



VII. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

VII. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. Following is a summary of the impacts associated with the proposed project that were concluded to be significant and unavoidable. These impacts are also described in detail in Chapter IV, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, of this EIR.

Air Quality/Global Climate Change: Short-term construction activities associated with the implementation of the proposed project would result in temporary significant unavoidable impacts relative to local and regional construction pollutant emissions, even with the implementation of applicable mitigation measures. For instance, project construction would exceed the regional thresholds for NO_x. Further, even with incorporation of mitigation measures, the project would remain in exceedance of the SCAQMD localized construction threshold for PM₁₀. Construction of the project would result in a less than significant impact with respect to all other criteria pollutants. However, given the exceedance of air pollutant emissions thresholds, a significant unavoidable impact regarding AQMP consistency would also occur.

With respect to operational impacts, the project would not result in a significant and unavoidable impact with respect to localized emissions thresholds. Regarding regional emissions thresholds, even with mitigation, regional operational emissions would still exceed the SCAQMD daily emission thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀. Therefore, operation of the project would have a significant and unavoidable impact on long-term regional air quality, which is also considered a significant cumulative impact. Similarly, even with incorporation of applicable mitigation measures, GHG emissions and related global climate change impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Traffic and Circulation: Regarding temporary construction impacts, two of the nine key study intersections will be temporarily impacted during the site grading/excavation construction phase of the proposed project. These two locations consist of the intersections of Pacific Coast Highway (PCH)/2nd Street and Studebaker Road/2nd Street. With implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, the temporary construction traffic impact at the intersection of PCH/2nd Street is eliminated. For the intersection of Studebaker Road/2nd Street, no physical mitigation measures are feasible; any additional turn lanes will require widening and additional right-of-way. Hence the temporary construction impact at this key intersection would be considered significant and unavoidable.

Regarding operational impacts, two methodologies were employed in the analysis of traffic impacts; the Intersection Capacity Utilization (ICU) method and the Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (HCM) method. Utilizing the ICU methodology, traffic associated with the proposed project and related projects will significantly impact six (6) of the twenty-five (25) key study intersections in the Year 2015, when compared to the LOS standards and significant impact criteria specified in this report. These intersections are as follows:

- No. 6 – PCH at 7th Street
- No. 8 – Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps

- No. 14 – Bay Shore Avenue at 2nd Street
- No. 17 – PCH at 2nd Street
- No. 18 – Shopkeeper Road at 2nd Street
- No. 19 – Studebaker Road at 2nd Street

The remaining fifteen (15) key study intersections are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS with the addition of project-generated traffic in the Year 2015. Implementation of the project's TDM Plan, recommended mitigation measures, and the project-sponsored shuttle service reduces the impact of the project at the six impacted key study intersections. For the remaining two key study intersections (PCH/2nd Street and Studebaker Road/2nd Street), implementation of improvements would reduce the impact of the project at these two intersections. Nevertheless, additional capacity-enhancing improvements at these two key study intersections beyond those identified in this EIR do not appear feasible given right-of-way constraints or other physical limitations. As a result, the project's Year 2015 traffic impacts at the following intersections would remain significant and unavoidable:

- No. 17 – PCH at 2nd Street
- No. 19 – Studebaker Road at 2nd Street

Utilizing the HCM methodology, two of the thirteen (includes Project Driveway B) State-controlled study intersections are forecast to operate at an unacceptable LOS during the A.M., P.M. and/or Saturday Midday peak hours with the addition of project traffic in the Year 2015. These intersections are as follows:

- No. 17 – PCH at 2nd Street
- No. 25 – Seal Beach at PCH

The implementation of recommended improvements at the two adverse intersections result in an acceptable LOS, except for the intersection of PCH/2nd Street, which will continue to operate at unacceptable LOS E during the Saturday Midday peak hour. While implementation of improvements reduces the impact of the project, the project's Year 2015 traffic impacts at the intersection of PCH/2nd Street will remain significant and unavoidable.

