. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requires these areas to remain available for aviation operations and aviation-related uses. The property in the Airport (AP) district is managed by the Airport Department of the City of Long Beach. Land use and development standards reflect this aviation focus and are intended to accommodate any aviation-related uses approved by the Airport Department.

This district in the GCSP is created to unify the land use regulations for the western and southern areas of the Long Beach Airport and is intended to serve as a model for the future adoption of an airport zoning district into Title 21 (Zoning Regulations), Long Beach Municipal Code, or adoption of a specific plan for the airport, either of which will cover the entire extent of the Long Beach Airport. At the time of the creation of the GCSP, land use at the Long Beach Airport was regulated through a mix of the General Industrial (IG) zoning district and several Planned Development (PD) districts, including Planned Development (PD) districts for the Long Beach Airport Terminal (PD-12), the Atlantic Aviation Center (PD-13), and Douglas Aircraft (PD-19). The GCSP replaces the western area of PD-19 (leaving the eastern area, which is east of Lakewood Boulevard, as-is) and absorbs all of PD-13 and the General Industrial (IG) zone on the airport property within the extent of the Plan Area.

- **Open Space (OS)** district is established to preserve the designated open space area at the southeast corner of Spring Street and California Avenue within the Plan Area. This district is intended to be used for active and passive public use, including for recreational, cultural, and community service activities that provide physical and psychological relief from the intense urban development of the Plan Area.
- **Cherry Avenue Overlay Zone (CAO)** is intended to allow complementary retail and restaurant amenities supportive of the underlying Business Park (BP) district and adjacent neighborhoods. Development standards are designed to ensure that new uses are pedestrian-oriented and address Cherry Avenue either as stand-alone buildings or integrated with new business park or modern industrial complexes in a campus-style setting.
- **Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ)** encompasses the entire Plan Area. It is intended to ensure that future land uses within the Plan Area are compatible with airport operations with respect to noise, safety, and airspace protection. The Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ) includes the areas within the airport's 65 and 70 decibels (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours; the six safety compatibility zones applicable to each airport runway where heightened risk levels may warrant restrictions on land use development; and the airspace protection surfaces that define the airport's airspace, including FAA Part 77 and TERPS surfaces. The information pertaining to this overlay zone is informational only. Final authority and land use jurisdiction rests with the City, with the FAA serving as an advisory body with respect to land use and height. The City intends to comply with all FAA airport land use planning guidelines, as well as California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and County of Los Angeles guidelines and regulations.
- **Land Use and Development Regulations.** This chapter provides development standards (building height, community benefits, setbacks, open space, parking, and adaptive reuse) and permitted uses within each development district and overlay zone.
- **Urban Design Guidelines.** This chapter describes the building design standards (e.g., massing, articulation, materials, openings, landscape, screening, signage).

- **Infrastructure Systems.** This chapter discusses the proposed distribution, location, and extent of the utilities infrastructure (water, wastewater, stormwater, gas, and electric), and other essential facilities proposed to be located within the Plan Area.
- **Implementation and Administration.** This chapter discusses the general administration, review and approval process, actions for implementation of the GCSP, and strategies for funding these improvements. The GCSP is the regulatory document guiding land use and development within the boundaries identified in the GCSP. Upon adoption by ordinance, the GCSP will serve as the zoning document for the properties within the Plan Area.

**Development Potential**

Development potential compares the range of development anticipated under the GCSP to existing development and the market projections prepared at the outset of the planning process. The market projections reflect employment and development trends for the South Los Angeles County market area and the estimated market capture rate of the Plan Area in relation to other job centers in the area. Table 1, Development Potential, summarizes the development potential for each land use district compared to existing land uses and the 10- to 20-year market demand.

The total development potential for the Plan Area is 8,906,403 square feet.

**Table 1. Development Potential**

GCSP Land Use	GCSP Development Potential (square feet)	Market Demand Plus Existing Development (square feet)	
		10 Years	20 Years
Office	1,872,602	843,862	1,551,062
Medical Office	146,095	43,063	104,229
Research and Development	234,651	11,398	22,797
Manufacturing	1,131,139	1,678,645	1,839,645
Light Industrial/ Warehousing	4,455,892	3,088,389	4,703,389
Retail	795,457	601,205	821,032
Restaurant	107,623	133,351	241,624
Hotel	162,944	200,000	400,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>8,906,403</b>	<b>6,599,913</b>	<b>9,683,778</b>

**Mobility Plan**

**New Streets**

The GCSP would involve implementation of new streets and pedestrian connectors that would be installed by developers incrementally as parcels are developed. Streets within the GCSP are divided into four street classifications and a pathway system: Major Avenue, Minor Avenue, Neighborhood Connector, Local Street, and Pedestrian Connection. Street classifications are consistent with the City’s General Plan Mobility Element. The Pedestrian Connection typology represents pathways providing pedestrian/bicycle access through parcels. New streets and pedestrian connections break down large blocks to enhance mobility and accessibility for all travel modes.

New Neighborhood Connector streets would continue 36th Street and 32nd Street east of Cherry Avenue, forming an outer loop around the central core area with Cherry Avenue and Globemaster Way. New Local Streets would extend 33rd Street east of Cherry Avenue and create new north/south mid-block connectors east and west of Cherry Avenue in both the central core and southwestern portions of the Plan Area. New pedestrian connections would create internal pedestrian/bicycle pathways that further strengthen accessibility and mobility through and between parcels. Combined improvements would achieve an integrated and multi-modal mobility system supportive of the land use districts.

The location of new streets and pedestrian connections are conceptual and designed to maximize the accessibility of and connectivity for active transportation modes. Actual locations may deviate from those discussed in the GCSP, provided the original intent is maintained. The actual locations would be determined as developments are proposed and would be approved by the Director of Public Works and the Director of Development Services.

### ***Street Improvements***

Improvements to existing streets and the design of new streets are important aspects of the GCSP. Bicycle facilities are proposed for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and all new streets in the Plan Area to help improve connectivity within the Plan Area and connect to existing bicycle infrastructure within the vicinity of the Plan Area, strengthening Long Beach's commitment to be the nation's most bicycle-friendly city.

Pedestrian improvements are also proposed for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and all new streets within the Plan Area to help ensure a continuous network of sidewalks and shaded parkways to facilitate and encourage walking through and to/from the Plan Area.

The following provides a description of the types of improvements planned for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and new streets within the Plan Area, including new pedestrian connections:

- **Cherry Avenue:** The new street section for Cherry Avenue would remove on-street parking on both sides and provide a new 11-foot 6-inch Class IV separated bikeway on both sides of Cherry Avenue. A curb, pole, planter, or striping would be placed to separate cyclists from traffic between the new bikeway and the street. A landscaped parkway would also be incorporated into the pedestrian right-of-way to beautify and provide shade for pedestrians and cyclists.
- **Wardlow Road:** The new street section for Wardlow Road would reduce the width of the two through-lanes from 14 feet and 10 feet to 11 feet and 10 feet to add a raised Class VI bike lane. A landscaped parkway would also be incorporated into the pedestrian right-of-way to beautify and provide shade for pedestrians and cyclists.
- **New Neighborhood Connector Streets:** The new street section for the Neighborhood Connector classification would provide three through-lanes instead of four to accommodate a parking lane and landscaped parkway on one side of the street, and a Class II bike lane on the other side of the street. These improvements to the Neighborhood Connector classification for new streets would facilitate access around the central core area, and improve the experience and accessibility to the central core from Cherry Avenue for pedestrians and cyclists.
- **New Local Streets:** The new street section for the Local Street classification would convert through-lanes to through/Class III bike lanes (i.e., signs or sharrows) and provide a landscaped parkway on both sides of the street. Alternative parking configurations (i.e., parallel or diagonal) are also possible and would provide flexibility in the design of new Local Streets. Improvements to the Local Street classification would enhance the experience and accessibility for cyclists and pedestrians to sites within the Plan Area.
- **New Pedestrian Connections:** The design of pedestrian connections are flexible; however, new pathways should be flanked by landscaping to beautify and provide on-site shading.

Similar improvements could be extended to other existing streets within the GCSP, as determined necessary by the City, and included in the design and specifications for the ultimate roadway improvements.

## 2.2 Required Project Approvals

In conformance with Sections 15050 and 15367 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Long Beach has been designated as the lead agency, which is defined as “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project.” Approvals by the lead agency required for development of the Proposed Project include the following:

- Zoning Code Amendment/Specific Plan Approval
- Zone Change
- Certification of the PEIR/PEIS

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



# 3 Project Location

---

The Plan Area is located in the central portion of the City of Long Beach, bordering the Long Beach Airport to the west and south, and the cities of Lakewood and Signal Hill to the north and south, respectively. The Plan Area is approximately 3 miles northeast of downtown Long Beach. The Port of Long Beach, the second busiest port in the United States and a twin of the No. 1 busiest Port of Los Angeles, is located 8 miles south and is also owned and operated by the City. The Plan Area is afforded direct access from I-405 via Cherry Avenue, providing easy access and high visibility to the area from a regional standpoint.

The Plan Area totals approximately 437 acres. Cherry Avenue and Spring Street form its central unifying spines. The historic California Heights Historic District and the Bixby Knolls neighborhood are located west of Cherry Avenue. East of the Plan Area on the opposite site of the airport is the Skylinks Golf Course and the Long Beach City College Liberal Arts Campus.

The Plan Area and surrounding area is characterized as a developed urban area composed of commercial, industrial, and residential uses. The most prominent land use adjacent to the Plan Area is the Long Beach Airport, which is generally located east of the Plan Area. The Plan Area is highly disturbed and consists primarily of commercial and industrial uses, with some vegetation and small amounts of unpaved areas. The Plan Area consists of a variety of low- to mid-rise commercial and industrial uses. Land uses are supported by a streetscape context that is largely auto-oriented and lacking street trees and other pedestrian amenities.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# 4 Issues Addressed in the PEIR/PEIS

---

It was determined during the preparation of the Initial Study and the Environmental Checklists (Appendix A-1, Initial Study, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS) that the Proposed Project would have either a less than significant or no impact associated with the following topics:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Recreation

As such, these issues were not analyzed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS. Based on the analysis presented in the IS/NOP and the information provided in the comments to the IS/NOP, the following environmental topics were analyzed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Environmental Justice
- Energy

The Draft PEIR/PEIS determined that the following topics would have significant and unavoidable impacts (see Section 6 of this Findings of Fact):

- Air Quality (Air Quality Plan, Criteria Air Pollutants, Sensitive Receptors, Cumulative Air Quality Impacts)
- Cultural Resources (Historical Resources)
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG Emissions; GHG Reduction Plan, Policy, Regulations; Cumulative GHG Emissions Impacts)
- Transportation (Circulation Plan, Ordinance, Policy; Cumulative Transportation Impacts)

The Draft PEIR/PEIS determined that the following topics would be potentially significant and require mitigation measures to be reduced to less than significant impacts (Section 7 of this Findings of Fact):

- Aesthetics (Light and Glare)
- Air Quality (Other Emissions)
- Cultural Resources (Archeological Resources and Human Remains, Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal and Hazardous Upset/Accident; Listed Hazardous Site, Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Water Quality Standards, Groundwater Supplies, Erosion, Surface Runoff, Stormwater Drainage System Capacity, Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts)
- Noise (Ambient Noise Levels, Groundbourne Vibration or Noise, Airport Land Use Plan, Cumulative Noise Impacts)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts)
- Utilities and Service Systems (Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Facilities, Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impacts)

The remainder of the threshold questions by topic that are not addressed above would be less than significant. In addition, the Draft PEIR/PEIS determined that the following topics would have less than significant impacts (Section 8 of this Findings of Fact):

- Land Use and Planning
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Environmental Justice
- Energy

# 5 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Report

---

Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that a public agency adopting an EIR take affirmative steps to determine that approved mitigation measures are implemented after project approval. The City as the lead agency under CEQA must adopt a reporting and monitoring program for the mitigation measures incorporated into a project or included as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance with the EIR during project implementation (California Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6[a][1]).

The Council of Environmental Quality specifies the use of mitigation and monitoring for compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act guidance. Mitigation commitments should be carefully specified in terms of measurable performance standards or expected results, so as to establish clear performance expectations.<sup>1</sup> The agency should also specify the timeframe for the agency action and the mitigation measures in its decision documents to ensure that the intended start date and duration of the mitigation commitment is clear. The Council of Environmental Quality Regulations explicitly require that “a monitoring and enforcement program shall be adopted ... where applicable for any mitigation.”<sup>2</sup>

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Record will be used by the City to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS for the Proposed Project. The City adopted a detailed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program/Environmental Commitments Record included in Chapter 4 of the Final PEIR/PEIS.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 2001, the Committee on Mitigating Wetland Losses, through the National Research Council, conducted a nationwide study evaluating compensatory mitigation, focusing on whether the process is achieving the overall goal of “restoring and maintaining the quality of the nation’s waters” (NRC 2001). The study’s recommendations were incorporated into the 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule promulgated jointly by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. See U.S. Army Corps of Engineers & U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources,” 73 Fed. Reg. 19,594 (April 10, 2008).

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* Section 1505.2(c).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# 6 Findings of Significant and Unavoidable Impacts, Required Mitigation Measures, and Supporting Facts

---

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the City, pursuant to Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines, if the Proposed Project is approved.

## 6.1 Air Quality

### 6.1.1 Air Quality Plan

- A. **Potential Impact.** Consistency Criterion No. 1 of the South Couth Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook establishes that the Proposed Project will not result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards of the interim emissions reductions specified in the Air Quality Management Plan. The Proposed Project would potentially result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, and would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1. Consistency Criterion No. 2 of the SCAQMD 1993 CEQA Air Quality Handbook establishes that the Proposed Project will not exceed the assumptions in the Air Quality Management Plan or increments based on the year of Proposed Project buildout and phase. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the demographic growth forecasts in the Southern California Association of Governments' 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy; therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the SCAQMD 2016 Air Quality Management Plan, which based future emissions estimates on the Southern California Association of Governments' 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategy. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 2. However, because the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1, impacts related to the Proposed Project's potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan is potentially significant and mitigation is required.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Based on the analysis provided in Section 3.2, Air Quality, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Proposed Project's potentially significant impact on air quality due to a conflict with an applicable air quality plan would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure (MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-10. MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), MM-AQ-2 (Fugitive Dust Control), and MM-AQ-3 (Architectural Coating VOC Emissions) would be required to

reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions, and MM-AQ-4 (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), MM-AQ-5 (Encourage Electric Vehicles), MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-7 (Energy Conservation), MM-AQ-8 (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), MM-AQ-9 (Electric Forklifts), and MM-AQ-10 (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. MM-AQ-1 would reduce various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation. MM-AQ-2 would reduce dust-related particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) emissions generated during construction and MM-AQ-3 would reduce volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions generated during application of architectural coating during construction. MM-AQ-4, MM-AQ-5, and MM-AQ-6 aim to reduce operational mobile-source emissions of various air pollutants. MM-AQ-7 focuses on reducing energy-related operational emissions, and MM-AQ-8 encourages reduction of operational area-source VOC emissions. MM-AQ-9 would reduce criteria air pollutants by replacing diesel-fueled forklifts with electric forklifts, and MM-AQ-10 would reduce criteria air pollutants generated by transport refrigeration unit (TRU) idling. Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation, due to the magnitude of emissions associated with buildout of the Proposed Project, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1: Construction Emissions Reductions**

The following measures shall be incorporated into the Proposed Project to reduce construction criteria air pollutant emissions, including VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, generated by construction equipment used for future development projects implemented under the proposed GCSP:

- a. For off-road equipment with engines rated at 50 horsepower or greater, no construction equipment shall be used that is less than Tier 4 Interim. An exemption from these requirements may be granted by the City in the event that the applicant documents that equipment with the required tier is not reasonably available and corresponding reductions in criteria air pollutant emissions are achieved from other construction equipment.<sup>19</sup> Before an exemption may be considered by the City, the applicant shall be required to demonstrate that two construction fleet owners/operators in the Los Angeles Region were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 Interim or better equipment could not be located within the Los Angeles region. To ensure that Tier 4 construction equipment or better would be used during the Proposed Project's construction, the City shall include this requirement in applicable bid documents, purchase orders, and contracts. Successful contractor(s) must demonstrate the ability to supply the compliant construction equipment for use prior to any ground disturbing and construction activities.
- b. Minimize simultaneous operation of multiple construction equipment units. During construction, vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall not idle for more than 5 minutes, and shall turn their engines off when not in use to reduce vehicle emissions.
- c. Properly tune and maintain all construction equipment in accordance with manufacturer's specifications;
- d. Where feasible, employ the use of electrical or alternative fueled (i.e., non-diesel) construction equipment, including forklifts, concrete/industrial saws, pumps, aerial lifts, air compressors, and other comparable equipment types to the extent commercially available.
- e. To reduce the need for electric generators and other fuel-powered equipment, provide on-site electrical hookups for the use of hand tools such as saws, drills, and compressors used for building construction.
- f. Develop a Construction Traffic Control Plan to ensure construction traffic and equipment use is minimized to the extent practicable. The Construction Traffic Control Plan shall include measures to



reduce the number of large pieces of equipment operating simultaneously during peak construction periods, scheduling of vendor and haul truck trips to occur during non-peak hours, establish dedicated construction parking areas to encourage carpooling and efficiently accommodate construction vehicles, identify alternative routes to reduce traffic congestion during peak activities, and increase construction employee carpooling.

- g. Encourage construction contractors to apply for South Coast Air Quality Management District “SOON” funds. The “SOON” program provides funds to applicable fleets for the purchase of commercially-available low-emission heavy-duty engines to achieve near-term reduction of NOx emissions from in-use off-road diesel vehicles.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2: Fugitive Dust Control**

The following measures shall be incorporated into the Proposed Project to reduce construction fugitive dust emissions (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), generated by grading and construction activities of future development projects implemented under the proposed GCSP, consistent with SCAQMD Rule 403, with a goal of retaining dust on the site:

- a. Water, or utilize another SCAQMD-approved dust control non-toxic agent, on the grading areas at least three times daily to minimize fugitive dust.
- b. All permanent roadway improvements shall be constructed and paved as early as possible in the construction process to reduce construction vehicle travel on unpaved roads. To reduce fugitive dust from earth-moving operations, building pads shall be finalized as soon as possible following site preparation and grading activities.
- c. Stabilize grading areas as quickly as possible to minimize fugitive dust.
- d. Apply chemical stabilizer, install a gravel pad, or pave the last 100 feet of internal travel path within the construction site prior to public road entry, and to on-site stockpiles of excavated material.
- e. Remove any visible track-out into traveled public streets with the use of sweepers, water trucks, or similar method as soon as possible.
- f. Provide sufficient perimeter erosion control to prevent washout of silty material onto public roads. Unpaved construction site egress points shall be graveled to prevent track-out.
- g. Wet wash the construction access point at the end of the workday if any vehicle travel on unpaved surfaces has occurred.
- h. Cover haul trucks or maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard to reduce blow-off during hauling.
- i. Evaluate the need for reduction in dust generating activity, potential to stop work, and/or implementation of additional dust control measures if winds exceed 25 miles per hour.
- j. Enforce a 15-mile-per-hour speed limit on unpaved surfaces.
- k. Provide haul truck staging areas for the loading and unloading of soil and materials. Staging areas shall be located away from sensitive receptors, at the furthest feasible distance.
- l. Construction Traffic Control Plans shall route delivery and haul trucks required during construction away from sensitive receptor locations and congested intersections, to the extent feasible. Construction Traffic Control plans shall be finalized and approved prior to issuance of grading permits.
- m. Review and comply with any additional requirements of SCAQMD Rule 403.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-3: Architectural Coating VOC Emissions**

To address the impact relative to VOC emissions, Super-Compliant VOC-content architectural coatings (0 grams per liter to less than 10 grams per liter VOC) shall be used during Proposed Project construction/application of paints and other architectural coatings to reduce ozone precursors. If paints and coatings with VOC content of 0 grams/liter to less than 10 grams/liter cannot be utilized, the developer shall avoid application of architectural coatings during the peak smog season: July, August, and September. The developer shall procure architectural coatings from a supplier in compliance with the requirements of SCAQMD's Rule 1113 (Architectural Coatings).

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4: Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies**

The Proposed Project shall implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program to facilitate increased opportunities for transit, bicycling, and pedestrian travel, as well as provide the resources, means, and incentives for ride-sharing and carpooling to reduce vehicle miles traveled and associated criteria air pollutant emissions. The following components are to be included in the TDM Program:

**Bike and Pedestrian Travel**

- a. Develop a comprehensive pedestrian network designed to provide safe bicycle and pedestrian access between the various internal Proposed Project land uses, which will include design elements to enhance walkability and connectivity and shall minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity. Physical barriers, such as walls or landscaping, that impede pedestrian circulation shall be eliminated.
- b. The Proposed Project design shall include a network that connects the Proposed Project uses to the existing off-site facilities (e.g., existing off-site bike paths).
- c. Proposed Project design shall include pedestrian/bicycle safety and traffic calming measures in excess of jurisdiction requirements. Roadways shall be designed to reduce motor vehicle speeds and encourage pedestrian and bicycle trips with traffic calming features. Traffic calming features may include: marked crosswalks, count-down signal timers, curb extensions, speed tables, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median islands, tight corner radii, roundabouts or mini-circles, on-street parking, planter strips with street trees, chicanes/chokers, and others.
- d. Provide bicycle parking facilities along main travel corridors: one bike rack space per 20 vehicle/employee parking spaces or to meet demand, whichever results in the greater number of bicycle racks.
- e. Provide shower and locker facilities to encourage employees to bike and/or walk to work: one shower and three lockers per every 25 employees

**Ride-Sharing and Commute Reduction**

- f. Promote ridesharing programs through a multi-faceted approach, such as designating a certain percentage of parking spaces for ridesharing vehicles; designating adequate passenger loading and unloading and waiting areas for ridesharing vehicles; or providing a website or message board for coordinating rides.
- g. Implement marketing strategies to reduce commute trips. Information sharing and marketing are important components to successful commute trip-reduction strategies. Implementing commute trip-

reduction strategies without a complementary marketing strategy would result in lower VMT reductions. Marketing strategies may include: new employee orientation of trip reduction and alternative mode options; event promotions; or publications.

- h. One percent (1%) of vehicle/employee parking spaces shall be reserved for preferential spaces for car pools and van pools.
- i. Coordinate with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) for carpool, vanpool, and rideshare programs that are specific to the Proposed Project.
- j. Implement a demand-responsive shuttle service that provides access throughout the Plan Area, to the park-and-ride lots, and to the nearby transit centers.

**Transit**

- k. Bus pull-ins shall be constructed where appropriate within the Plan Area.
- l. Coordinate with SCAG on the future siting of transit stops/stations within or near the GCSP.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5: Encourage Electric Vehicles**

Subsequent future projects under the Proposed Project shall incorporate the following into final plans:

- a. Designate 10% of parking spaces to be for electric and alternative fuel vehicles.
- b. Install Level 2 EV charging stations in 6% of all parking spaces.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6: Idling Restriction**

For Proposed Project land uses that include truck idling, the Proposed Project shall minimize idling time of all vehicles and equipment to the extent feasible; idling for periods of greater than five (5) minutes shall be prohibited. Signage shall be posted at truck parking spots, entrances, and truck bays advising that idling time shall not exceed five (5) minutes per idling location. To the extent feasible, the tenant shall restrict idling emission from trucks by using auxiliary power units and electrification.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7: Energy Conservation**

The following energy conservation measures into Proposed Project building plans:

- a. Install a solar photovoltaic rooftop system to reduce the electric demand from the local grid.
- b. Install Energy Star rated heating, cooling, lighting, and appliances.
- c. Outdoor lighting shall be light emitting diodes (LED) or other high-efficiency lightbulbs.
- d. Provide information on energy efficiency, energy efficient lighting and lighting control systems, energy management, and existing energy incentive programs to future tenants of the Proposed Project.
- e. Non-residential structures shall meet the U.S. Green Building Council standards for cool roofs. This is defined as achieving a 3-year solar reflective index (SRI) of 64 for a low-sloped roof and 32 for a high-sloped roof.
- f. Outdoor pavement, such as walkways and patios, shall include paving materials with 3-year SRI of 0.28 or initial SRI of 0.33.

- g. Construction of modest cool roof, defined as Cool Roof Rating Council (CRRC) Rated 0.15 aged solar reflectance and 0.75 thermal emittance.
- h. Use of Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) equipment with a Seasonal Energy Efficiency Ratio (SEER) of 12 or higher.
- i. Installation of water heaters with an energy factor of 0.92 or higher.
- j. Maximize the use of natural lighting and include daylighting (e.g., skylights, windows) in rooms with exterior walls that would normally be occupied.
- k. Include high-efficacy artificial lighting in at least 50% of unit fixtures.
- l. Install low-NOx water heaters and space heaters, solar water heaters, or tankless water heaters.
- m. Use passive solar cooling/heating.
- n. Strategically plant trees to provide shade.
- o. Structures shall be equipped with outdoor electric outlets in the front and rear of the structure to facilitate use of electrical lawn and garden equipment.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-8: Low-VOC/Green Cleaning Product Educational Program**

Proposed Project tenants shall develop and implement a Low-VOC/Green Cleaning Product and Paint education program.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9: Electric Forklifts**

Proposed Project warehouse and manufacturing tenants shall require that all forklifts are electric-powered; if electric is not available or feasible, propane is acceptable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10: Transport Refrigeration Unit Plug-Ins.**

Electric plug-ins shall be installed at the loading docks at cold storage facilities to allow for transport refrigeration unit standby electric plug-in.

## 6.1.2 Criteria Pollutants

- A. **Potential Impact.** Construction and operation of the Proposed Project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants from mobile, area, energy, and/or stationary sources, which may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in emissions of criteria air pollutants for which the South Coast Air Basin is designated as nonattainment under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards or California Ambient Air Quality Standards.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Because construction specifications are not currently available, under a conservative scenario where maximum emissions from each assessed construction phase would occur concurrently, estimated Proposed Project emissions would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds for VOCs and nitrous oxides (NOx). Emissions of carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SOx), PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub> are not estimated to exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Implementation of MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-3 would be required

to reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions. MM-AQ-1 would reduce various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation, MM-AQ-2 would reduce dust-related PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions generated during construction, and MM-AQ-3 would reduce VOC emissions generated from the application of architectural coating during construction. Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation, Proposed-Project-generated construction criteria air pollutant emissions would remain significant and unavoidable.

During operations, Proposed-Project-generated VOC, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub> would exceed the SCAQMD's thresholds. MM-AQ-4 (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), MM-AQ-5 (Encourage Electric Vehicles), MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-7 (Energy Conservation), MM-AQ-8 (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), MM-AQ-9 (Electric Forklifts), and MM-AQ-10 (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation, potential impacts during operation of the Proposed Project would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-3** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-8** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10** (See Section 6.1.1)

### 6.1.3 Sensitive Receptors

- A. **Potential Impact.** Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would result in temporary sources of on-site fugitive dust and construction equipment emissions. The Proposed Project could result in toxic air contaminant (TAC) exposure to existing or future sensitive land uses during construction. As such, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily diesel particulate matter, is potentially significant and mitigation is required. The Proposed Project would provide for various nonresidential land uses, including industrial land uses such as manufacturing and warehousing, and research and development, which could include various sources of TACs. However, because the type and location of Proposed Project land uses and tenants have not been identified, the potential health risk associated with buildout of the GCSP cannot be accurately estimated. Due to the uncertainty of Proposed Project land uses and tenants, and their associated TAC emissions, as well as the potential location of additional sensitive receptors and the effectiveness of TAC reduction measures, the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant health risk impact as a result of operation, and

mitigation is required. Because tenants and associated operational TAC sources have not been identified, no source-specific TAC mitigation measures can be identified at this time.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** According to the localized significance threshold analysis, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions in excess of site-specific localized significance thresholds; therefore, localized construction impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required. MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Emissions Reduction) and MM-AQ-2 (Fugitive Dust Control) would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions. Nonetheless, site-specific impacts during construction of the Proposed Project would remain significant and unavoidable.

The potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily diesel particulate matter, is potentially significant and mitigation is required. Implementation of MM-AQ-1, which would result in reductions in exhaust PM<sub>10</sub> emissions from construction equipment, would be required. Nonetheless, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily diesel particulate matter, is significant and unavoidable. Operational TAC exposure could not be identified due to the uncertainty of future sensitive receptor locations and the effectiveness of TAC reduction measures. However, to reduce the potential for the Proposed Project to expose sensitive receptors to TACs and the associated health risk, MM-AQ-11 (Health Risk Siting), MM-AQ-12 (Toxic Air Contaminant Reduction), and MM-AQ-13 (Health Risk Assessment Requirements) would be implemented. Note that mitigation measures that reduce criteria air pollutants also reduce TACs, specifically MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-9 (Electric Forklifts), and MM-AQ-10 (TRU Plug-Ins). Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation, which cannot be quantified at this time, the Proposed Project would have a significant and unavoidable health risk impact as a result of operations.