It is important to note that based on the results of the ICU methodology, the intersection of Seal Beach Boulevard/PCH is not operating at an unacceptable LOS with the project in the Year 2015. The intersection only operates at an unacceptable LOS based on the HCM methodology. The remaining State-controlled key study intersections (including Project Driveway B) are forecast to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS, with the addition of project generated traffic in the Year 2015.

In conclusion, for the purposes of the analysis provided in this EIR, full implementation of the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable traffic impacts at the following two intersections:

- No. 17 – PCH at 2nd Street
- No. 19 – Studebaker Road at 2nd Street

Land Use: While the proposed project would conform with the vast majority of City plans and policies, it would not be consistent with certain statements in the Land Use Element (Urban Design Component), the Local Coastal Program (LCP) Element (an Element of the General Plan that incorporates the policies of the Coastal Act), and the Southeast Area Development Improvement Plan (SEADIP) that relate to proposed scale/heights and residential uses. In addition, the project would conflict with the Transportation Element of the General Plan since the project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact at two intersections. Accordingly, the applicant has requested a series of entitlements to permit the project. If the City of Long Beach approves the requested entitlements, then the project would thereafter be considered consistent with applicable land use plans and policies.

While the project is in conflict with certain statements in the Land Use Element Urban Design Component due to the scale of a 12-story structure, and would also conflict with the SEADIP 35-foot building height restriction, the height of the structure and the massing of development on the site would not result in related significant physical impacts associated with incompatible land use, such as shade/shadow effects, light spill-over effects, or obstruction or degradation of important public scenic views. However, the project would result in traffic and air quality impacts that relate to the intensity of development on the site and are significant and unavoidable. Therefore, because the inconsistency of the project with statements suggesting lower scale and intensity development for site also translates to physical impacts on the environment, land use impacts in this regard are considered significant. Furthermore, while mitigation measures are provided in Sections IV.B, *Air Quality/Global Climate Change*, and IV.L, *Traffic and Circulation*, of this EIR, impacts on traffic and air quality cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant. Therefore, the inconsistency with the SEADIP and associated physical impacts on the environment associated with the project would result in a significant unavoidable land use impact.

With regard to cumulative analyses contained in Chapter IV, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, the project will contribute to significant cumulative impacts associated with regional construction and operational air pollutant emissions, global climate change, and local and CMP intersection traffic impacts.

B. REASONS WHY THE PROJECT IS BEING PROPOSED, NOTWITHSTANDING SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

In addition to identification of the project's significant unavoidable impacts, Section 15126.2(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* also requires a description of the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding significant unavoidable impacts associated with the project. The reasons why this particular project has been proposed are identified in the development, design, and economic objectives included in Chapter II, *Project Description*, of this EIR. The underlying purpose of the proposed project is to create a successful mixed-use development that includes residential, hotel, retail, and restaurant uses and various public amenities oriented toward the adjacent marina, while minimizing adverse effects on the surrounding community and the environment.

The project would provide much needed housing opportunities for those who work in the community. The project site is conveniently located immediately near various employment opportunities and in relative proximity of the major employment centers in the City (e.g., downtown Long Beach). The project would create housing opportunities within walking distance of numerous jobs and transit options. In doing so, the project would be consistent with the goals of the community in minimizing traffic impacts and air quality

impacts, as well as meeting housing needs. Furthermore, the proposed mix of uses would enhance the walkability of the neighborhood and foster a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly environment.

Several alternatives to the proposed project were considered in Chapter V, *Alternatives*, of this EIR. Among those alternatives, no feasible alternative other than the No Project/No Development Alternative is identified that would reduce all of the significant unavoidable effects of the proposed project. In addition, none of the alternatives would achieve the objectives to the extent the project the project would. Significant unavoidable impacts from project operation would result from operational traffic generation, including study area intersections, regional and local construction air pollutant emissions, AQMP consistency, regional operational air pollutant emissions, and greenhouse gas emissions. Finally, since the No Project/No Build Alternative would not meet the underlying purpose of the project, it is not considered a feasible development alternative.

In addition to the environmental reasons why the project has been proposed as cited above, there are economic and urban planning reasons in support of the proposed development. Such reasons include City goals and policies supportive of the provision of higher density housing in proximity to employment centers, encouragement of alternative transportation, vehicle trip reduction through mixed-use development, energy and water conservation, provision of recreational uses, and high quality urban design in development projects. Additionally, the proposed project would include a number of beneficial features, including amenities such as the Marine Science Learning Center, Coastal Cycling Center, and CSULB Repertory Theater, as well as enhanced pedestrian facilities (including a dedicated bridge connecting the project site to the Alamitos Bay Marina waterfront), new bicycle paths connecting to regional bicycle facilities, and extensive landscaped public open space areas. The Second+PCH development would strengthen southeast Long Beach's ability to attract retail customers, restaurant patrons, and tourists by offering an integration of high-end services and amenities, and would generate additional annual sales tax revenues to the City. It would also provide for-sale multi-family housing (325 residential units in order to support the existing and proposed commercial uses on-site and in the surrounding area. The project would also provide for the redevelopment of the site currently occupied by the aging Seaport Marina Hotel, and would establish an iconic development at the City's southeastern gateway. Finally, placing commercial/retail, residential, and hotel uses in a mixed-use urban setting designed to accommodate the retail and open space needs of employment and residential uses would support objectives for a livable, walkable, and diverse district.

C. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

According to Sections 15126(c) and 15126.2(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, an EIR is required to address any significant irreversible environmental changes that would occur should the proposed project be implemented. As stated in *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.2(c) indicates:

"[u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter likely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified."

The project would necessarily consume limited, slowly renewable and non-renewable resources. This consumption would occur during the construction phase of the project and would continue throughout its operational lifetime. Project development would require a commitment of resources that would include: (1) building materials, (2) fuel and operational materials/resources, and (3) the transportation of goods and people to and from the project site. Project construction would require the consumption of resources that are not replenishable or which may renew so slowly as to be considered non-renewable. These resources would include the following construction supplies: certain types of lumber and other forest products; aggregate materials used in concrete and asphalt such as sand, gravel and stone; metals such as steel, copper, and lead; petrochemical construction materials such as plastics; and water. Fossil fuels such as gasoline and oil would also be consumed in the use of construction vehicles and equipment.

The resources that would be committed during project operation would be similar to those currently consumed within the City of Long Beach. These would include energy resources such as electricity and natural gas, petroleum-based fuels required for vehicle-trips, fossil fuels, and water. Fossil fuels would represent the primary energy source associated with both construction and ongoing operation of the project, and the existing, finite supplies of these natural resources would be incrementally reduced. Project operation would occur in accordance with Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations, which sets forth conservation practices that would limit the amount of energy consumed by the project. However, the energy requirements associated with the project would, nonetheless, represent a long-term commitment of essentially non-renewable resources.

Limited use of potentially hazardous materials typical of commercial and residential uses, including household and vehicle maintenance materials (i.e., cleaning supplies, paints, fertilizers, oil, and grease) would be used and stored on the project site. The use of these materials would be in small quantities and used, handled, stored, and disposed of in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions and applicable government regulations and standards. Compliance with these regulations and standards would serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, demolition activities would comply with regulatory requirements to ensure that asbestos and lead-based paints are not released into the environment. Compliance with such regulations would serve to protect against a significant and irreversible environmental change resulting from the accidental release of hazardous materials. Similarly, mitigation has been included to address any hazardous materials discovered construction.

In summary, project construction and operation would result in the irretrievable commitment of limited, slowly renewable, and nonrenewable resources, which would limit the availability of these particular resource quantities for future generations or for other uses during the life of the project. However, continued use of such resources would be on a relatively small scale and consistent with regional and local growth forecasts in the area. As such, although irreversible environmental changes would result from the project, such changes would not be considered significant.

D. POTENTIAL SECONDARY EFFECTS

Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires mitigation measures to be discussed in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project if the mitigation measure(s) would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed. With regard to this section of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project mitigation measures that could cause potential impacts

were evaluated. The following provides a discussion of the potential secondary effects that could occur as a result of the implementation of the project mitigation measures, listed by environmental issue area. Only those EIR Sections that contain mitigation measures are addressed.