Based on the criteria air pollutant evaluation, because construction and operation of the Proposed Project could result in exceedances of the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and PM<sub>10</sub>, the potential health effects associated with criteria air pollutants are potentially significant. Implementation of MM-AQ-1 through MM-AQ-3 would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions, and implementation of MM-AQ-4 through MM-AQ-10 would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with implementation of mitigation, potential impacts would remain significant and unavoidable during both construction and operation.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-3** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-8** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-11: Health Risk Siting**

The City shall minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to toxic air contaminants (TACs), to the extent possible, by considering distance, orientation, and wind direction to minimize exposure and associated health risk when siting TAC-emitting sources near sensitive land uses.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-12: Toxic Air Contaminant Reduction**

At the time of discretionary approval of new sources of TAC emissions in close proximity to existing sensitive land uses, the City shall require development projects to implement applicable best management practices, as necessary and feasible, that will reduce exposure to TACs. Specific reduction measures will be evaluated and determined depending on proposed land use TAC sources and feasibility.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-13: Health Risk Assessment Requirements**

Consistent with the California Air Resources Board's recommendations on siting new sensitive land uses, a formal health risk assessment shall be performed under the following conditions:

- a. **Distribution Centers.** For any distribution center that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week located within 1,000 feet of a sensitive receptor. In addition, configuration of entry and exit points of the distribution center shall be considered to minimize exposure to sensitive receptors.
- b. **Gasoline Dispensing Facilities.** For any large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater) within 300 feet of a sensitive receptor. For any typical gas dispensing facility (with a throughput of less than 3.6 million gallons per year) within 50 feet of a sensitive receptor.
- c. **Dry Cleaners Using Perchloroethylene.** For any dry cleaning operation within 300 feet of a sensitive receptor. For operations with three or more machines, consult with the South Coast Air Quality Management District for when a health risk assessment shall be prepared as the distance to the closest sensitive receptor may be less than 300 feet.
- d. **Other Sources of Toxic Air Contaminants.** For other sources of TACs, the City shall evaluate the need to prepare a health risk assessment based on the types of TACs and the distance to sensitive receptors.

## 6.1.4 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** Construction and operational activities associated with the Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable increase in emissions of nonattainment pollutant and potential emissions of TACs, as previously discussed in Sections 6.1.1 through 6.1.3 of this Findings of Fact.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the identified air quality impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** As previously discussed in Sections 6.1.1 and 6.1.2 of this Findings of Fact, although mitigation would reduce Proposed-Project-generated construction and operational emissions, the reduction in emissions cannot be accurately quantified. Therefore, the potential for the Proposed Project to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Proposed Project region is in non-attainment under an applicable national or California ambient air quality standard is significant and unavoidable. Additionally, as discussed in Section 6.1.3, due to the uncertainty of future sensitive receptor locations and the effectiveness of TAC reduction measures, TAC exposure cannot be quantified. Thus, the cumulative impacts of TAC emissions are significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-3** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-8** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-11** (See Section 6.1.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-12** (See Section 6.1.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-13** (See Section 6.1.3)



## 6.2 Cultural Resources

### 6.2.1 Historical Resources

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project would result in rezoning portions of the Plan Area and allow for project-level design plans that would include redevelopment of parcels and street improvements to existing roadways and planned neighborhood connectors. Because rezoning the property would not result in a direct or indirect impact to a designated historical resource, the rezoning and design plans proposed for the Plan Area would likely result in construction in the future. There are known historical resources in the Plan Area, and the potential for more properties that have not been evaluated and could be CEQA historical resources. In particular, the Plan Area includes resources that are recently reaching 45 years or more of age that are associated with periods of Long Beach history and are not fully documented in the Historic Context Statement. Preservation of these buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP. Furthermore, because these resources are not listed, they may be eligible for local listing but not eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources or National Register of Historic Places. Consequently, these future activities could result in significant impacts to CEQA historical resources in the Plan Area.

Any future project that would potentially result in the modification and/or removal of a locally designated historic landmark would be subject to compliance with Chapter 2.63 (Cultural Heritage Commission) and Section 16.52.290 (the Termo Company Building) of the Long Beach Municipal Code related to the preservation of designated historic properties.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the identified historical resources impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Implementation of MM-CUL-1, which requires future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level, and that properties 45 years old or older be evaluated for historical significance prior to initiation of any project-related activities that could identify significant impacts to historic properties. Development under the proposed GCSP has a potential for demolishing structures that are eligible for historic significance.

In the event that a future development could result in the demolition of a historical resource, the inclusion of MM-CUL-2 would ensure that the historic structure is documented pursuant to the guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level III. This documentation would be prepared by a qualified professional in the field. Due to the potential loss of historic-age structures with implementation of the GCSP, significant impacts would remain after the incorporation of identified mitigation. As such, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1: Project Level Analysis of Historic Era Built Environment Resources**

Implementation of the Proposed Project (re-zoning and design plans within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area) will likely result in the development of plans for future project-level activities that involve construction and ground disturbing activities within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area. As such, future projects involving these types of activities could constitute a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource by means of physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings, such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5). To mitigate the potential impacts of future

projects developed under the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan, prospective project developers and/or stakeholders shall be required to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed as part of planning and environmental clearance for their individual project(s).

Prior to the initiation of any construction and/or ground disturbing activities, the Proposed Project will require review by a qualified architectural historian to assess the potential impacts to known and potential CEQA historical resources. If project implementation could result in impacts, than a Historic Resource Evaluation Report will need to be prepared by a qualified architectural historian for the specific project to verify if any CEQA historical resources could be impacted by the Proposed Project. This subsequent identification and impact analysis, including consideration of previously identified historical resources and evaluation of buildings and structures over 45 years old for historical significance in accordance with the guidance of the State of California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), shall be conducted.

In addition, a historical evaluation of the project level impacts (direct or indirect) at the following sites shall be analyzed in accordance with OHP guidance prior to the approval of future project entitlements:

1. Fire Station No. 14, 1838 E. Wardlow Road (APN: 7148-020-024), constructed in 1941
2. 3341 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-021), constructed in 1933
3. 3275 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-009), constructed in 1929
4. 3249 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7148-020-010), constructed in 1929
5. 3170 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-047), constructed in 1940
6. 3204 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-045), constructed in 1933
7. 3252 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-042), constructed in 1937
8. 3254 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-062), constructed in 1937
9. 3366 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7149-006-035), constructed in 1937
10. 3431 Cherry Avenue (APN: 7147-026-017), constructed in 1947
11. Iglesia Católica Santísimo Sacramento, 1900 E. Carson Street (APN: 7137-013-001), constructed in 1942
12. California Heights Baptist Church, 4110 Gardenia Avenue (APN: 7137-012-009), constructed in 1947

A qualified architectural historian, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, shall conduct all work related to the preparation of historic resource evaluation reports, impact analyses, mitigation recommendations (if deemed necessary), and/or subsequent technical reports, should the proposed construction and implementation of future individual projects under the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan result in potential impacts to CEQA historical resources. If HRE report results indicate that the project will not result in impacts to CEQA historical resources than no further documentation will be required and the impact for the Proposed Project will likely be no impact or less than significant. If the HRE identifies the presence of CEQA historical resources and impacts cannot be avoided through project redesign or relocation than implementation of mitigation measure MM-CUL-2 will need to be implemented. It is important to note that demolition of a CEQA historical resource cannot be mitigated to less-than-significant. Still, mitigation measure MM-CUL-2 would apply.

### Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2: Project Level Mitigation Alternatives

In consultation with the Planning Bureau of the Long Beach Development Services Department, prior to the approval of a project level that will result in a significant and unavoidable impact to a historic resource under CEQA, mitigation will be required. Mitigation should be developed by an historic qualified historic preservation specialist or architectural historian based on individual resource historic significance to help ensure that the mitigation addresses what is significant about the resource. A range of mitigation options are available including but not limited to development of interpretive materials, salvage of historic materials, or documentation of the buildings and structures proposed for demolition that follows the general guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS)-level III documentation. All mitigation needs to be initiated prior to project construction and completed prior to project completion, HABS documentation, which is a common form of mitigation for CEQA historical resources, shall include high resolution digital photographic recordation, a historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified professional who meets the standards for history, architectural history, or architecture as set forth by the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards (36 CFR, Part 61). The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the South Central Coastal Information Center (SCCIC), Billie Jean King Main Library, and Historical Society of Long Beach to make it available for current and future generations. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, where it would be available to local researchers. The documentation reports shall be completed and approved by the City of Long Beach prior to the issuance of demolition permits.

## 6.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

### 6.3.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- A. **Potential Impact.** Construction of the Proposed Project would result in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, primarily associated with the use of off-road construction equipment and on-road vehicles (haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles). The total construction GHG emissions were calculated, amortized over 30 years, and added to the total operational emissions for comparison with the GHG significance threshold of 3,000 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2e</sub>) per year. Accordingly, the Proposed Project is estimated to result in 5.74 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> per service population per year (64,166 MT CO<sub>2e</sub>/year ÷ 11,170 service population), which would exceed the applied efficiency metric threshold 1.92 MT CO<sub>2e</sub> per service population per year.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the GHG emissions impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** The Proposed Project's GHG contribution would be cumulatively considerable and is potentially significant. Implementation of MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), MM-AQ-4 (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), MM-AQ-5 (Encourage Electric Vehicles), MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-7 (Energy Conservation), MM-AQ-9 (Electric Forklifts), MMAQ-10 (TRU Plug-Ins), MM-GHG-1 (Water Conservation), and MM-GHG-2 (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed-Project-generated GHG emissions. However, even with implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-1: Water Conservation**

Prior to the issuance of building permits for projects under the GCSP, the project applicant shall provide building plans that include the following water conservation measures:

- a) Install low-water use appliances and fixtures
- b) Restrict the use of water for cleaning outdoor surfaces and prohibit systems that apply water to non-vegetated surfaces
- c) Implement water-sensitive urban design practices in new construction
- d) Install rainwater collection systems where feasible.

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-2: Solid Waste Reduction**

Prior to the issuance of building permits for projects under the GCSP, the project applicant shall provide building plans that include the following solid waste reduction measures:

- a) Provide storage areas for recyclables and green waste in new construction, and food waste storage, if a pick-up service is available.
- b) Evaluate the potential for on-site composting

### 6.3.2 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan, Policy, Regulations

- A. **Potential Impact.** The City is currently developing a Climate Action and Adaption Plan (CAAP). Regarding the potential for the Proposed Project to conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs, the efficiency target of 1.92 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population per year is also relevant because the per service population efficiency targets are based on the 2040 reduction targets established for the CAAP and are consistent with the state’s target reductions of 40% below 1990 levels by 2030 and the state’s 2050 GHG target. Because the Proposed Project would exceed the 1.92 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per service population per year threshold, it would not be consistent with the City’s draft CAAP. In addition, regarding consistency with Executive Order S-3-05 and Senate Bill (SB) 32, the Proposed

Project (without mitigation) would generate GHG emissions that may interfere with implementation of GHG reduction goals for 2030 and 2050.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the GHG emissions impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Based on the above evaluations, the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and as such, impacts are potentially significant. As discussed previously, implementation of MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), MM-AQ-4 (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), MM-AQ-5 (Encourage Electric Vehicles), MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-7 (Energy Conservation), MM-AQ-9 (Electric Forklifts), MM-AQ-10 (TRU Plug-Ins), MM-GHG-1 (Water Conservation), and MM-GHG-2 (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed-Project-generated GHG emissions and associated impacts related to the potential to conflict with applicable GHG emissions reduction plans, policies, or regulations. In addition to the various mitigation measures required, as discussed previously, the City is developing a CAAP to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term state GHG reduction goals. Once the CAAP is formally adopted, future projects under the GCSP would be required to include a project-level analysis demonstrating consistency with the goals, policies, and standards established under the CAAP. Implementation of the CAAP would contribute to reducing GHG emissions resulting from Proposed Project implementation to the extent applicable to nonresidential land use development. However, even with implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-1** (See Section 6.3.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-2** (See Section 6.3.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-9** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-10** (See Section 6.1.1)

### 6.3.3 Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** GHG emissions inherently contribute to cumulative impacts, and thus, any additional GHG emissions would result in a cumulative impact. As discussed in Sections 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 of this Findings of Fact, the Proposed Project would result in GHG emissions that exceed applied thresholds.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the GHG emissions impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** The Proposed Project's GHG contribution would be cumulatively considerable and is potentially significant. Additionally, the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Implementation of MM-AQ-1 (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), MM-AQ-4 (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), MM-AQ-5 (Encourage Electric Vehicles), MM-AQ-6 (Idling Restriction), MM-AQ-7 (Energy Conservation), MM-GHG-1 (Water Conservation), and MM-GHG-2 (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed-Project-generated GHG emissions. In addition to the various mitigation measures required, as discussed previously, the City is developing a CAAP to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term state GHG reduction goals. Once the CAAP is formally adopted, future projects under the GCSP would be required to include a project-level analysis demonstrating consistency with the goals, policies, and standards established under the CAAP. Implementation of the CAAP would contribute to reducing GHG emissions resulting from Proposed Project implementation to the extent applicable to nonresidential land use development. However, even with implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-1** (See Section 6.3.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-GHG-2** (See Section 6.3.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-4** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-5** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-6** (See Section 6.1.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-7** (See Section 6.1.1)

## 6.4 Transportation

### 6.4.1 Circulation Plan, Ordinance, or Policy

- A. **Potential Impact.** Under the Existing (2018) Plus Project Intersection Peak Hour Levels of Service (LOS), six of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic. Five of these intersections would be significantly impacted compared to LOS standards. The LOS standard applies to the GCSP's PEIR/PEIS because SB 743 was not in effect at the time of the NOP.