1. Air Quality

Mitigation Measures B-1 through B-13 address construction-related air quality impacts, and specifically relate to upkeep of diesel equipment, phasing of construction activities, use of power poles in lieu of diesel generators, and control of fugitive dust sources by periodic watering, sweeping, use of diesel particulate filters on construction equipment, and covering of hauled dirt materials. Mitigation Measures B-14 and B-15 relate to scheduling of truck deliveries during off-peak traffic periods and offering preferred parking to low-emission vehicles to minimize air pollutant emissions during project operation. As such, as these measures would result in beneficial effects, no secondary impacts would occur.

2. Biological Resources

Mitigation Measure C-1 requires that any vegetation removal undertaken as part of the proposed project be conducted outside of migratory and songbird species' nesting season, or that surveys be conducted prior to vegetation clearing if it falls within the nesting season to identify any active nests and delineate buffers around such vegetation to preclude adverse effects on nesting birds. Thus, this mitigation measure would result in beneficial effects and no secondary impacts would occur.

3. Cultural Resources

Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-6 relate to archaeological and Native American Resources. These mitigation measures require that an archaeological and Native American monitor be present during excavation activities. In the event that such resources are discovered during construction activities, such resources should be collected, preserved, and documented, as appropriate. Mitigation Measures D-1 through D-6 are site-specific and would be beneficial to any discovered archaeological resources. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures D-1 through C-6 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measures D-7 through D-12 relate to paleontological resources. The mitigation measures generally require that a paleontologist monitors excavation activities. In the event that resources are discovered, the resources will be collected and preserved, as appropriate. It should be noted that excavation activities would occur regardless of the identification of any paleontological resources and thus, would not result in any physical changes. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures D-7 through D-12, which are site-specific, would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measure D-13 specifically requires that if human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction excavation and grading activities no further disturbance occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure D-13 would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

4. Geology and Soils

Mitigation Measure E-1 requires that building foundations be constructed utilizing driven piles, or an equivalent foundation system, in order to minimize the potential risks associated with liquefaction or related ground failure. Since the proposed project design already incorporates a pile foundation system, this mitigation measures would not create secondary environmental effects. Mitigation measures E-2 and E-3 address potential operational ground settlement (e.g., through the removal and compaction or in-situ ground modification of compressible soils, if warranted) and potential construction settlement (e.g., by limiting and monitoring groundwater dewatering and installing engineering controls). Furthermore, Mitigation E-4 is proposed to reduce vibration impacts on the project site and surrounding vicinity. For instance, this mitigation measure requires the monitoring of ground surfaces for evidence of vibration-induced settlement and requires preventative measures be taken if such settlement is identified. As a result, these mitigation measures would ensure that all potential geology impacts be reduced and limited to the project site. As such, no secondary impacts would occur.

5. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Mitigation Measures F-1 through F-11 relate to sampling, testing, and remediation or removal of known or suspected hazardous materials on the project site. These activities would be carried out prior to and throughout construction activities, as applicable, and would not require substantial efforts to achieve relative to the overall project construction activities. Excavation and/or removal, as well as transport and disposal, of such materials would be conducted in compliance with applicable regulations as part of the overall site clearing and preparation activities. Further, these mitigation measures are specifically designed to prevent any hazardous materials concerns, as well as to localize any potential hazards and ensure that there is no release of materials into the environment. Any hazardous materials removed from the site would be hauled, treated, and/or disposed of by licensed contractors. Compliance with regulations and standards would serve to protect against significant and irreversible environmental change that could result from the accidental release of hazardous materials. Therefore would not result in adverse secondary effects.

6. Noise

Mitigation Measures I-1 through I-4 require that steps be taken by the construction contractor(s) to minimize noise generation from equipment operation during construction activities. For instance, these mitigation measures require that blasting and impact pile driving not be used during construction, that engine idling be limited to 5 minutes, scheduling activities to avoid running multiple pieces of equipment at one time, and properly maintaining construction equipment. Mitigation Measures I-5 and I-6 require additional design-specific studies by a qualified acoustical engineer to evaluate design-specific noise impacts once more detailed building designs for the various project uses are available. These mitigation measures would ensure that noise off-site impacts would be reduced or eliminated during project construction and operation. As such, implementation of these mitigation measures would not result in physical changes that would result in adverse secondary effects.