Future analysis of individual projects will be subject to review under SB 743 vehicle miles traveled (VMT) standards. Under the Year 2040 Baseline Plus Project traffic conditions, 10 of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic, and would be significantly impacted when compared to the LOS standards used by the City of Long Beach. An analysis of Caltrans facilities indicates that the Proposed Project would impact the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection under Existing Plus Project traffic conditions. The Proposed Project would also impact the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection, along with I-405 northbound ramp/32nd Street intersection, under Year 2040 Plus Project conditions.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the transportation impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** With the implementation of MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, all intersections would operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Existing (2018) Plus Project conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards used by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is significant if a project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

Implementation of MM-TRAF-5 through MM-TRAF-13 at the significantly impacted intersections would offset the Proposed Project's impact and improve the LOS to acceptable conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards used by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an operational deficiency occurs if a project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Since the study intersection currently operates at an adverse LOS under existing traffic conditions, the Proposed Project's impact would not be adverse or unacceptable. Although this intersection is not considered significantly impacted, it does operate adversely under existing traffic conditions. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, future development under the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

With implementation of MM-TRAF-9, the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions. With implementation of MM-TRAF-9 and MM-TRAF-14, the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection and the I-405 northbound ramp/32nd Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

The mitigation measures identify when the proposed improvements would fall under the authority of another jurisdiction or require additional right-of-way acquisition, causing operational deficiencies or conflicts with the intent of the GCSP. All identified mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible; therefore, all impacts related to consistency with established LOS metrics are significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-1: Intersection 1 – Cherry Avenue/Carson Street (Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Project Applicant shall be responsible for the construction of the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/Carson Street:

Widen and/or restripe the existing exclusive northbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1 would require additional right-of-way acquisition since the City of Long Beach identified that Cherry Avenue would implement planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities. Additional right-of-way acquisition or roadway widening would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs. The objectives of the specific plan include the introduction of land uses to stimulate economic development and job growth and to increase mobility choices throughout the Plan Area. Therefore, the loss of developable areas and mobility connections to implement this mitigation to restore LOS would be in conflict with the intent of the specific plan. Therefore, this mitigation measure would potentially conflict with adopted mobility plans and require additional right-of-way that is not consistent with planning documents, including the GCSP. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-2: Intersection 3 – Cherry Avenue/Cover Street (Long Beach/Lakewood)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/Cover Street:

Widen or restripe the existing exclusive northbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-2 would require additional right-of-way acquisition since the City of Long Beach identified that Cherry Avenue would implement planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities. Due to the nature of these improvements, right-of-way acquisition from the City of Lakewood would not be required. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition or roadway widening would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-3: Intersection 5 – Cherry Avenue/36th Street (Long Beach/Lakewood)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/36th Street:

Restripe the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane. Construct an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Lakewood.



Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-3 would require additional right-of-way acquisition from only the City of Lakewood (due to the nature of these improvements, right-of-way acquisition from the City of Long Beach would not be required). Additionally, the City of Long Beach has identified potential planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities, which would require additional right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Lakewood. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require acquisition of land in another jurisdiction (City of Lakewood). Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-4: Intersection 7 – Cherry Avenue/Wardlow Road (Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/ Wardlow Road:

Construct two additional northbound through lanes and an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. Construct two additional southbound through lanes. Restripe the existing eastbound shared through-left turn lane to an exclusive left-turn lane and construct an additional eastbound through lane. Restripe the existing westbound shared through-left turn lane to an exclusive left-turn lane. Construct two westbound through lanes. Restripe the westbound shared through-right turn lane to an exclusive westbound right-turn lane. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-4 would require additional right-of-way acquisition inclusive of proposed bicycle facilities identified by City of Long Beach. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-5: Intersection 9 – Orange Avenue/32nd Street (Signal Hill)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Orange Avenue/ 32nd Street:

Restripe the northbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Signal Hill.

Since the improvements under mitigation measure MM-TRAF-5 fall under the jurisdiction of another public agency (City of Signal Hill) and not the lead agency (City of Long Beach), the improvements cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-6: Intersection 1 – Cherry Avenue/Carson Street (Long Beach)**

In addition to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Project Applicant shall be responsible for the construction of the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/Carson Street:

Widen the eastbound approach to construct a 4th through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-6 would require additional right-of-way acquisition since the City of Long Beach identified that Cherry Avenue would implement planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-7: Intersection 3 – Cherry Avenue/Cover Street (Long Beach/Lakewood)**

In addition to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-2, prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/Cover Street:

Widen the northbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Lakewood.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-7 would require additional right-of-way acquisition since the City of Long Beach identified that Cherry Avenue would implement planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Lakewood. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require acquisition of land in another jurisdiction (City of Lakewood). Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-8: Intersection 5 – Cherry Avenue/36th Street (Long Beach/Lakewood)**

In addition to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-3, prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue/36th Street:

Modify the traffic signal to provide for an 8-phase traffic signal. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Lakewood.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-8 would require additional right-of-way acquisition since the City of Long Beach identified that Cherry Avenue would implement planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-9: Intersection 12 – Atlantic Avenue/Spring Street (Signal Hill/Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Atlantic Avenue/ Spring Street:

Construct an additional eastbound through lane and an additional westbound through lane. Restripe the existing exclusive westbound right-turn lane to a shared through-right turn lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Signal Hill.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-9 would require additional right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill. Additionally, the City of Long Beach has identified proposed bicycle facilities, which would require additional right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require acquisition of land in another jurisdiction (City of Signal Hill). Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-10: Intersection 15 – Orange Avenue/Spring Street (Signal Hill/Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Orange Avenue/ Spring Street:

Widen and/or restripe the northbound approach to provide a shared through/right-turn lane. Convert the southbound right-turn lane into a shared through/right-turn lane. Widen along the Proposed Project frontage to accommodate two south bound through lanes. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Signal Hill.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-10 would require additional right-of-way acquisition from the City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill. Additionally, the City of Long Beach has identified potential planned improvements consisting of proposed bicycle facilities, which would require additional right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require acquisition of land in another jurisdiction (City of Signal Hill). Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-11: Intersection 19 – Temple Avenue/Spring Street (Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Temple Avenue/ Spring Street:

Widen the eastbound approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane. Widen the westbound approach to provide an additional through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-11 would also require additional right-of-way acquisition inclusive of proposed bicycle facilities identified by the City of Long Beach. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-12: Intersection 21 – Redondo Avenue/Spring Street (Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Redondo Avenue/ Spring Street:

Widen the eastbound approach to provide an additional through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-12 would require additional right-of-way acquisition inclusive of proposed bicycle facilities identified by the City of Long Beach. Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-13: Intersection 26 – Orange Avenue/Willow Street (Signal Hill/Long Beach)**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at Cherry Avenue at Willow Street:

Construct an additional northbound through lane. Construct an additional southbound through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the City of Signal Hill.

Mitigation measure MM-TRAF-13 would fall under the jurisdiction of another public agency (City of Signal Hill) and are not guaranteed. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition from both the City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill. Implementation of this mitigation measure would require acquisition of land in another jurisdiction (City of Signal Hill). Similar to mitigation measure MM-TRAF-1, additional right-of-way acquisition is required and would result in a loss of sidewalks and a loss of developable areas and related jobs, which would conflict with key GCSP objectives. This identified improvement is considered infeasible. Without incorporation of feasible mitigation measures, the operation of this intersection would continue to be at an unacceptable level.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-14: Intersection 18 – I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street**

Prior to receiving a Certificate of Occupancy, the Proposed Project shall construct the following improvements at I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street:

Restripe the westbound approach to provide an additional through lane. These improvements are subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and/or Caltrans.

Since the improvements under mitigation measure MM-TRAF-14 fall under the jurisdiction of another public agency (Caltrans) and not the lead agency (City), the improvements cannot be guaranteed at this time.

## 6.4.2 Cumulative Transportation Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** Transportation impacts are, by nature, cumulative, and cumulative impacts to the study area's transportation network (study area intersections and freeway mainline segments) are addressed in Section 6.4.1. As previously discussed in Section 6.4.1, under the Existing (2018) Plus Project Intersection Peak Hour LOS, six of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic. Five of these intersections would be significantly impacted compared to LOS standards. The LOS standard applies to the GCSP PEIR/PEIS because SB 743 was not in effect at the time of the NOP. Future analysis of individual projects will be subject to review under SB 743 VMT standards. Under the Year 2040 Baseline Plus Project traffic conditions, 10 of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic, and would be significantly impacted when compared to the LOS standards used by the City of Long Beach. An analysis of Caltrans facilities indicates that the Proposed Project would impact the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection under Existing Plus Project traffic conditions. The Proposed Project would also impact the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection, along with I-405 northbound ramp/32nd Street intersection, under Year 2040 Plus Project conditions.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible the alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS, and the transportation impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 10 of this Findings of Fact).
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Based on the analysis provided in Section 6.4.1 of this Findings of Fact, with implementation of MM-TRAF-1 through MM-TRAF-5, all intersections would operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Existing (2018) Plus Project conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards used by the City of Long Beach, which specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is significant if a project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

Implementation of MM-TRAF-5 through MM-TRAF-13 at the significantly impacted intersections would offset the Proposed Project's impact and improve the LOS to acceptable conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hours, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards used by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an operational deficiency occurs if a project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Since the study intersection currently operates at an adverse LOS under existing traffic conditions, the Proposed Project's impact would not be adverse or unacceptable. Although this intersection is not considered significantly impacted, it does operate adversely under existing traffic conditions. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicates that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, future development under the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

With implementation of MM-TRAF-9, the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions. With implementation of MM-TRAF-9 and MM-TRAF-14, the I-405 southbound off-ramp/Spring Street intersection and the I-405 northbound ramp/32nd Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

The mitigation measures identify when the proposed improvements would fall under the authority of another jurisdiction or require additional right-of-way acquisition, causing operational deficiencies or conflicts with the intent of the GCSP. All identified mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible; therefore, all impacts related to consistency with established LOS metrics are significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-1** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-2** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-3** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-4** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-5** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-6** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-7** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-8** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-9** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-10** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-11** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-12** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-13** (See Section 6.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TRAF-14** (See Section 6.4.1)

# 7 Findings of Significant Impacts, Required Mitigation Measures, and Supporting Facts

---

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Project that require findings to be made under CEQA Section 21081(a) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1). Based on substantial evidence, the City finds that adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in this section would reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant.

## 7.1 Aesthetics

### 7.1.1 Light and Glare

- A. **Potential Impact.** Although the GCSP itself would not result in direct sources of light or glare, future development facilitated by the GCSP would introduce new sources of lighting that are typical of commercial/retail, industrial, and institutional projects that could affect airport land uses.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant aesthetic-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Based on the analysis provided in Section 3.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Proposed Project's potentially significant impact on aesthetics due to substantial light or glare would be mitigated to less than significant with implementation of MM-AES-1 and MM-AES-2. MM-AES-1 requires lighting plans and MM-AES-2 requires shielding for light fixtures.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-AES-1: Lighting Plans and Specifications**

Prior to the issuance of building permits for new development projects, the applicant shall submit lighting plans and specifications for all exterior lighting fixtures, light standards, and window treatments (e.g., consideration of specialized manicuring or tinting to reduce glare from interior lighting) to the City of Long Beach's Development Services Department for review and approval. The plans shall include a photometric design study demonstrating that all outdoor light fixtures to be installed are designed or located in a manner as to contain the direct rays from the lights on site and to minimize spillover of light onto surrounding properties or roadways. All parking structure lighting shall be shielded and directed away from residential uses. Open space areas are encouraged in the Plan. Lighting for such features shall be designed so that light is directed so as to provide adequate security and minimal spill-over or nuisance lighting.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-AES-2: Light Fixture Shielding**

Prior to the issuance of building permits for development projects within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area, applicants shall demonstrate to the City of Long Beach's Development Services Department that all nighttime lighting installed on private property within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan area shall be shielded, directed away from residential and other light-sensitive uses, and

confined to the Plan Area. Rooftop lighting, security lighting, or aviation warning lights shall be in accordance with Airport/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements. Additionally, all lighting shall comply with all applicable Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) Safety Policies and FAA regulations.

## 7.2 Air Quality

### 7.2.1 Other Emissions

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project is not anticipated to result in other emissions that have not been addressed under Thresholds A through C. As such, this analysis focuses on the potential for the Proposed Project to generate odors. Odors would be potentially generated from vehicles and equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the Proposed Project. Potential odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement application. Such odors would disperse rapidly from the Plan Area and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people. Based on potential types of land uses for the GCSP, during the operational phase of the Proposed Project, anticipated odors could be generated from industrial or retail land uses, including food-service odors.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant air-quality-related impacts associated with other emissions of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Potential odor impacts associated with Proposed Project construction would be less than significant. Because specific land uses and tenants have not been identified for the GCSP, odor sources associated with Proposed Project buildout and their potential to cause a significant impact to nearby sensitive receptors also cannot be completely identified. Therefore, the potential for the Proposed Project to generate an odor impact is potentially significant and MM-AQ-14 (Odor Siting) and MM-AQ- 15 (Odor Abatement Plan) would be required for uses that could cause a significant odor impact. Therefore, impacts associated with odors during operation would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-14: Odor Siting**

Land uses that have the potential to generate objectionable odors shall be located as far away as possible and/or downwind from sensitive receptors.



**Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-15: Odor Abatement Plan**

To address odors from the Proposed Project, any odor-generating land use shall implement an Odor Abatement Plan (OAP). The OAP shall include the following:

- a. Name and telephone number of contact person(s) at the facility responsible for logging in and responding to odor complaints
- b. Policy and procedure describing the actions to be taken when an odor complaint is received, including the training provided to the staff on how to respond
- c. Description of potential odor sources at the facility
- d. Description of potential methods for reducing odors, including minimizing idling of delivery and service trucks and buses, process changes, facility modifications, and/or feasible add-on air pollution control equipment
- e. Contingency measures to curtail emissions in the event of a public nuisance complaint.

## 7.3 Cultural Resources

### 7.3.1 Archaeological Resources

- A. **Potential Impact.** No archaeological resources were identified within the Plan Area as a result of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) records search or Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File search. It is always possible that unanticipated discoveries could be encountered during ground-disturbing activities associated with implementation of future projects under the GCSP. If such unanticipated discoveries were encountered, impacts to encountered resources could be potentially significant.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant archaeological-resources-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** With the implementation of MM-CUL-3, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of a find would be required to immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist (meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Archaeology) can evaluate the significance of the find. Additionally, implementation of MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9, which identifies the City's standard monitoring guidance for ground-disturbance activities, would further ensure impacts to archaeological resources are less than significant. As such, potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to less than significant. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3: Inadvertent Discovery of Archaeological Resources**

In the event that archaeological resources (sites, features, or artifacts) are exposed during future construction activities, all construction work occurring within 100 feet of the find shall immediately stop until a qualified archaeologist, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, and tribal monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation can evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether or not additional study is warranted. Depending upon the significance of the find under CEQA (14 CCR 15064.5(f); PRC Section 21082), work may continue

on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, additional protective mitigation takes place. If the discovery proves significant under CEQA, additional work, such as preparation of an archaeological treatment plan, testing, or data recovery may be warranted.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-1** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-2** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-3** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-4** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-5** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-6** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-7** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-8** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-9** (See Section 7.7.1)

### 7.3.2 Human Remains

- A. **Potential Impact.** No prehistoric or historic burials were identified within the Plan Area as a result of the records search. However, the possibility of encountering human remains within the Plan Area exists. The discovery of human remains would require handling in accordance with PRC 5097.98, which states that in the event that human remains are discovered during construction, construction activity shall be halted and the area shall be protected until consultation and treatment can occur as prescribed by law. In the unexpected event that human remains are unearthed during construction activities, impacts could be potentially significant.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural-resources-related impacts associated with human remains of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** With implementation of MM-CUL-4, which identifies the guidance and protocol for handling the inadvertent discovery of human remains, impacts related to human remains would be reduced to less than significant.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4: Inadvertent Discovery of Human Remains**

In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found during future construction activities, the County Coroner shall be immediately notified of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the Plan Area or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the County Coroner determines that the remains are, or are believed to be, Native American, he or she shall contact,

by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and Public Resource Code 5097.98 shall be followed. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descendant from the deceased Native American. The most likely descendant shall complete their inspection within 48 hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the property owner, the disposition of the human remains.