7. Police Protection

Mitigation Measure K-1 would reduce construction impacts on emergency vehicle response times by requiring that the project developer notify the LBPD of the times of day and locations of all temporary lane closures throughout construction activities. Additionally, the mitigation measure requires that lane closures

be coordinated so that they do not occur during peak traffic periods, to the extent feasible. As a result, this mitigation measure would ensure that emergency vehicle response would not decrease during project construction. Therefore, implementation of this mitigation measure would be beneficial and would not result in adverse secondary effects.

8. Traffic and Circulation

Mitigation Measures L-1 L-2 and L-9 are intended to offset impacts at key intersections without making physical improvements to the intersections. These mitigation measures require the preparation of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan and the implementation of a shuttle service, as well as the payment of a transportation improvement fee. As no physical change to the environment would occur under these measures, no secondary impacts would result. Similarly, Mitigation Measure L-8 outlines construction truck routes so that temporary impacts to area streets would be reduced during project construction. As a result, this Mitigation Measure would not result in adverse secondary impacts.

Mitigation Measures L-3 through L-7 require physical improvements to area intersections to reduce the proposed project's operational impacts on area intersections. Physical improvements include modifying medians, construction of new dedicated turn lanes, restriping the intersections, and separating an intersection into two separate intersections. As these improvements would require off-site physical improvements, they would be the most likely to result in environmental impacts. Nonetheless, these improvements would not be of sufficient scope to result in adverse secondary impacts.

For instance, most of these measures would not extend beyond the existing pavement area (e.g., lane restriping). For those measures that do extend below the depth of the existing pavement, their construction would require limited amounts of ground disturbance and/or the excavation of soils. Additionally, these measures would not alter existing drainage patterns, result in an increase in impervious surfaces, or increase downstream stormwater flows. Moreover, construction of these features would occur in accordance with all applicable codes, reducing any potential temporary air and noise impacts. Lastly, these improvements would use standard construction materials and comply with applicable regulation and good housekeeping practices to reduce any potential water quality or hazardous materials impacts. As such, there would be no secondary effects with implementation of these mitigation measures.

9. Solid Waste

Mitigation Measure M.3-1 requires that the Applicant provide a copy of the receipt or contract indicating that the construction contractor will only contract for waste disposal services with a company that recycles demolition and construction related wastes. While this would require additional trips by a recycler or hauler, construction-related traffic would not have a significant impact on surrounding roadways. Mitigation Measure M.3-2 requires the construction contractor to provide temporary waste separation bins on-site during demolition and construction. As concluded in this Section of the EIR, there would not be a significant impact in regards to recycling facilities able to accommodate construction waste and debris. Thus, there would be no secondary effects with implementation of these mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measure M.3-3 stipulates that proposed project include recycling bins at appropriate locations to promote recycling of paper, metal, glass, and other recyclable material and Mitigation Measure M.3-4 requires that new homeowners/tenants be provided with educational materials on the proper management

and disposal of household hazardous waste, in accordance with educational materials made available by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works. These are administrative actions that would not result in impacts to the physical environment but would only reduce the amount of solid waste going to landfills. Therefore, there would be no secondary impacts with implementation of these mitigation measures.

E. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that an EIR shall contain a brief statement indicating reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and not discussed in detail in the Draft EIR. An Initial Study was prepared for the project and is included in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The Initial Study provides a detailed discussion of the potential environmental impact areas and the reasons that each topical area is or is not analyzed further in the Draft EIR. The City of Long Beach determined that the project would not result in potentially significant impacts related to Agricultural Resources, Air Quality (odors), Biological Resources (riparian habitat, federally protected wetlands, conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources), Geology and Soils (surface fault rupture, landslides, expansive soil, alternative wastewater systems), Hazards and Hazardous Materials (transport of hazardous materials, emit hazardous materials within one-quarter mile from a school, located within an airport land use plan area, emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, wildland fires), Hydrology and Water Quality (groundwater recharge, flooding, seiche, tsunami, mudflows), Land Use and Planning (physically divide a community or conflicts with habitat conservation plans), Mineral Resources, Noise (excessive noise from public airport or private airstrip), Population and Housing (population or housing displacement), Transportation and Circulation (air traffic patterns), and Utilities and Service Systems (comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, other utilities and service systems).