### 7.3.3 Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** Cumulative impacts on cultural resources consider whether the impacts of the Proposed Project together with other related projects substantially diminish the number of historic or archeological resources within the same or similar context or property type. However, impacts to cultural resources, if any exist, tend to be site-specific. The Proposed Project could have potentially significant impacts to unknown archaeological resources and human remains. It is anticipated that cultural resources that are potentially affected by related projects would be subject to the same requirements of CEQA as the Proposed Project, and that the project applicants would mitigate for their impacts, if applicable. These determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis, and the effects of cumulative development on cultural resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible in accordance with CEQA and other applicable legal requirements.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant cumulative cultural-resources-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** The cultural resources that are potentially affected by the related projects would also be subject to the same requirements of CEQA as the Proposed Project, and as such, any impacts would be mitigated, as applicable. These determinations would be made on a case-by-case basis, and the effects of cumulative development on historical resources would be mitigated to the extent feasible in accordance with CEQA and other applicable legal requirements. While the potential for demolition of historic-age properties (45 years or older) would occur with buildout of the GCSP, not all structures within the Plan Area over 45 years of age would meet the eligibility requirements for designation as a historic resource. The majority of structures are likely not eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and/or National Register of Historic Places. With implementation of MM-CUL-1, property eligibility will be determined on a project-level basis. Therefore, while implementation of the GCSP could result in the potential for demolition of historic-age structures, this impact would not represent a cumulative impact because MM-CUL-1 and MM-CUL-2 require analysis on a project-level basis, and there are few existing designated historic resources within the Plan Area that would be demolished without further environmental analysis. Although the possibility exists for unlisted but eligible for local listing resources to be demolished, there is no historic landmark district or grouping of structures eligible for consideration as a district within the boundaries of the Plan Area. Therefore, there would be no cumulative impact from the loss of individual resources or any group of resources. Each loss of individual resources is potentially significant and therefore no additional cumulative impact exists beyond those individual impacts. Existing designated historic districts, contributing properties in historic districts, and landmark buildings would be protected under the provisions of the Municipal Code related to historic preservation.

MM-CUL-3 and MM-CUL-4 would reduce potential impacts related to the unanticipated discovery of archaeological resources and human remains. Additionally, MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9 would reduce potential impacts related to tribal cultural resources within the Plan Area. Given the site-specific nature of

such impacts, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact associated with cultural resources. The cumulative impacts on cultural resources would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-1** (See Section 6.2.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-2** (See Section 6.2.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-3** (See Section 7.3.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-CUL-4** (See Section 7.3.2)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-1** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-2** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-3** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-4** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-5** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-6** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-7** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-8** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-9** (See Section 7.7.1)

## 7.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

### 7.4.1 Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal and Hazardous Upset/Accident

- A. **Potential Impact.** Future development and redevelopment projects pursuant to the GCSP may require demolition of existing buildings and structures associated with a specific development site. Due to the age of the buildings and structures throughout the Plan Area (many over 50 years old), it is likely that asbestos-containing material (ACM) and lead-based paint, as well as other building materials containing lead (e.g., ceramic tile), were used in their construction. Grading activities of the individual future development projects that would be accommodated by the GCSP would involve the disturbance of on-site soils. Soils on certain parcels of the Plan Area could be contaminated with hazardous materials due to current and historical commercial land uses. Exposure of contaminated soils to workers and the surrounding environment would result in a significant impact.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid

potentially significant hazards and hazardous-materials-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.

- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Under CEQA, impacts associated with the Proposed Project potentially creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant with incorporation of MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2. Additionally, impacts associated with the Proposed Project potentially creating 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 would be less than significant through compliance with applicable regulatory requirements. As such, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated during construction and operation of future projects under the GCSP.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-1**

Prior to the issuance of demolition permits for any buildings or structures that would be demolished in conjunction with individual development projects that would be accommodated by the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan, the project applicant/developer shall conduct the following inspections and assessments for all buildings and structures on site and shall provide the City of Long Beach Development Services Department with a copy of the report of each investigation or assessment.

1. The project applicant shall retain a California Certified Asbestos Consultant (CAC) to perform abatement project planning, monitoring (including air monitoring), oversight, and reporting of all asbestos-containing materials (ACM) encountered. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all ACM shall be conducted in accordance with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's Rule 1403 and California Code of Regulation Title 8, Section 1529 (Asbestos).
2. The project applicant shall retain a licensed or certified lead inspector/assessor to conduct the abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered. The contracted lead inspector/assessor shall be certified by the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). All lead abatement shall be performed by a CDPH-certified lead supervisor or a CDPH-certified worker under the direct supervision of a lead supervisor certified by CDPH. The abatement, containment, and disposal of all lead waste encountered shall be conducted in accordance with the US Occupational Safety and Health Administration Rule 29, CFR Part 1926, and California Code of Regulation, Title 8, Section 1532.1 (Lead).
3. Evidence of the contracted professionals attained by the project applicant shall be provided to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department. Additionally, contractors performing ACM and lead waste removal shall provide evidence of abatement activities to the City of Long Beach Building and Safety Bureau.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-2**

Prior to the issuance of project entitlements or grading permits (whichever occurs first) for individual development projects that would be accommodated by the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan, the project applicant/developer shall submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to the City of Long Beach Development Services to identify environmental conditions of the development site and determine whether contamination is present. The Phase I ESA shall be prepared by a Registered Professional Engineer and in accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Standard E 1527.13, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. If recognized environmental conditions related to soils are identified in the Phase I ESA, the project applicant shall perform soil sampling as a part of a Phase II ESA. If contamination is found at significant levels, the

project applicant shall remediate all contaminated soils in accordance with state and local agency requirements (California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Long Beach Fire Department, etc.). All contaminated soils and/or material encountered shall be disposed of at a regulated site and in accordance with applicable laws and regulations prior to the completion of grading. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a report documenting the completion, results, and any follow-up remediation on the recommendations, if any, shall be provided to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department evidencing that all site remediation activities have been completed.

## 7.4.2 Listed Hazardous Site

- A. **Potential Impact.** A number of sites and facilities in the Plan Area are listed in hazardous materials sites databases. The majority of these listings do not identify hazardous material releases, but identify current or historic uses of hazardous materials where there is, or was, some potential for release, including hazardous waste generators and existing or historic underground storage tanks. Individual future development projects permitted by the GCSP may be impacted by hazardous substance contamination remaining from historical operations on a particular portion of the Plan Area, which may pose a significant health risk resulting in a significant impact.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous-materials-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** An ACM and lead-based paint survey would be required (in accordance with MM-HAZ-1) prior to the commencement of future demolition activities within the Plan Area, and a Phase I ESA would be required (in accordance with MM-HAZ-2) for land purchasers to qualify for the Innocent Landowner Defense under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. A Phase I ESA would also be required to minimize environmental liability under other laws, such as the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and as a lender prerequisite to extend a loan for purchase of land. With incorporation of MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2, impacts associated with potentially contaminated sites would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-1** (See Section 7.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-2** (See Section 7.4.1)

## 7.4.3 Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** The area considered for cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts is the City of Long Beach and the adjacent portions of the City of Lakewood and the City of Signal Hill. The Proposed Project has the potential to result in considerably cumulative impacts with respect to accidental release of hazards and hazardous materials, hazardous materials site listings, and/or airport-related hazards. The Proposed Project would involve the use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials. Such use and handling of hazardous materials could create risks of accidental release if the materials were not used, stored, transported, or disposed of safely. Additionally, the other planned development projects in the City of Long Beach, in accordance with the City's General Plan, would involve redevelopment or reuse of sites that could be listed as hazardous materials sites. Ground disturbances at such sites, and redevelopment or reuse with structures for human occupancy on such sites in combination with the Proposed Project,

could create hazards for people and/or the environment. Further, other planned development projects in the City of Long Beach, in accordance with the City's General Plan, may occur in the area surrounding Long Beach Airport where heights of structures are regulated to avoid obstructions to navigable airspace pursuant to FAA Part 77 regulation.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hazards and hazardous-materials-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Through compliance with regulatory requirements and the implementation of MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2, the proposed GCSP would not result in any hazardous conditions with regard to building materials or soil contamination, and would not combine with other planned development projects to result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to these potential hazards. Therefore, the proposed GCSP's contribution to cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and waste or the creation of any health hazards would not be significant.

With regards to the hazardous materials site, through compliance with regulatory requirements and the implementation of MM-HAZ-1 and MM-HAZ-2, the proposed GCSP would not result in any hazardous conditions with regard to building materials or soil contamination and would not combine with other planned development projects to result in a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to these potential hazards. Therefore, the proposed GCSP's contribution to cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials and waste or the creation of any health hazards would not be significant.

Further, compliance with the General Plan height standards in areas around the Long Beach Airport would ensure other planned development projects proposing structures would not exceed such elevation limits. The FAA would conduct an aeronautical study to determine whether the proposed structure would be an obstruction to navigable airspace. Local land use control is under the jurisdiction of the City of Long Beach, not the FAA. The City is responsible for ensuring that development of proposed structures does not create obstructions to navigable airspace. Therefore, the proposed GCSP's contribution to cumulative impacts related to airport-related hazards would not be significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-1** (See Section 7.4.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HAZ-2** (See Section 7.4.1)

## 7.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

### 7.5.1 Water Quality Standards

- A. **Potential Impact.** Proposed Project activities would result in potential soil erosion, which in turn could result in siltation of receiving water bodies, including the Cerritos Channel, Los Angeles River, and downstream Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor. In addition, during construction of the Proposed Project, petroleum hydrocarbons in site runoff could result from incidental spills during construction equipment/vehicle fueling or maintenance. During Proposed Project operations, nonpoint source runoff of pollutants, such as oil, grease, and metals, in parking and vehicle maintenance areas; incidental spills of hazardous materials

from industrial facilities; pesticides, herbicides, nitrogen, and phosphorous in landscape areas; and miscellaneous pathogens (bacteria), trash, and debris could occur at the Plan Area.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Proposed-Project-related nonpoint source runoff associated with future construction and operation of projects under the GCSP could potentially exacerbate existing surface water pollution in the already impaired Los Cerritos Watershed Management Area (WMA) and Los Angeles River WMA. As such, MM-HYD-1a would require the completion of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), MM-HYD-1b would require the City of Long Beach to review and approve the SWPPP, and MM-HYD-1c would require all construction activities to comply with the City of Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan. These mitigation measures would ensure effective control of not only sediment discharge, but also of pollutants associated with sediments, such as nutrients, heavy metals, and certain pesticides, including legacy pesticides. Additionally, MM-HYD-2a requires development of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), and MM-HYD-2b requires the SUSMP to comply with the City of Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan. The SUSMP would result in an increase in pervious surfaces and associated groundwater recharge, such that impacts would be less than significant after mitigation. Impacts would be less than significant with implementation of MM-HYD-1a through MMHYD-1c and MM-HYD-2a and MM-HYD-2b.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a**

A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be completed for Proposed Project grading in excess of one acre, in accordance with the Statewide Construction General Permit (State Water Resources Control Board Order 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended). In accordance with the SWPPP, the construction contractor shall implement water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that water quality standards are met, and that stormwater runoff from construction work areas do not cause degradation of water quality in receiving water bodies, including the Cerritos Channel, Los Angeles River, and downstream Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor.

The SWPPP shall include erosion control measures and proper handling of petroleum products, such as proper petroleum product storage and spill response practices, appropriate handling and disposal of small quantities of hazardous materials/wastes, litter control and pick up, and vehicle and equipment repair and maintenance in designated areas.

Typical BMPs that shall be incorporated into the SWPPP (as applicable) include the following:

1. Diverting off-site runoff away from the construction site
2. Vegetating landscaped/vegetated swale areas as soon as feasible following grading activities
3. Placing perimeter straw wattles to prevent off-site transport of sediment
4. Construction of sedimentation basins
5. Limitations on work periods during storm events
6. Protection of stockpiled materials



7. Using drop inlet protection (filters and sand bags or straw wattles), with sandbag check dams within paved areas
8. Regular watering of exposed soils to control dust during demolition and construction
9. Implementing specifications for demolition/construction waste handling and disposal
10. Maintaining erosion and sedimentation control measures throughout the construction period
11. Stabilizing construction entrances to avoid trucks from imprinting soil and debris onto City roadways
12. Training, including for subcontractors, on general site housekeeping
13. Using contained equipment wash-out and vehicle maintenance areas
14. Providing educational materials on oil disposal and recycling programs
15. Implementing spill control at fueling facilities

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1b**

The SWPPP shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Long Beach for compliance with the Los Angeles County Public Works Construction Site Best Management Practices Manual (LACDPW 2010).

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1c**

All Proposed Project construction activities are required to comply with the City of Long Beach, Stormwater Management Plan, which requires controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques, and engineering/system methods for the control of such pollutants.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2a**

A Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) shall be developed during the design of the Proposed Project. The SUSMP shall demonstrate how specific projects would minimize impervious surfaces, retain or treat stormwater runoff from the site, and implement designs consistent with the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual (City of Long Beach 2013). The design shall include Source Control and Treatment BMPs and an Operations & Maintenance Plan for the proposed BMPs. The SUSMP shall address long-term effects on water quality within the Los Cerritos Channel/Alamitos Bay Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed and ensure BMPs and LID designs minimize potential water quality concerns to the maximum extent practicable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2b**

The SUSMP shall comply with the City of Long Beach, Stormwater Management Plan, which requires controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable, including management practices, control techniques, and engineering/system methods for the control of such pollutants.

## 7.5.2 Groundwater Supplies

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project would allow for the intensification and redistribution of land uses with higher-density development, which would result in the extraction of additional groundwater supplies.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Because the City of Long Beach maintains reliable water sources from an adjudicated basin, the Proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. However, because the Proposed Project could result in new impervious surfaces, impacts under CEQA related to groundwater recharge are potentially significant. However, implementation of MM-HYD-2a and MM-HYD-2b require a SUSMP, which requires demonstration of how specific projects would minimize impervious surfaces, retain or treat storm water runoff from the site, and implement designs consistent with the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual. With the implementation of MM-HYD-2a and MM-HYD-2b, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2b** (See Section 7.5.1)

## 7.5.3 Erosion

- A. **Potential Impact.** Proposed grading and construction of individual projects under the GCSP would result in minor alterations to existing drainage patterns to accommodate each proposed development. However, continued on-site urban development would not substantially alter drainage patterns such that siltation would occur on site or off site. Potential erosion and off-site siltation of downstream waterways would be temporary and related primarily to grading and construction activities. Although the existing drainage pattern of the site would largely remain similar to existing conditions, all on- and off-site impacts related to hydrology would be mitigated through compliance with regulatory requirements.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Proposed-Project-related erosion-induced siltation of downstream waterways, in association with the construction of future projects under the GCSP, could potentially exacerbate existing surface water pollution in the already impaired Los Cerritos WMA and Los Angeles River WMA. MM-HYD-1a and MM-HYD-1b outline the requirements for preparation of a SWPPP and compliance with established BMPs. Furthermore, MM-HYD-1c requires all construction activities to comply with the City of Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan, which includes management practices and control techniques. MM-HYD-3a and MM-HYD-3b require a Hydrology/Drainage Report during the design of individual projects proposed as part of the GCSP. Redevelopment of the area, with mitigation, would facilitate greater on-site retention, treatment, infiltration, and appropriate conveyance when compared to the existing conditions baseline.

With the implementation of MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD-1c, MM-HYD-3a, and MM-HYD-3b, impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1c** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3a**

A Hydrology/Drainage Report shall be developed during the design of individual projects proposed as part of the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan. The Hydrology/Drainage Report shall demonstrate that stormwater runoff flow volume and flow rate, associated with specific projects, would be less than or equal to existing conditions to prevent on- and off-site flooding. Project design features that would contribute in reducing stormwater runoff could include:

1. On-site biofiltration (unlined bioswales and bioretention basins)
2. Lined (i.e., impervious) bioswales and detention basins
3. Vegetation-based stormwater quality control measures, including self-treating landscape areas and lined planters
4. Proprietary stormwater quality control measures, which are also known as manufactured treatment devices

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3b**

The Hydrology/Drainage Report shall comply with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology and Hydraulic Design Manual (LACDPW 2006) for storm drain planning and design calculations.

## 7.5.4 Surface Runoff

- A. **Potential Impact.** Proposed grading and construction of individual projects under the GCSP would result in minor alterations of existing drainage patterns to accommodate each proposed development. Continued on-site urban development would not substantially alter drainage patterns of the Plan Area. However, Proposed Project development could potentially result in an increase in surface runoff as a result of increased impervious surfaces in a manner that could result in flooding on site or off site, or exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems. All on- and off-site impacts related to flooding would be mitigated through compliance with regulatory requirements.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Much of the land within the Plan Area is paved, either as right-of-way, parking lot, or covered by buildings. Regardless, depending on the specific project design, Proposed Project development could potentially result in an increase in surface water runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site, or exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm drain systems. MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD-3b outline the requirements for compliance with all regulations related to hydrology

and water quality during construction and operation, including the completion of a hydrology/drainage report. With implementation of MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD-3b, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1c** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3a** (See Section 7.5.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3b** (See Section 7.5.3)

## 7.5.5 Stormwater Drainage System Capacity

- A. **Potential Impact.** Proposed Project grading and construction could result in erosion-induced siltation of receiving water bodies, including the Cerritos Channel, Los Angeles River, and downstream Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor. In addition, during construction, petroleum hydrocarbons in site runoff could result from incidental spills during construction equipment/vehicle fueling or maintenance. During Proposed Project operations, nonpoint source runoff of pollutants, such as oil, grease, and metals, in parking and vehicle maintenance areas; incidental spills of hazardous materials from industrial facilities; pesticides, herbicides, nitrogen, and phosphorous in landscape areas; and miscellaneous pathogens (bacteria), trash, and debris could occur in the Plan Area. All on- and off-site impacts related to runoff during construction and operation of future individual projects under the GCSP would be mitigated through compliance with regulatory requirements.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** Proposed-Project-related nonpoint source runoff associated with future construction and operation under the GCSP could potentially exacerbate existing surface water pollution in the already impaired Los Cerritos WMA and Los Angeles River WMA. MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD-3b outline the requirements for compliance with all regulations related to hydrology and water quality during construction and operation, including the completion of a hydrology/drainage report. With implementation of MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD-3b, impacts would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1c** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3a** (See Section 7.5.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3b** (See Section 7.5.3)

## 7.5.6 Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with water quality is the encompassing Los Cerritos Channel/Alamitos Bay Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed. Cumulative development within the watershed could contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to water quality. As previously discussed in Section 7.5.1. of this Findings of Fact, the Proposed Project grading and construction could result in erosion-induced siltation of receiving water bodies, including the Cerritos Channel, Los Angeles River, and downstream Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor. In addition, during construction, petroleum hydrocarbons in site runoff could result from incidental spills during construction equipment/vehicle fueling or maintenance. During Proposed Project operations, nonpoint source runoff of pollutants, such as oil, grease, and metals, in parking and vehicle maintenance areas; incidental spills of hazardous materials from industrial facilities; pesticides, herbicides, nitrogen, and phosphorous in landscape areas; and miscellaneous pathogens (bacteria), trash, and debris could occur in the Plan Area. All on- and off-site impacts related to runoff during construction and operation of future individual projects under the GCSP would be mitigated through compliance with regulatory requirements.

The geographic extent for the cumulative impacts related to storm drainage is the Los Cerritos Channel/Alamitos Bay Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed. Cumulative development within the watersheds could potentially increase the amount of impervious surfaces that could cause or contribute to storm drain and creek bed capacity exceedance, alter existing creek bed profiles (i.e., create erosive downcutting and bank failure), and/or require construction of new or expanded flood control infrastructure. New developments, such as the Proposed Project, within the watersheds would be subject to the environmental review process and compliance with local stormwater regulations, such as the Construction General Permit, the Section 404 permit process of the Clean Water Act, local municipal code requirements, and local Water Quality Management Plan requirements.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant hydrology- and water-quality-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** The Proposed Project would require implementation of MM-HYD-1a through MM-HYD1c, which mandate completion of a SWPPP and associated BMPs during construction to reduce potential erosion-induced siltation of off-site water bodies. The Proposed Project would also require implementation of MM-HYD-2a and MM-HYD-2b, which mandate development of a SUSMP during project design to reduce impervious surfaces and increase on-site filtration of contaminants in stormwater runoff. The SUSMP would address long-term effects on water quality within the Los Cerritos Channel/Alamitos Bay Watershed and the Los Angeles River Watershed, and would ensure that BMPs and LID designs minimize potential water quality concerns to the maximum extent practicable. In addition, the Proposed Project would require implementation of MM-HYD-3a and MM-HYD-3b, which mandate that a Hydrology/Drainage Report be developed during the design of individual future projects proposed under the GCSP. The Hydrology/Drainage Report would demonstrate that stormwater runoff

flow volumes and flow rates associated with specific projects would be less than or equal to existing conditions to prevent on- and off-site flooding. Therefore, the Proposed Project's contribution to water quality and storm drainage impacts would not be cumulative considerable.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1c** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-2b** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3a** (See Section 7.5.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3b** (See Section 7.5.3)

## 7.6 Noise

### 7.6.1 Ambient Noise Levels

- A. **Potential Impact.** On-site noise-generating activities and sources associated with the Proposed Project would include successive (and sometimes concurrent) short-term construction projects, as well as long-term operations (due to introduction of new stationary noise-producing sources, such as HVAC systems, and changes to transportation). Therefore, the Proposed Project could substantially increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** The suite of controls required as part of MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2 could result in a reduction of maximum construction noise levels in the range of 10 to 15 dB, especially if a temporary sound barrier is installed and obscures line-of-sight between the construction activity noise source(s) and the sensitive receptor of concern. Therefore, temporary construction-related noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated under CEQA.

In addition, MM-NOI-3 would require involvement of an acoustical specialist with the responsibility to ensure that the equipment specifications and plans for HVAC and other outdoor mechanical equipment incorporate measures that are features of the project design, such as the specification of quieter equipment or provision of acoustical enclosures or other sound abatement. As a result, operational impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1**

Construction activities associated with the Proposed Project shall take place only during the permitted times and days per the City of Long Beach, City of Lakewood, and City of Signal Hill noise ordinances, respectively, for the NSLU under consideration.

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2**

The City of Long Beach shall enforce adherence to the following measures for all future construction projects implemented under the Proposed Project, as a pre-requisite to approving necessary permits to proceed:

- a. The project contractor shall, to the extent feasible, submit a construction noise management plan (CNMP) prepared or reviewed by a qualified acoustician (retained at the expense of the project applicant or construction contractor) that features the following:
  - i. A detailed construction schedule, at daily (or weekly, if activities during each day of the week are typical) resolution and correlating to areas or zones of on-site project construction activity(ies) and the anticipated equipment types and quantities involved. Information will include expected hours of actual operation per day for each type of equipment per phase; and, indication of anticipated concurrent construction activities onsite.
  - ii. Suggested locations of a set of noise level monitors, attended by a qualified acoustician or another party under its supervision or direction, at which sample outdoor ambient noise levels will be measured and collected over a sufficient sample period and subsequently analyzed (i.e., compared with applicable time-dependent dBA thresholds) to ascertain compliance with the hourly FTA guidance-based limit of 90 dBA  $L_{eq}$ . Sampling shall be performed, at a minimum, on the first (or otherwise considered typical construction operations) day of each distinct construction phase.
  - iii. If sample collected noise level data indicates that the hourly noise threshold has or will be exceeded, construction work shall be suspended (for the activity or phase of concern) and the project applicant/owner or construction contractor shall implement one or more of the following measures as detailed or specified in the CNMP:
    - 1) Administrative controls (e.g., reduce operating time of equipment and/or prohibit usage of equipment type[s] within certain distances).
    - 2) Engineering controls (upgrade noise controls, such as install better engine exhaust mufflers).
    - 3) Install noise abatement on the site boundary fencing (or within, as practical and appropriate) in the form of sound blankets or comparable temporary barriers to occlude construction noise emission between the site (or specific equipment operation as the situation may define) and the noise-sensitive receptor(s) of concern.

The implemented measure(s) will be reviewed or otherwise inspected and approved by the qualified acoustician (or another party under its supervision or direction) prior to resumption of the construction activity or process that caused the measured noise concern or need for noise mitigation. Noise levels shall be re-measured, after installation of said measures, to ascertain post-mitigation compliance with the noise threshold. As needed, this process shall be repeated and refined until noise level compliance is demonstrated and documented. A report of this implemented mitigation and its documented success will be provided to the City Planner (or other authorized party, as directed by the City of Long Beach).
- b. All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. Enforcement shall be accomplished by random field inspections by applicant personnel during construction activities, to the satisfaction of the respective municipality building official or noise control officer.
- c. Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, construction of a temporary noise barrier, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and

adjacent NSLU, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, in lieu of fossil-fueled equipment, shall be used where feasible.

- d. During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded (i.e., introduce light-of-sight occluding barriers, such as storage trailers) from NSLU.
- e. If equipment is being used that can cause hearing damage at adjacent noise receptor locations (distance attenuation shall be taken into account), portable noise barriers shall be installed that are demonstrated to be adequate to reduce noise levels at receptor locations below hearing damage thresholds (i.e., generally over 90 dBA, assuming this exposure for an 8-hour construction day). This may include erection of temporary berms or plywood barriers to create a break in the line-of-sight, or erection of a heavy fabric tent around the noise source.
- f. Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the municipality having jurisdiction receives a complaint, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented and a report of the action provided to the reporting party. Appropriate corrective actions could include stricter enforcement of construction schedule, re-location of stationary equipment further from adjacent noise-sensitive receptors, reduction in the number of equipment working simultaneously in proximity to the sensitive receptor, erection of temporary noise barriers, or a combination of the above.

### Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-3

Because heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) equipment and other mechanical equipment can generate noise that could affect surrounding NSLU and because the details, specifications, and locations of this equipment is not yet known, the City of Long Beach shall require that future applicants for commercial and industrial developments within the Plan Area retain an acoustical specialist to review development project construction-level plans. The acoustical specialist shall have the responsibility to ensure that the equipment specifications and plans for HVAC and other outdoor mechanical equipment incorporate measures, such as the specification of quieter equipment or provision of acoustical enclosures, that will avoid exceeding relevant noise standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses (e.g., residential). Prior to the commencement of construction for future commercial and industrial developments, the acoustical specialist shall certify in writing to the City of Long Beach that the equipment specifications and plans incorporate measures that will achieve the relevant noise limits.

## 7.6.2 Groundborne Vibration or Noise

- A. **Potential Impact.** Construction activities that might expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise could cause a potentially significant impact.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** With respect to human annoyance, impacts related to groundborne vibration from construction activities would be less than significant with MM-NOI-2 incorporated. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated under CEQA. In addition, impacts related to groundborne vibration from operation of stationary sources (i.e., electro-mechanical equipment) installed as a result of



site-specific development due to Proposed Project implementation would be less than significant and, thus, would not require mitigation.

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2** (See Section 7.6.1)

### 7.6.3 Airport Land Use Plan

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project does anticipate development of a Business Park (BP) district bounded by the Long Beach Airport to the north, south, and east. The portion of the Business Park (BP) expected to be located within the 65 A-weighted decibel (dBA) CNEL contour is currently identified by the Proposed Project land use and mobility plan as being within the Community Commercial (CC) district planned north of the intersection between Hudson Avenue and Cover Street, and as such, would create an opportunity for workers to be exposed to airport noise levels exceeding 65 dBA CNEL. At this location, anticipated noise impacts would be significant for exterior usage areas that might include restaurant patios, hotel balconies, outdoor recreation areas, and outdoor retail areas.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** MM-NOI-4 and MM-NOI-5 would implement noise reduction features that would ensure the potential airport activity noise contribution is below a level of significance. As such, this noise impact would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4**

Because the details, specifications, and locations of commercial development potentially involving outdoor use areas within the Proposed Project Community Commercial (CC) district is not yet known, the City of Long Beach shall require that future applicants for commercial and industrial developments within these areas of the Proposed Project to retain an acoustical specialist to review development project construction-level plans. The acoustical specialist shall have the responsibility to ensure that the design, location, and orientation (e.g., facing with respect to Long Beach Airport operations) of outdoor use areas will not expose facility occupant and visitors to Long Beach Airport operations noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL. Prior to the approval of discretionary entitlements for future commercial and industrial developments, the acoustical specialist shall certify in writing to the City of Long Beach that the specifications and plans incorporate measures that will achieve this exterior noise limit for these outdoor use areas.