1. Agricultural Resources

The project site is fully developed within a highly urbanized area and is not mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is located within Subarea 17 of PD-1, Southeast Area Development and Improvement Plan (SEADIP), which is designated for commercial development. In addition, no agricultural or other related activity currently occur on the site or within the project vicinity, no agricultural zoning is present in the surrounding area, and no nearby lands are enrolled under the Williamson Act. Therefore, no conflict with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts would occur. Thus, the proposed project would not involve the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. No impacts to agricultural land or uses would occur.

2. Air Quality

Potential sources of odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents. The activities and materials associated with project construction would be typical of construction projects of similar type and size. Any odors that may be generated during construction or operation of the project would be localized and temporary in nature and would not be sufficient to affect a substantial number of people or result in a nuisance as defined by SCAQMD Rule 402. As such, impacts with regard to odors during construction would be less than significant.

According to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The project involves the development of retail, residential, and entertainment uses along with a hotel and associated parking and would not introduce any major odor-producing uses that would have the potential to affect a substantial number of people. Only limited odors associated with project operations would be generated by on-site waste generation and storage, the use of certain cleaning agents, and/or restaurant uses, all of which would be consistent with existing conditions on-site and in the surrounding area. Odor impacts during project operations would be less than significant.

3. Biological Resources

The project site is entirely developed with a hotel and surface parking areas. Existing landscaping includes limited areas of non-native landscaping and numerous large ornamental trees. No riparian or other sensitive natural community exists on the project site. The project site is separated from the Los Cerritos Wetlands to the northeast by PCH (PCH, a five-lane highway) and intervening urban development, including a retail shopping center, a gas station, and various restaurants. As no riparian habitat or other natural community is located within or adjacent to the project site, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Impacts on riparian or other sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.

The project site is currently developed and does not contain any federally protected wetlands. The proposed project would not require any activities on federally protected wetlands through direct removal, filling or hydrological interruption, or other means, as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Furthermore, indirect impacts to wetlands from pollutant discharges in stormwater flows from the site would be addressed through compliance with applicable regulations and permit requirements of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (refer to Section IV.G, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this EIR). As such, implementation of the proposed project would not have a significant impact on federally protected wetlands.

As previously described, the project site is entirely developed with hotel, restaurant, retail uses, and parking lots and existing landscaping is limited to ornamental trees and other non-native landscaping. Native or natural vegetation and landmark or heritage trees that are subject to preservation policies or regulations do not occur within the project site. Any street trees removed for project development would be replaced in accordance with City standards, and the project would provide landscaping in accordance with City of Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC) requirements that would offset the loss of trees and open space landscaping. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

4. Geology and Soils

Fault rupture is defined as the displacement that occurs along the surface of a fault during an earthquake. Based on criteria established by the California Geological Survey (CGS), faults can be classified as active,

potentially active, or inactive.¹ Active faults are those having historically produced earthquakes or shown evidence of movement within the past 11,000 years (during the Holocene Epoch).² Potentially active faults have demonstrated displacement within the last 1.6 million years (during the Pleistocene Epoch), but do not displace Holocene Strata. Inactive faults do not exhibit displacement younger than 1.6 million years before the present. In addition, there are buried thrust faults, which are low angle reverse faults with no surface exposure. Due to their buried nature, the existence of buried thrust faults is usually not known until they produce an earthquake.

The seismically active Southern California region is crossed by numerous active and potentially active faults and is underlain by several blind thrust faults. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (formerly Special Study Zones) have been established throughout California by CGS. These zones, which extend from 200 to 500 feet on each side of a known active fault, identify areas where potential surface rupture along an active fault could prove hazardous and identify where special studies are required to characterize hazards to habitable structures.