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5**

Because the details, specifications, and locations of commercial development potentially involving nonresidential indoor occupied spaces within the Proposed Project Community Commercial (CC) district is not yet known, the City of Long Beach shall require that future applicants for commercial and industrial developments within these areas of the Proposed Project retain an acoustical specialist to review development project construction-level plans. The acoustical specialist shall have the responsibility to ensure that the design and materials of sound insulating assemblies (i.e., the composite of walls, doors, fenestration, etc.) will be sufficient to yield interior background sound levels attributed to exterior-to-interior noise intrusion to no more than 50 dBA hourly  $L_{eq}$ . Prior to the approval of discretionary entitlements for future commercial and industrial developments, the acoustical specialist shall certify in writing to the City

of Long Beach that the specifications and plans incorporate measures that will achieve this interior background noise limit for these occupied indoor use areas.

## 7.6.4 Cumulative Noise Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project and related development projects within the Plan Area would all be subject to applicable noise standards. As described in Sections 7.6.1 through 7.6.3 of this Findings of Fact, the Proposed Project would result in noise increases during construction and operations. Therefore, the Proposed Project could substantially increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity. Additionally, construction activities could expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise and might cause a potentially significant impact.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** All future development under the Proposed Project would be required to comply with limits on allowable construction hours per relevant portions of Long Beach, Lakewood, and Signal Hill noise ordinances. The suite of controls required as part of MM-NOI-1 and MM-NOI-2 could result in a reduction of maximum construction noise levels in the range of 10 to 15 dB, especially if a temporary sound barrier is installed and obscures line-of-sight between the construction activity noise source(s) and the sensitive receptor of concern. Therefore, temporary construction-related noise impacts would not be cumulatively considerable. In addition, MM-NOI-3 would require involvement of an acoustical specialist with the responsibility to ensure that the equipment specifications and plans for HVAC and other outdoor mechanical equipment incorporate measures that are features of the project design, such as the specification of quieter equipment or provision of acoustical enclosures or other sound abatement. As a result, operational impacts would not be cumulative considerable. Further, MM-NOI-4 and MM-NOI-5 would implement noise reduction features that would ensure the potential airport activity noise contribution is below a level of significance and not cumulatively considerable. As such, cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-1** (See Section 7.6.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-2** (See Section 7.6.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-3** (See Section 7.6.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-4** (See Section 7.6.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-NOI-5** (See Section 7.6.3)

## 7.7 Tribal Cultural Resources

### 7.7.1 Public Resource Code Section 5024.1

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Plan Area is within an urbanized area and has been previously graded and paved. Because the Plan Area has been developed previously, any surficial archaeological resources, human remains, or tribal cultural resources (TCRs) that may have been present at one time have likely been

disturbed, and the likelihood of encountering intact resources is low. However, during tribal consultation, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation noted that the Plan Area is in an area that is traditionally or culturally affiliated. Although there is no evidence that TCRs exist on the surface of the Plan Area, it is possible that previously unknown TCRs could exist in undisturbed soils on the site. During consultation, the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation provided mitigation measures to avoid or limit potential impacts of Proposed Project construction on TCRs.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant tribal cultural-resource-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9 include provisions for tribal monitors during ground-disturbing activities and procedures in the event of unanticipated discovery. With implementation of MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9, impacts would be less than significant.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-1**

Prior to the issuance of any Grading Permit a project, the City of Long Beach Development Services Department shall ensure that the construction contractor provide access for Native American monitoring during ground-disturbing activities. This provision shall be included on project plans and specifications. The site shall be made accessible to any Native American tribe requesting to be present, provided adequate notice is given to the construction contractor and that a construction safety hazard does not occur.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-2**

Should a potential TCR be encountered and no monitors are present, construction activities near the encounter shall be temporarily halted within 50 feet of the discovery and the City notified. The City will notify Native American tribes that have been identified by the Native American Heritage Commission to be traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the Proposed Project. If the potential resource is archaeological in nature, appropriate management requirements shall be implemented as outlined in mitigation measure MM-CUL-1. If the City determines that the potential resource is a TCR (as defined by PRC, Section 21074), tribes consulting under AB 52 and SB 18 would be provided a reasonable period of time, typically 5 days from the date a new discovery is made, to conduct a site visit and make recommendations regarding future ground disturbance activities, as well as the treatment and disposition of any discovered TCRs. A qualified archaeologist shall implement a plan for the treatment and disposition of any discovered TCRs based on the nature of the resource and shall consider the recommendations of the tribe(s). Implementation of proposed recommendations will be made based on the determination of the City that the approach is reasonable and feasible. All activities shall be conducted in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-3: Native American Monitor/Consultant**

The Project Applicant shall be required to retain and compensate for the services of a Tribal monitor/consultant who is both approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation Tribal Government and is listed under the NAHC's Tribal Contact list for the area of the project location. This list is provided by the NAHC. The monitor/consultant will only be present on-site 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 Plan Area. 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 on-site monitoring shall end when the Plan Area 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.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-4**

Unanticipated Discovery of Tribal Cultural and Archaeological Resources. Upon discovery of any archaeological resources, cease construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the find until the find can be assessed. All archaeological resources unearthed by project construction activities shall be evaluated by the qualified archaeologist and tribal monitor/consultant approved by the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians-Kizh Nation. If the resources are Native American in origin, 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 reburial or preservation for educational purposes. Work may continue on other parts of the project while evaluation and, if necessary, 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 and 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. Any historic archaeological material that is not Native American in origin shall be curated at a public, nonprofit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County or the Fowler Museum, if such an institution agrees to accept the material. If no institution accepts the archaeological material, they shall be offered to a local school or historical society in the area for educational purposes.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-5: Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains and Associated Funerary Objects**

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 Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and PRC 5097.98 shall be followed.

#### **Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-6: Resource Assessment & Continuation of Work Protocol**

Upon discovery, the tribal and/or archaeological monitor/consultant/consultant will immediately divert work at minimum of 150 feet and place an exclusion zone around the burial. 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 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).

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-7: Kizh-Gabrieleno Procedures for Burials and Funerary Remains**

If the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation is designated MLD, the following treatment measures shall be 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 burial of funerary objects with the deceased, and the ceremonial burning of human remains. These remains 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.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-8: Treatment Measures**

Prior to the continuation of ground disturbing activities, the land owner 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 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 Plan Area but at a location agreed upon between the Tribe and the landowner at a site to be protected in perpetuity. There shall be no publicity regarding any cultural materials recovered

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-9: Professional Standards**

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.

## 7.3.2 Cumulative Tribal Cultural Resources Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project, together with other related projects identified within the vicinity of the Plan Area, could substantially diminish the number of TCRs within the same or similar context. However, there are no known TCRs within the Plan Area, and as such, the Plan Area is not part of an existing or known grouping of TCRs that would be impacted as part of the cumulative impacts of implementing the Proposed Project with other area related projects. During tribal consultation, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation noted that the Plan Area is in an area that is traditionally or culturally affiliated. Although there is no evidence that TCRs exist on the surface of the Plan Area, it is possible that previously unknown TCRs could exist in undisturbed soils on the site. During consultation, the Gabrieleño Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation provided mitigation measures to avoid or limit potential impacts of Proposed Project construction on TCRs.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant tribal-cultural-resources-related impacts associated with human remains of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.** With implementation of MM-TCR-1 through MM-TCR-9, which identify protocols for handling the inadvertent discovery of TCRs, the Proposed Project would not cumulatively contribute to a significant impact. Impacts related to cumulative TCR impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-1** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-2** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-3** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-4** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-5** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-6** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-7** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-8** (See Section 7.7.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-TCR-9** (See Section 7.7.1)

## 7.8 Utilities and Service Systems

### 7.8.1 Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Facilities

- A. **Potential Impact.** The Proposed Project does not include any physical improvements, but would facilitate future development that would have the potential to create a need for new or expanded water facilities, wastewater infrastructure, and stormwater drainage facilities within the City. Upgrades would be required

associated with new construction with respect to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities. Upgrades would likely be completed by either trenchless technology or completion of open trenching to the depth of the underground utilities. Construction of the laterals would be temporary and would be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements. Environmental impacts would generally be related to potential short-term erosion-related impacts.

- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant utility- and service-systems-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.

C. **Facts in Support of Finding.**

**Water Facilities**

Potential impacts to existing water distribution systems would be potentially significant if the expansion of existing infrastructure would result in additional significant impacts. MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the Long Beach Water Department to serve the site, the project applicant would fund such improvements. No further mitigation is required. As such, impacts to water facilities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Wastewater Infrastructure**

Potential impacts to existing wastewater distribution systems would be potentially significant if the expansion of existing infrastructure would result in additional significant impacts. MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts or Long Beach Water Department to serve the site, the project applicant would fund such improvements. No further mitigation is required. As such, impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Storm Water Drainage**

Potential impacts to existing storm water drainage facilities would be potentially significant if the expansion of existing infrastructure would result in additional significant impacts. MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District and Long Beach Public Works Department to serve the site, the project applicant would fund such improvements. MM-HYD-1a would ensure that future projects are in compliance with regulatory requirements, which includes site BMPs to reduce runoff. In addition, MM-HYD-3a requires the preparation of a hydrology/drainage report to demonstrate that storm water runoff flow volume and flow rate, associated with specific projects, would be less than or equal to existing conditions to prevent on- and off-site flooding. Potential erosion-related water quality impacts would be potentially significant but mitigable with implementation of mitigation measures. As such, impacts to stormwater drainage would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications**

Potential impacts to existing electric, natural gas, and telecommunication utilities would be potentially significant if the expansion of existing infrastructure would result in additional significant impacts. MM-

UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the respective utility provider to serve the site, the project applicant would fund such improvements. As such, impacts to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-3a** (See Section 7.5.3)

**Mitigation Measure MM-UTIL-1**

Prior to the issuance of project entitlements or grading permits, whichever comes first, for individual development or redevelopment projects under the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP), a utilities report shall be prepared by the Project Applicant that will identify the ability for existing utility infrastructure to serve the project. As part of this report, the project applicant shall provide evidence to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department that that the development project has been reviewed by the applicable utility provider and that a “Will Serve” letter has been issued. The “Will Serve” letter process is necessary in order to determine whether or not sufficient capacity exists to serve each development project and if the existing utility facilities will be affected by the development project. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following analyses:

**Water Infrastructure**

1. The report shall analyze the existing water main conditions and estimates the project-specific water demand for future development, considering the water infrastructure needs of the Long Beach Water Department service area. Any development or redevelopment project that would impact existing water facilities within the Plan Area, for which improvements and/or relocation are required or have been identified, shall fund the improvements those as prescribed by City of Long Beach Water Department.

**Stormwater/Storm Drain Infrastructure**

2. A Hydrology/Hydraulics report shall be prepared that estimates the site-specific discharge rates for a future development. The hydrology and hydraulic study shall analyze the on-site and immediate off-site storm drain systems to determine capacity and integrity of the existing systems. The Project Applicant shall request the “allowable discharge rate” – which limits peak flow discharges as compared to existing conditions based on regional flood control constraints – from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works and shall comply with such discharge rate. This report can be completed in conjunction with the Hydrology/Drainage Report required under mitigation measure MM-HYD-3a. Any development or redevelopment project that would impact segments of the existing storm drain facilities within the Plan Area, for which improvements are required, shall fund upsizing of those storm drain segments as prescribed by City of Long Beach Public Works Department and Los Angeles County Flood Control District.

**Wastewater/Sewer Infrastructure**

3. The report shall analyze the existing sewer main conditions and estimates the project-specific wastewater generation for future development. Any development or redevelopment project that would impact existing sewer facilities within the Plan Area, for which improvements and/or relocation are



required or have been identified, shall fund those improvements as prescribed by Los Angeles County Sanitation District and Long Beach Water Department. Due to the combined/cumulative nature of sewage conveyance facilities, the utilities report shall include projections of future capacity requirements within the same catchment area. The report shall pay special attention to lift station capacity, and capacity of the force main and trunk sewer from the lift to the Los Angeles County Sanitation District trunk sewer connection. In addition, the report should consider potential future costs to future developers and how those costs can be fairly and legally shared among all developments within the GCSP area.

#### **Electrical Infrastructure**

4. The report shall analyze the existing electrical capacity and estimate the project-specific electrical demand for future development. Any development or redevelopment project that would impact existing electrical loads or require new electrical substations or facilities within the Plan Area, for which improvements and/or relocation are required or have been identified, shall fund the improvements those as prescribed by Southern California Edison.

#### **Natural Gas**

5. The report shall analyze the existing gas pipeline capacity and estimate the project-specific natural gas demand for future development. Any development or redevelopment project that would impact existing natural gas facilities or require new infrastructure within the Plan Area, for which improvements and/or relocation are required or have been identified, shall fund the improvements those as prescribed Long Beach Energy Resources Department.