The project site is not located within an established Alquist-Priolo Fault zone. The nearest active fault to the project site is the Newport Inglewood Fault Zone, located approximately ¼-mile to the northeast.³ Active faults with the potential for surface rupture are not known to be located beneath the project site. Therefore, the potential to expose people to impacts from fault rupture resulting from seismic activity during the design life of the buildings is considered less than significant.

The project site is not identified as an area of slope instability in the General Plan Seismic Element. Landslides generally occur in loosely consolidated, wet soil and/or rock on steep sloping terrain exposed to the effects of water. The project site is characterized by relatively flat topography and is entirely developed, which reduces direct exposure to water. The surrounding area is characterized by a gently sloping topography that is also almost entirely developed with paved surfaces. As steep hillsides are not present on-site or in the project vicinity, impacts associated with landslides would be less than significant.

Expansive soil is defined as soil that expands to a significant degree upon wetting and shrinks upon drying. Generally, expansive soils contain a high percentage of clay particles. The natural soils in the area consist of primarily of river and coastal alluvium, containing high levels of gravel and sand, which, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code are not considered to be expansive. Thus, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

The project site is located in a fully urbanized area served by existing wastewater infrastructure and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts related to the ability of soils to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

¹ *The California Geological Survey was formerly known as the Division of Mines and Geology of the California Department of Conservation.*

² *California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey. California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Survey. "Note 49: Guidelines for Evaluating the Hazard of Surface Fault Rupture." 2002.*

³ *City of Long Beach General Plan, Seismic Safety Element, October 1988.*

5. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The type and amount of hazardous materials to be used for the project would be typical of those used for residential and commercial developments. Specifically, operation of the proposed uses would involve the use and storage of small quantities of potentially hazardous materials in the form of cleaning solvents, painting supplies, pesticides for landscaping, and petroleum products. Construction of the project could require the temporary use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. However, all potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers' instructions and handled in compliance with applicable standards and regulations. Any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with these standards and regulations. Therefore, impacts associated with the types of hazardous materials used routinely in the construction and operation of the project would be less than significant.

The project site is not located within one-quarter mile of any schools, within an airport land use plan area, or within two miles of an airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport is Long Beach Airport, located approximately 3.5 miles north-northwest of the site. As such, no impacts with respect to a school, an airport, airport land use plan, or private airstrip would occur.

Immediate access to the project site is provided via PCH, 2nd Street, and Marina Drive. Emergency response and emergency evacuation for the City is based on the availability of through streets and multiple access routes and bridges. Access to the project vicinity is provided by PCH and 2nd Street. The proposed project would not impede street access through the removal of any through streets or changes in the existing street and highway pattern in the area. Additionally, construction activities and staging areas would be generally confined to the project site so as not to physically impair access to and around the site. Access along through streets and highways in the area, including PCH, 2nd Street, and Marina Drive would be maintained during construction and project operation. Therefore, as construction and operation of the proposed project would not permanently impede any through streets or evacuation routes, or otherwise conflict with emergency response or evacuation plans, impacts with respect to such plans would be less than significant.

Finally, the project site and surrounding areas are predominately developed and no wildlands occur within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

6. Hydrology and Water Quality

The project is not located within an inundation area associated with any levees or dams. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the exposure of people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding associated with the failure of a levee or dam. The project site is not located below an enclosed basin or storage tank and would not be susceptible to seiche. In addition, the project site is not located within a hilly area that would be susceptible to mudflow. However, according to the General Plan Seismic Safety Element, the project site is located within an area of the City susceptible to tsunami.⁴ The NHMP also addresses the possibility of tsunamis impacting the City of Long Beach and states

⁴ *City of Long Beach General Plan Seismic Safety Element, Plate 11, Tsunami and Seiche Influence Areas (Source: Base Map Bureau of Engineers, USGS, 1961, and Steinbrugge, 1982), October 1988.*

that the most significant impacts would occur, among other shore areas, at the port and surrounding commercial areas that are at or near sea level.⁵

Based on seismicity, geodenics, and geology, a large locally generated tsunami from either local seismic activity or a local submarine landslide would likely not occur more than once every 10,000 years. In addition, the maximum mean wave height resulting from remote sources would be approximately 2.46 feet (0.75 meters) and maximum mean wave height from local sources (based on the worst case Palos Verdes Landslide model) would reach approximately 23 feet (7 meters) at the Navy Mole in the Port of Long Beach. However, the proposed project would be developed above parking structure podiums, with the majority of proposed development located above podium level, which ranges from 22 to 33 feet above site grade. Given existing site elevations ranging from approximately 8 to 11 feet above mean sea level (msl), the majority of proposed land uses would be located over 30 above site grade. With a worst case wave height of 23 feet, the occupied residential units, hotel-branded condominium units, and hotel rooms would be above the level of the maximum tsunami wave. Given the low probability of tsunamis (extreme infrequency) and configuration of the occupied portion of the project above the podium level, the proposed project would not have a significant impact with respect to tsunami hazards.

7. Land Use and Planning

The project site is fully developed with urban uses, including a hotel, night club, and other hotel-oriented retail uses. Surrounding uses include retail shopping centers to the northeast, southeast, and northwest, and the Alamitos Bay Marina to the southwest. Redevelopment of the project site with retail, hotel, and residential uses would not result in the physical division of an established community or incompatible land use. Thus, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

The project site is entirely developed with a two-story hotel and associated commercial retail and restaurant uses and associated surface parking areas within a highly urbanized area of southeast Long Beach. Despite its location near the Los Cerritos Wetlands, no Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. Therefore, the implementation of the proposed project would have no impact on adopted habitat conservation or natural community conservation plans.

8. Mineral Resources

Petroleum is the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach. The project site is not classified by the City of Long Beach as an area containing significant deposits of oil, gas, or other mineral deposits. In addition, the project is not currently utilized for oil extraction, nor are oil and other mineral deposits known to occur within the project site. As the development of the project site would not result in the loss of a known mineral resource, no impact with respect to this issue would occur. Therefore, project implementation would not result in impacts associated with the loss or availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

⁵ *City of Long Beach Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan, Chapter 9, Tsunami Hazards in the City of Long Beach, page 13, October 19, 2004.*

9. Noise

As previously described, the project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport to the project site is the Long Beach Airport, located approximately 3.5 miles north-northwest of the project site, to the north of the I-405 freeway. Therefore, the project would not expose people to excessive airport-related noise levels.

10. Population and Housing

There are no existing residential uses on the project site, and thus, the proposed project would not displace existing housing or people. No impacts would occur in this regard.

11. Transportation/Traffic

As described above, the project site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private airport. The nearest airport to the site is the Long Beach Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 3.5 miles northwest of the project site. Based on the Long Beach Municipal Airport's airport land use plan, the project site is not located within its Planning Boundary. The project does not propose any uses that would increase the frequency of air traffic. The project includes low- to mid-rise buildings generally ranging from two to six stories in height, with one residential tower reaching a maximum of 12 stories (approximately 136 feet above ground level). The project would comply with applicable Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) requirements regarding rooftop lighting for multi-story buildings, as applicable, resulting in less than significant impacts in this regard.

12. Utilities and Service Systems

Electricity transmission to the project site is provided and maintained by Southern California Edison (SCE). The project would generate a net demand increase of approximately 4,391 Megawatt hours (MWh) per year. Compared to SCE's annual output, project-related annual electricity demand would represent a small fraction of existing demand from a service that has an annual output of 121 billion kWh and anticipates an increase of approximately 3 billion kWh of renewable energy by 2012. Therefore, the electricity demand generated by the proposed project would fall within the anticipated service capabilities of SCE.

Natural gas is provided to the project site by the City of Long Beach Gas and Oil Department (LBGO). The project would generate a net demand increase of just over 16,000 thousand cubic feet per year (kcf/year). This volume represents a small percentage increase with respect to current capacity and expanding local and regional supplies. In addition, the project's compliance with energy conservation standards set forth in the amended Title 24 (effective January 2009) and voluntary LEED features will further reduce the project's potential impacts on natural gas resources. Therefore, substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the project's estimated demand on natural gas supplies that would exceed supply or LBGO's delivery capacity would occur. As such, no significant impacts to local or regional supplies of natural gas would occur.