### 7.8.2 Cumulative Utilities and Service Systems Impacts

- A. **Potential Impact.** As discussed in Section 7.8.1 of this Findings of Fact, the Proposed Project does not include any physical improvements, but would facilitate future development that would have the potential to create a need for new or expanded water facilities, wastewater infrastructure, and stormwater drainage facilities within the City. Upgrades would be required associated with new construction with respect to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunication facilities. Upgrades would likely be completed by either trenchless technology or completion of open trenching to the depth of the underground utilities. The need for new or expanded utilities could create a cumulatively considerable impact on existing utility providers.
- B. **Finding.** Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1) and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Proposed Project that would mitigate or avoid potentially significant utility- and service-systems-related impacts of the Proposed Project identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- C. **Facts in Support of Finding.**

#### **Water Facilities**

MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure, considering the water infrastructure needs of the Long Beach Water Department service area. If required improvements are identified by the Long Beach Water Department to serve the site, the

project applicant would fund such improvements. As such, cumulative impacts to water facilities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Wastewater Infrastructure**

Potential impacts to existing wastewater distribution systems would be potentially significant if the expansion of existing infrastructure would result in additional significant impacts. MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. Due to the combined/cumulative nature of sewage conveyance facilities, the utilities report shall include projections of future capacity requirements within the same catchment area. As such, cumulative impacts to wastewater treatment facilities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Stormwater Drainage**

MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by the existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the Los Angeles County Flood Control District and Long Beach Public Works Department to serve the site, the project applicant shall fund such improvements. These improvements would be completed on a project level and carried out consistent with relevant planning documents for the subject utility. Potential cumulative construction-related stormwater quality impacts would be potentially significant but mitigable with implementation of MM-HYD-1a, in combination with similar mitigation measures implemented at other cumulative project sites. Cumulative impacts to water would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Electric Power, Natural Gas, and Telecommunications**

MM-UTIL-1 would require project-specific analyses to determine if future projects can be served by existing infrastructure. If required improvements are identified by the respective utility provider to serve the site, the project applicant would fund such improvements. As such, cumulative impacts to electric power, natural gas, and telecommunications would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

**Solid Waste**

There is currently sufficient permitted capacity within the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts system serving Los Angeles County to provide adequate future capacity for Los Angeles County’s solid waste needs. The City currently complies with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not have a significant cumulative impact on waste disposal capacity at Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts facilities. As such, cumulative impacts to solid waste would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure MM-UTIL-1** (See Section 7.8.1)

**Mitigation Measure MM-HYD-1a** (See Section 7.5.1)

# 8 Effects Found Not to Be Significant

---

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 require that an EIR contain a brief statement disclosing the reasons why various possible significant effects of a project were found not to be significant, and therefore would not be discussed in detail in the EIR. Chapter 5, Other CEQA Considerations, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS identified the following issue areas that would not be impacted by the Proposed Project, and thus, Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS does not contain the following issue areas:

- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Biological Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Recreation
- Wildfire<sup>3</sup>

In addition, the IS/NOP determined that although some issue areas would be carried forward to the Draft PEIR/PEIS for further analysis, specific thresholds were determined to have either a less than significant impact or no impact. Based on the analysis contained in the IS/NOP and the Draft PEIR/PEIS, the following issue areas have been determined to fall within the “less than significant impact” or “no impact” category:

- Aesthetics (Scenic Vistas; Scenic Resources; Visual Character)
- Air Quality (Criteria Pollutants, specifically Carbon Monoxide Hotspots)
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials (Hazardous Emissions within One-Quarter Mile of a School)
- Hydrology and Water Quality (Inundation; Conflict with Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan)
- Land Use and Planning (Physically Divide an Established Community; Conflict with Applicable Plan)
- Population and Housing (Induce Substantial Population Growth; Displace Substantial Numbers of Existing Housing or People)
- Public Services (Fire; Police; Schools; Park; Other Public Services)
- Transportation (Vehicle Miles Traveled)
- Tribal Cultural Resources (Local and/or Listed on California Register of Historical Resources)
- Utilities and Services Systems (Water Supplies; Wastewater Treatment Capacity; Solid Waste Capacity)
- Environmental Justice (Disproportionate Impact)
- Energy (Energy Consumption; Renewable Energy Plan)

---

<sup>3</sup> On December 28, 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency finalized the updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project was issued September 12, 2018, and the environmental analysis was initiated at the same time. As such, the analysis included within the Draft PEIR/PEIS considered the State CEQA Guidelines that were in effective at the time the NOP was issued and environmental analysis began. The new State CEQA Guidelines (adopted December 28, 2018) include a discussion in Appendix G on Wildfire, but because of the timing of the NOP, Wildfire is not included within the analysis provided throughout the Draft PEIR/PEIS. However, the Draft PEIR/PEIS provides a brief discussion that describes the Proposed Project’s environmental impact as it relates to wildfire, which was found to be less than significant

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# 9 Findings Regarding Feasible Alternatives

---

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), EIRs must “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of this project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

CEQA establishes no categorical legal imperative as to the scope of alternatives to be analyzed in an EIR. To be legally sufficient, the consideration of project alternatives in an EIR must permit informed agency decision-making and informed public participation. The analysis of alternatives is evaluated against a rule of reason. Alternatives are suitable for study in an EIR if they meet all of the following thresholds: (1) substantially reduce or avoid the project’s significant environmental impacts; (2) attain most of the basic project objectives; (3) are potentially feasible; and (4) are reasonable and realistic. Candidate alternatives that do not satisfy these requirements may be excluded from further analysis. An EIR need not consider alternatives that would change the fundamental nature of a project or that cannot achieve the fundamental goals and purposes of a project.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project are evaluated in Chapter 4, Alternatives, of the Draft PEIR/PEIS in terms of their ability to meet the basic objectives of the Proposed Project and eliminate or further reduce its significant environmental effects. Based on these parameters, the following alternatives were considered and analyzed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS:

- Alternative 1: No Project Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

## 9.1 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

State CEQA Guidelines require analysis of the No Project Alternative. According to Section 15126.6(e), “the specific alternative of ‘no project’ shall also be evaluated, along with its impacts. The ‘no project’ analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the NOP is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project was not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.”

Alternative 1, No Project Alternative, assumes that the environmental conditions of the Plan Area are those that occur at the time that the NOP was released (September 2018). As such, under Alternative 1, the existing uses within the Plan Area would continue to function as they currently do into the foreseeable future. As stated in Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency is required to examine conditions that are reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the Proposed Project were not approved. The “no project” alternative assumes continuation of the existing plan, policy, or operation into the future. Therefore, redevelopment within the Plan Area would continue to occur under the guidance of the existing 2019 General Plan and zoning regulations.

The Plan Area currently consists of the following zoning areas: Douglas Aircraft Planned Development District (PD-19), General Industrial (IG), Light Industrial (IL), Medium Industrial (IM), Regional Highway Commercial (CHW), Commercial Storage (CS), Community Commercial Automobile-Oriented (CCA), Single-Family Residential, standard

lot (R-1-N), Park (P), Institutional (I), and Atlantic Aviation Center Planned Development District (PD-13). The majority of the Plan Area is built out; however, redevelopment that is consistent with the applicable designation could result in an increase in intensity.

- A. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- B. **Facts in Support of Findings.** Alternative 1, the No Project Alternative, is rejected as infeasible because it would not meet the primary objectives of the Proposed Project, which include the following:
  - o Create a 21st Century Employment District that Fosters Innovation
  - o Stimulate Economic Development and Job Growth
  - o Cultivate the Existing Human Capital of Long Beach
  - o Establish Cherry Avenue as a Multi-Modal Unifying Corridor
  - o Increase Mobility Choices Throughout the Globemaster Corridor District

For the reasons stated above, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Proposed Project, and rejects this alternative.

## 9.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2, Reduced Project Alternative, would allow for the same proposed land use designations within the GCSP. However, Alternative 2 represents a reduced project alternative by reducing the development potential from 8,906,403 square feet to 5,245,331 square feet. A comparison of the overall buildout summaries of Alternative 2 and the Proposed Project is provided in Table 2.

**Table 2. Development Potential Comparison**

Land Uses	Development Potential (square feet)	
	Alternative 2	Proposed Project
General Office	1,502,134	1,872,602
Medical Office	53,016	146,095
Research and Development	212,065	234,651
Manufacturing	2,397,684	1,131,139
Light Industrial/Warehousing	600,669	4,455,892
Retail	371,763	795,457
Restaurant	17,000	107,623
Hotel	91,000	162,944
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,245,331</b>	<b>8,906,403</b>

- A. **Finding.** Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Draft PEIR/PEIS.
- B. **Facts in Support of Findings.** The purpose of studying alternatives to the Proposed Project is to identify alternatives that would substantially reduce or avoid the significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project. Implementation of Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to the Proposed Project.

Under Alternative 2, the density and intensity of development would be reduced. Given that less redevelopment would occur, Alternative 2 would result in reduced impacts associated with hydrology and water quality, noise, transportation, and utilities and service systems. Nonetheless, Alternative 2 would result in the construction of new land uses and implement similar design guidelines, and, thus, impacts would be similar in regards to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, population and housing, public services, tribal cultural resources, and environmental justice.

Moreover, although Alternative 2 would meet some of the identified project objectives, it would fail to meet those objectives as fully as the Proposed Project. Alternative 2, Reduced Project Alternative, would not meet or only partially meet the following objective:

- Stimulate Economic Development and Job Growth

For the reasons stated above, the City finds that this alternative is infeasible and less desirable than the Proposed Project, and rejects this alternative.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



# 10 Statement of Overriding Considerations

---

## 10.1 Statement of Overriding Considerations

As discussed in Section 6 of these Findings of Fact, the Final PEIR/PEIS concludes that the Proposed Project, even with incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures and consideration of alternatives, would have a significant impact on air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, and transportation.

Section 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the lead agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable.”

When the lead agency approves a project that would result in significant effects that are identified in the EIR, but are not avoided or substantially lessened by the adoption of all feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, the lead agency must state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. The Statement of Overriding Considerations must be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations regarding the unavoidable significant impacts on air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, and transportation outlined in the Final PEIR/PEIS for the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan, and the anticipated economic, legal, social, and technological and other benefits associated with the Proposed Project.

In approving the Proposed Project, the City has weighed the benefits of the Proposed Project against the significant adverse impact identified in the Final PEIR/PEIS that has not been avoided or lessened through mitigation to a level of less than significant. The City hereby determines that benefits of the Proposed Project outweigh the unmitigated adverse impacts, and that the Proposed Project should be approved. The City finds that to the extent that the identified significant or potentially significant adverse impacts have not been avoided or substantially lessened, there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations that support approval of the Proposed Project.

### 10.1.1 Adoption of Overriding Considerations

The City adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations and finds that (a) the Proposed Project has substantially lessened all significant impacts of the Proposed Project where feasible, and (b) the remaining unavoidable impacts of the Proposed Project are acceptable in light of the economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations set forth herein, as the benefits of the Proposed Project outweigh the significant adverse impacts of the Proposed Project. The City finds that each of the overriding considerations set forth below constitutes a separate and independent ground for finding that the benefit of the Proposed Project outweighs the significant adverse environmental impacts. These matters are supported by substantial evidence in the record that includes, but is not limited to, the Final PEIR/PEIS, staff reports and analysis, and other documents referenced in this Statement of Overriding Considerations and its adopting resolution.

## 10.1.2 Benefits of the Proposed Project

The City finds that the Proposed Project's unavoidable potentially significant environmental impacts are outweighed by the following benefits:

- **Implements Guiding Principles and Objectives Established for the Proposed Project:** The GCSP would implement the guiding principles and objectives of the Proposed Project, including the following:
  - Create a 21st Century Employment District that Fosters Innovation
  - Stimulative Economic Development and Job Growth
  - Cultivate the Existing Human Capital of Long Beach
  - Establish Cherry Avenue as a Multi-Modal Unifying Corridor
  - Increase Mobility Choices Throughout the Globemaster Corridor District
- **Aligns with City General Plan and Policies.** The Proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan and policies in that it provides industrial, commercial, park, and office development consistent with the site's land use regulations; provides needed infrastructure improvements, including bike lanes, roadways, and sidewalks; and provides park improvements. Specifically, the GCSP is consistent with several of the Citywide Implementation Strategies identified in the General Plan Land Use Element. The GCSP proposes to reinvent the Cherry Avenue Corridor by allowing the designation of new development districts and design guidelines that promote pedestrian, bicyclists, and transit use safety (LU-M-4). The GCSP is designed to support economic development, prosperity, preservation of existing businesses, and the attraction of new businesses. Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the GCSP vision is to continue to attract and optimize new work opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise, and competitive economies of Long Beach Airport, the City of Long Beach, and the Southern California region. Furthermore, the addition of ancillary retail and commercial jobs (such as food service and hair stylists) will provide a range of jobs and small business opportunities (LU-M-13). Additionally, the GCSP was prepared to implement the Economic Development Blueprint of the City to increase the number of businesses, employment, sales tax revenue, and business services for residents and neighborhoods (LU-M-17). Further, the GCSP would amend zoning regulations to adopt the Proposed Project, which would allow for flexible standards through the creation of land use districts, to target infill development. The development standards for each of the land use districts addresses compatibility, parking, public infrastructure and right-of-way improvements, transit access, and bicycle and multi-modal improvements (LU-M-25).
- **Generates Property Tax.** The approval of the GCSP would result in an increased generation of property tax revenue for the City of Long Beach throughout the Plan Area. In terms of General Fund revenues to help offset the service costs, the Proposed Project would generate property tax for the City and some of the land uses, particularly retail, would generate sales tax. Based on a fiscal impact study prepared in 2018 that analyzed the fiscal impacts stemming from the net growth in the development of the GCSP, an annual estimated \$13 million in net revenue would result for the City of Long Beach with implementation of the Proposed Project.<sup>4</sup> The GCSP would increase economic activity in the Plan Area, consistent with the City of Long Beach's Economic Development Blueprint.

---

<sup>4</sup> Svensson, D. "Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan Fiscal Analysis." Memo from ADE to Dudek. October 31, 2018.

- **Generates Employment.** The C-17 Boeing facility site is currently vacant and is not a source of employment. At its peak, the C-17 Site employed up to 5,000 people; however, since 2010, Boeing has steadily downsized the C-17 workforce in anticipation of the closure. Job creation in the GCSP area can be estimated based on the GCSP development potential. The approximately 8.9 million square feet of development would result in an estimated 11,170 new jobs. Accounting for the loss of some existing jobs, the Plan Area would account for about one-third of total citywide net job growth projected out to 2040. Additionally, employment is important to addressing Citywide VMT and GHG emissions. The City is expected to have a jobs-to-housing ratio of 1.04 by 2040, which is lower than Los Angeles County and the Southern California Association of Governments region by 0.28 and 0.27, respectively.<sup>5</sup> This means that the City is considered to be “jobs poor,” indicating that many of the residents must commute to places of employment outside of the City. Implementation of the GCSP would provide the framework for development of uses with employment density to balance the jobs-to-housing ratio. By increasing the number of jobs in proximity to a number of residents brings goods, services, and employment closer to existing residents, thereby reducing VMT and GHG emissions.
- **Improves Infrastructure.** Improvements to existing streets and the design of new streets is an important aspect of the GCSP. New streets and pedestrian connections are proposed to maximize connectivity in support of state law (SB 743). The GCSP proposes new bicycle facilities for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and all new streets in the Plan Area to help improve connectivity with existing bicycle infrastructure. Additionally, the GSCP proposes pedestrian improvements for Cherry Avenue, Wardlow Road, and all new streets in the Plan Area to ensure a continuous network of sidewalks.

## 10.2 Conclusion

The City has considered the information contained in the record of administrative proceedings on the Proposed Project and has weighed the above-outlined benefits of the Proposed Project against the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts identified in the Final PEIR/PEIS. The City hereby determines that, based on the substantial evidence in the record before it, these benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental impacts of the Proposed Project, and further determines that these environmental impacts are acceptable. Therefore, the City approves the Proposed Project.

---

<sup>5</sup> Svensson, D. 2020. “Revised Job Projections for Globemaster Specific Plan.” Memorandum from D. Svensson (ADE) to R. Thomas and S. Wages (Dudek). April 20, 2020.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK