

## **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

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

This Draft EIR has been prepared by the City of Long Beach (City) to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Belmont Pool Revitalization Project (proposed Project); to discuss alternatives; and to propose mitigation measures for identified potentially significant impacts that will minimize, offset, or otherwise reduce or avoid those environmental impacts. Data for this Draft EIR was obtained from on-site field observations; discussion with affected agencies; review of adopted plans and policies; review of available studies and reports; and specialized environmental assessments prepared for the proposed Project (e.g., air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, paleontological resources, noise, and traffic).

### **1.2 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool (Belmont Pool) site is operated by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine and is located in the Belmont Shore Beach Park in southeast Long Beach. The proposed Project site is bordered on the south by the Pacific Ocean, the beach, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and volleyball courts; on the west by Belmont Veterans Memorial Pier, Belmont Beach, and the Pier Parking Lot; and on the northwest by Surf Terrace Apartments, Belmont Shores Condominiums, and a Jack in the Box restaurant; on the north by several businesses located along the northern side of East Olympic Plaza; on the northeast by the Belmont Shore neighborhood; on the east by the City beach maintenance yard, the temporary outdoor pool, Rosie's Dog Beach, a boat launch, and the Beach Parking Lot.

The proposed Project would replace the former Belmont Pool facility and provide the City with a revitalized and modern pool complex. The Project proposes the construction and operation of an approximately 125,500 square foot (sf) pool complex that includes indoor and outdoor pool components and an approximately 1,500 sf cafe. Permanent indoor seating for approximately 1,250 spectators would be provided to view competitive events at the indoor 50-Meter Competition Pool and the Dive Pool. Temporary outdoor seating would be provided for larger events at the outdoor 50-Meter Competition Pool with a maximum seating capacity of up to 3,000 spectators. The proposed Project does not include any permanent outdoor seating designed for spectator viewing.

The proposed Project would consist of three main areas: the pool facility; the open space/park area; and the outdoor café area, including a public restroom facility. The pool facility consists of the recreational and competitive aquatic components and would be the central focus of the Project site. The passive park area would be situated along the western and northern portions of the Project site and near the outdoor café on the east side, and would be intended for general park uses, similar to the uses at the existing passive park. A comparison of the proposed Project with the former Belmont Pool facility is presented in Table 1.A.

**Table 1.A: Project Component Comparison Table**

Project Component	Former Pool	Proposed Project	Change
Lot Size	5.8 ac	5.8 ac	0 ac
Building Size	45,595 sf	125,500 sf	+79,905 sf
Maximum Building Height	60 ft	71 ft	+11 ft
Indoor Pool Surface Area	14,010 sf	18,610 sf	+4,600 sf
Outdoor Pool Surface Area	4,400 sf	17,840 sf	+13,440 sf
Open Space Area	118,790 sf	127,085 sf	+8,295 sf
Passive Park/Landscaped Area	45,160 sf	55,745 sf	+10,585 sf
Seating	2,500	4,250*	+1,750 <sup>1</sup>
Restaurant/Cafe	5,665 sf	1,500 sf	-4,165 sf
Public Restrooms	0 sf	600 sf	+600 sf

Source: City of Long Beach (2016).

\* Permanent indoor seating = 1,250. Temporary outdoor seating = 3,000.

ac = acre(s)

ft = foot/feet

sf = square feet

A pick-up and drop-off area would be located along the eastern boundary and would be adjacent to the café/restroom area at the southeastern corner of the Project site. East Olympic Plaza would be closed to vehicular traffic.

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

### 1.3 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR describe significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if the proposed Project is implemented, including those effects that can be mitigated but not reduced to a less than significant level. As determined in the contents of this Draft EIR, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable adverse impacts. All potentially significant impacts have been effectively mitigated to a less than significant level.

### 1.4 ALTERNATIVES

The following five alternatives to the proposed Project were selected for consideration, including the No Project/No Development Alternative as required by CEQA:

- Alternative 1: No Project/No Development
- Alternative 2: Maintain Temporary Pool with Ancillary Uses
- Alternative 3: Outdoor Diving Well
- Alternative 4: Reduced Project – No Outdoor Components
- Alternative 5: Reduced Project – No Diving Well and No Outdoor Components

In evaluating an appropriate range of alternatives to the proposed Project, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected by the Lead Agency. These included consideration of the following options:

- Fully Enclosed Pools Alternative
- Alternative Project Locations

Each of these alternatives was rejected for differing reasons, as described further in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed Project on the basis of the lack of physical impacts that would occur with the No Project/No Development Alternative. While the No Project/No Development Alternative would lessen or avoid the impacts of the proposed Project, the beneficial impacts of the proposed Project—including the provisions of a permanent aquatic recreational complex not currently provided by the City—would not occur, and none of the Project objectives would be met. Overall, however, the No Project/No Development Alternative is considered environmentally superior because the physical impacts associated with this alternative are significantly less than the proposed Project and other alternatives.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, “the EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (*State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6[e][2]). Alternative 5, Reduced Project – No Diving Well and No Outdoor Pool Components, would lessen most of the environmental impacts as compared to the proposed Project. Although Alternative 5 would be considered environmentally superior to the proposed Project, the reduction of recreational facilities would not achieve the goals and objectives of the proposed Project, and would not be consistent with the primary objective of the City, which is to replace the former Belmont Pool facility with a more modern facility that better meets the needs of the local community, region, and State’s recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, aquatic sports participants, and additional pool users due to the tremendous demand for these services in the local community, region, and State. Therefore, Alternative 5 would meet some of the Project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed Project.

The alternatives analysis is described in greater detail in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR.

## 1.5 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Pursuant to *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15123, this Draft EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved that are known to the City or that were raised by agencies and

the public. Key environmental issues and concerns raised in the responses to the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) included (1) potential for increased traffic, (2) potential for discovery of cultural resources, (3) potential for air quality impacts, (4) increases in wastewater discharges, (5) potential for impacts to storm drain facilities, and (6) concerns of pool design and amenities meeting the overall desires of the swimming community. Additionally, based on input from the City Council, the Stakeholders Advisory Committee, the general public, and the California Coastal Commission, the major common issues of concern raised included (1) loss of park space, (2) wildlife, (3) parking, (4) noise, (5) aesthetics, (6) geologic stability, (7) design features, and (8) cost.

This Draft EIR addresses all environmental issues of concern raised during the NOP comment period, examines Project-related and cumulative environmental impacts, identifies significant adverse environmental impacts, and proposes mitigation measures designed to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project.

## 1.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 1.B identifies the potential environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and level of significance after mitigation is incorporated into the proposed Project. Table 1.B also identifies cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed Project in conjunction with the approved and pending cumulative projects, which are listed in Chapter 4.0, Existing Environmental Setting, Environmental Analysis, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of this Draft EIR. Environmental topics addressed in this Draft EIR include Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Noise, Recreation, Transportation and Circulation, and Utilities and Service Systems.

In addition to identifying potentially significant impacts of the proposed Project that required additional study, the IS also identified effects determined not to be significant consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15063(c)(3)(B). Impacts that were determined to be less than significant were discussed and evaluated in the IS contained in Appendix A of this Draft EIR. The analysis determined that the proposed Project would result in no impacts to agricultural resources, public services, population and housing, or mineral resources. Additionally, the IS substantiates the determination that the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts associated with the following thresholds: 4.2.5 under Section 4.2, Air Quality; 4.3.2, 4.3.3, and 4.3.6 under Section 4.3, Biological Resources; 4.4.1, 4.4.2, and 4.4.4 under Section 4.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources; 4.5.1 (iv) and 4.5.5 under Section 4.5, Geology and Soils; 4.7.5, 4.7.7, and 4.7.8 under Section 4.7, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; 4.8.7 under Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality; 4.9.1 and 4.9.3 under Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning; 4.11.1, under Section 4.1, Recreation; 4.12.3 and 4.12.4 under Section 4.12, Transportation and Traffic; and 4.13.10 under Section 4.13, Utilities and Service Systems. No new information identifying a change in the level of impacts was discovered during the scoping process. As a result, these thresholds are not considered further in the analyses of the potential impacts of the proposed Project.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.1: AESTHETICS</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.1.1: Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> There are no locally designated scenic vistas on or surrounding the Project site but expansive ocean views from public right-of-ways can generally be considered to have aesthetic value. The proposed pool complex would be located generally on the same building footprint of the former Belmont Pool facility. The proposed placement and alignment of the Bubble would allow for increased views of the coastline that were previously blocked by the former Belmont Pool structure. Additionally, the curved elliptical shape of the Bubble reduces the structural scale and mass, when compared to a traditional rectangular building, by eliminating the corners of the building, allowing for an increase in viewable area. Therefore, the change in the building alignment on the site, in combination with the reduced structural mass from the Bubble’s elliptical design, would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas and a less than significant impact would occur. No mitigation is required.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
<p><b>Threshold 4.1.2: Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State-designated scenic highway.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> While Ocean Boulevard adjacent to the Project site is not a designated State Highway, the Scenic Routes Element of the City of Long Beach (City) General Plan has identified the portion of Ocean Boulevard adjacent to the Project site as a designated scenic route associated with the Recreational</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Scenic Route. While implementation of the proposed Project would modify the views to and from the Project site by replacing the former Belmont Pool facility with a new pool complex, the proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing character of the surrounding area. Motorists along Ocean Boulevard would experience increased views of the coastline following implementation of the proposed Project. Therefore, potential impacts of the proposed Project on the Recreational Scenic Route would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.1.3: Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Construction of the proposed Project would involve on-site grading and construction activities that would be visible to travelers along Ocean Boulevard and other adjacent roadways. Construction activities for the proposed Project would be short-term and temporary fencing would be placed along the perimeter of the site to screen construction activities from the street level. Construction fencing could serve as a potential target for graffiti if not appropriately monitored. Mitigation Measure 4.1.1, requiring the maintenance of the Project site fencing, would ensure that impacts associated with unwanted debris and graffiti would be less than significant.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed Project would alter the existing visual character of the site because the design of the proposed structure would be dramatically different than the former Belmont Pool</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.1.1: Maintenance of Construction Barriers.</b> Prior to issuance of any construction permits, the Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction plans include the following note: During construction, the Construction Contractor shall ensure, through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections, that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways, and that any such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner. In the event that unauthorized materials or markings are discovered on any temporary construction barrier or temporary pedestrian walkway, the Construction Contractor shall remove such items within 48 hours.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>facility. However, the proposed Project design has a comparable mass, scale, and height and would also be aligned to provide for increased coastal views. Additionally, the proposed Project would replace one large recreational pool complex with another recreational pool complex and although the design would be different, the visual character of the Project site would not be substantially degraded with the implementation of the proposed Project. Project impacts would be less than significant impacts, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.1.4: Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Lighting required during the construction period could generate light spillover in the vicinity of the proposed Project site. However, construction activities would occur only during daylight hours and any construction-related illumination would be used for safety and security purposes only (in compliance with Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC) light intensity requirements) and would occur only for the duration required for the temporary construction process. Minor glare from sunlight on construction equipment and vehicle windshields is not anticipated to impact visibility in the area because the construction site would be fenced and shielded from pedestrian views and passenger vehicle views. In addition, construction vehicles would not be operating at night and thus would not create nighttime sources of glare. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and light</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>impacts associated with construction would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Project would include the installation of new lighting for the pool, which would replace the existing lighting for the outdoor pools, park, and associated street lights. Additionally, nighttime lights are necessary for the safety and security of the visitors and employees on site and along the park pathways, but outdoor light fixtures would be shielded and directed in compliance with the existing LBMC. The Project signage would be illuminated by light-emitting diode lights in conformance with the existing LBMC, and would be required to obtain Site Plan Review and approval. The Bubble shell is made from a low reflective. While the proposed Project’s building accents may include metal or other highly polished surfaces around building entrances, such accents would be small relative to the size of the facade and would be partially blocked by landscaping buffers. Additionally, daytime glare and nighttime glare would be reduced due to the obstruction from the proposed landscaping in the interior portions of the Project site. The nighttime glare produced by the signage, exterior lighting, and vehicular headlights would be similar to the existing nighttime glare produced by the surrounding residential and commercial uses and would not result in enough glare to be considered substantial or affect nighttime views. In addition, the interior lighting of the Bubble would not be considered a glare-producing light because the structure would be illuminated from the inside, which would produce a glow and not a direct light. Additionally, the lighting of the Bubble structure would be limited to end at 10:00 p.m., the operational hours of the facility, and</p>		



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>would not be lit throughout the night. Therefore, impacts due to light and glare generation and interference with the performance of an off-site activity or adverse effects on views would be less than significant during operation of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The proposed Project is located in an urban area with a number of existing sources of light and glare. Because the proposed Project would replace the former Belmont Pool with a modernized pool complex, light and glare as a result of the proposed Project would be consistent with the baseline conditions in the area and would not impact views in the area. The potential aesthetic impacts to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and existing visual character were evaluated and found to be less than significant. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project to potential cumulative visual/aesthetic impacts in the study area is considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>4.2: AIR QUALITY</b></p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.2.1: Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Emissions associated with the proposed Project are not anticipated to exceed the General Plan projections or contribute to air quality deterioration beyond South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds. The proposed Project is consistent with the site’s current General Plan land use designation. Therefore, since the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is based on local General Plans and the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Standard Condition 4.2.1: Construction Emissions.</b> The proposed Project is required to comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the emission source. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent fugitive dust from creating a</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>proposed Project is consistent with the General Plan, the proposed Project would not conflict with the AQMP. However, the proposed Project would be required to adhere to Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, which include a variety of measures aimed at controlling dust during Project construction, consistent with the General Plan Air Quality Element Policy 6.1. In addition, the proposed Project would be built to meet Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold (or higher) certification standards and would implement a variety of conservation and sustainability features aimed at reducing energy consumption, consistent with General Plan policies. Furthermore, the proposed Project would be compliant with all Mandatory Measures outlined in the California Green Building Standards Code (Cal Green Code) aimed at the improvement of air quality. Therefore, because the proposed Project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan Air Quality Element, the Cal Green Code, and the Final 2012 AQMP, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to conflict with applicable goals and policies, and no mitigation would be required.</p>	<p>nuisance off site. Applicable dust suppression techniques from Rules 403 and 402 are summarized below. Implementation of these dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM<sub>10</sub>] component).</p> <p><b>Standard Condition 4.2.2: Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures.</b> The Project construction contractor shall develop and implement dust-control methods that shall achieve this control level in a SCAQMD Rule 403 dust control plan, designate personnel to monitor the dust control program, and order increased watering, as necessary, to ensure a 55 percent control level. Those duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. Additional control measures to reduce fugitive dust shall include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply water twice daily, or nontoxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturers’ specifications, to all unpaved parking or staging areas or unpaved road surfaces or as needed to areas where soil is disturbed.</li> <li>• Use low-sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2.</li> <li>• During earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust-preventive measures using the following procedures:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All material excavated shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering, with complete coverage, shall occur at least twice daily, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>the day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All earthmoving or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., winds greater than 20 miles per hour [mph] averaged over 1 hour).</li> <li>○ All material transported off site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.</li> <li>○ The area disturbed by earthmoving or excavation operations shall be minimized at all times.</li> <li>● After earthmoving or excavation operations, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Portions of the construction area to remain inactive longer than a period of 3 months shall be revegetated and watered until cover is grown.</li> <li>○ All active portions of the construction site shall be watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.</li> <li>○ Road improvements shall be paved as soon as feasible, watered periodically, or chemically stabilized.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● At all times during the construction phase, ozone precursor emissions from mobile equipment shall be controlled using the following procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Equipment engines shall be maintained in good condition and in proper tune according to manufacturers' specifications.</li> <li>○ On-site mobile equipment shall not be left idling for a period longer than 60 seconds.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outdoor storage piles of construction materials shall be kept covered, watered, or otherwise chemically stabilized with a chemical wetting agent to minimize fugitive dust emissions and wind erosion.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Threshold 4.2.2: Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>  <b>Construction Emissions.</b> The use of construction equipment on the site would result in localized exhaust emissions. However, with implementation of Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2., the proposed Project would be required to adhere to a variety of measures aimed at controlling dust during Project construction. Therefore, with incorporation of these SCAQMD Rules and emission control measures, construction emissions would not exceed any of SCAQMD's thresholds.</p> <p><b>Operation Emissions.</b> The proposed Project's emissions (from both stationary sources and vehicular sources) would not exceed SCAQMD daily emissions thresholds. Therefore, the long-term air quality impacts of the proposed Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Refer to Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.2.3: Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The projected construction,</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>operational, and localized significance threshold (LST) emissions of criteria pollutants as a result of the proposed Project are expected to be below the emissions thresholds established for the region. Cumulative emissions are part of the emission inventory included in the AQMP for the Project area. Therefore, there would be no cumulatively considerable net increase of the criteria pollutants that are in “nonattainment” status in the South Coast Air Basin, and Project impacts would have a less than significant impact; no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.2.4: Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The sensitive land uses within the vicinity of the proposed Project include the existing Belmont Shores Children’s Center (Preschool/Child Care) facility located within 25 feet of the northern boundary of the Project site, residences approximately 80 feet (ft) to the west, and residences across East Ocean Boulevard approximately 100 ft to the northeast of the Project site. Fugitive dust emissions would occur during construction of the proposed Project; however, the Project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Standard Conditions and Rule 403, as specified in Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2. Therefore, with implementation of Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, no significant impacts to sensitive receptors related to fugitive dust during Project construction would occur.</p> <p>Carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) emissions during construction would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the Project construction would result in less than</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p>Refer to Standard Conditions 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>significant air quality impacts related to CO and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Long-term operational criteria pollutant emission impacts are those associated with stationary and mobile sources. The maximum emissions from Project operation would not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. Therefore, the long-term operation of the Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts related to CO, NO<sub>x</sub>, or other criteria pollutants and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Long-Term Microscale (CO Hot Spot) Analysis.</b> Because the intersections evaluated for the proposed Project would not be congested and the Project area has low background CO levels, the likelihood for CO concentrations to reach unhealthful levels is low. Therefore, the proposed Project would not have a significant impact on local air quality for CO, and no mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Air Quality Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The proposed Project would not result in significant operational air quality impacts, contribute to an ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) exceedance at a nearby monitoring station, cause the area to be in noncompliance with the AQMP, or result in a significant health risk for any of the analyzed pollutants. As described further in this table in Section 4.12, Transportation and Traffic, there would not be a significant cumulative traffic impact,</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>and so there would not be a cumulative traffic emissions impact. Therefore, the proposed Project’s air quality emissions, when considered in combination with the cumulative projects within the Project vicinity, would be incremental and would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<b>4.3: BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.3.1: Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> No sensitive natural community or special-status plant species were identified on the Project site, and no designated critical habitat is located in the Project Site. Although the on-site vegetation is nonnative, Allen’s hummingbirds were observed foraging on the Project site. However, bird species known to be utilizing the site, including Allen’s hummingbird, would be able to relocate to other hunting and foraging habitats once the Project is implemented. The loss of disturbed nonnative habitat and the associated reduction of locally common wildlife populations are not considered a significant impact. The removal of on-site vegetation is not expected to have a significant adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species, as defined by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Therefore, any impacts to sensitive or special-status species would be less than significant, and no mitigation is</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>required.</p> <p><b>Threshold 4.3.4: Interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      The Project site is developed and located in an urban area subject to frequent intense human activity and does not function as a wildlife movement corridor. However, because of the presence of several mature ornamental trees, implementation of the proposed Project may interfere with native resident or migratory bird species. A total of 30 trees would be removed or relocated. In addition, noise and activities during construction could cause the potential abandonment of nests by migratory birds and may result in some temporary disruptions to the roosting activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.1 would be required to ensure that potential impacts to migratory birds are reduced to a less than significant level.                      Construction of the pool facilities and renovations to the passive park areas has the potential to cause a direct loss of nesting trees or the abandonment of nests. However, the bird species present in the Project area are currently coexisting with pool and park users and are accustomed to human intrusion and noise and are anticipated to be able to reestablish to the relocated trees and adapt to the additional trees installed as a part of the proposed Project. Therefore, long-term operation of the proposed Project is anticipated to have less than significant impacts on nesting and/or roosting birds.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.3.1: Migratory Bird Treaty Act.</b> Tree and vegetation removal shall be restricted to outside the likely active nesting season (January 15 through September 1) for those bird species present or potentially occurring within the proposed Project area. That time period is inclusive of most other birds' nesting periods, thus maximizing avoidance of impacts to any nesting birds. If construction is proposed between January 15 and September 1, a qualified biologist familiar with local avian species and the requirements of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and the California Fish and Game Code shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds no more than 3 days prior to construction. The survey shall include the entire area that will be disturbed. The results of the survey shall be recorded in a memorandum and submitted to the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director within 48 hours. If the survey is positive, and the nesting species are subject to the MBTA or the California Fish and Game Code, the memorandum shall be submitted to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) to determine appropriate action. If nesting birds are present, a qualified biologist shall be retained to monitor the site during initial vegetation clearing and grading, as well as during other activities that would have the potential to disrupt nesting behavior. The monitor shall be empowered by the City to halt construction work in the vicinity of the nesting birds if the monitor believes the nest is at risk of failure or the birds are excessively disturbed.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>No bats were observed emerging from the former Belmont Pool building complex at any time during the emergence survey, no bats were observed flying or foraging in the vicinity, and no bats were detected with acoustic equipment. Therefore, no impacts to day-roosting bats or bat colonies on the Project site or in the vicinity of the Project site are expected to occur.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.3.5: Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The proposed Project would be constructed within an existing developed area that contains ornamental landscaping and nonnative vegetation. The proposed Project would comply with the Tidelands Area Tree Trimming policy by restricting tree trimming within 300 feet of any tree containing an active nest or nesting activity during the period from January 15 through September 1.</p> <p>Construction of the pool facilities as currently planned would result in removal or relocation of 30 trees. In accordance with the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code, Chapter 14.28, a ministerial permit from the Public Works Director would be required before the removal of any trees on City-owned property. A tree removal permit would be obtained prior to any grading or construction activities. The City’s Tree Maintenance Policy requires a 1:1 replacement ratio and payment of a fee that is equivalent to the cost of a City-approved 15-gallon tree. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.3.2, impacts related</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.3.2: Local Tree Removal Ordinances.</b> Prior to the start of any demolition or construction activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks, Recreation, and Marine Director, or designee, shall obtain a tree removal permit from the City’s Public Works Director. A City-approved Construction Plan shall be submitted with the permit to remove tree(s). The City-approved Plan shall show that the existing City (parkway) tree has a direct impact on the design and function of the proposed Project. The City shall incur all removal costs, including site cleanup, make any necessary repair of hardscape damage, and replace the tree. The removed tree shall be replaced with an approved 15-gallon tree and payment of a fee that is equivalent to a City-approved 15-gallon tree.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
to the City’s tree protection ordinance would be reduced to a less than significant level.		
<p><b>Cumulative Biological Resource Impacts.</b> The proposed Project has a limited potential to result in a cumulative impact to nesting migratory bird species or biological resources. However, Mitigation Measures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, requiring avoidance of construction during nesting season and replacement of removed trees at a 1:1 ratio, would reduce potential impacts to migratory bird species to a less than significant level. Therefore, overall adverse impacts to nesting migratory bird species would not be cumulatively significant.</p> <p>The Project site does not contain any native habitat, and is in an area with substantial urban development and limited native habitat. Therefore, loss of potential habitat on the Project site would not be a substantial impact. As a result, when considered with the potential effects of other development in this part of the City on biological resources, the proposed Project would not contribute appreciably to cumulative adverse impacts on biological resources. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project to cumulative adverse impacts on biological resources would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, above.	Less than Significant.
<b>4.4: CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.3: Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> During Project construction, there is a potential for significant fossil remains to be encountered during grading activities at depths</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.4.1: Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program.</b> Prior to commencement of any grading or excavation activity on site, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a paleontologist has been retained on an on-call basis for all excavation from the surface to depths of 23 feet (ft) below the</p>	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>of 23 feet (ft) or greater. Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 requires a qualified paleontologist to be retained to monitor grading activities. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources are reduced to below a less than significant level.</p>	<p>surface. Once a depth of 23 ft is reached, the paleontologist shall visit the site and determine if there is a potential for the sediments at this depth to contain paleontological resources.</p> <p>A paleontologist shall not be required on site if excavation is only occurring in depths of less than 23 ft, unless there are discoveries at shallower depths that warrant the presence of a paleontological monitor. In the event that there are any unanticipated discoveries, the on-call paleontologist shall be called to the site to assess the find for significance, and if necessary, prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) as outlined below.</p> <p>If excavation will extend deeper than 23 ft, exclusive of pile-driving and vibro-replacement soil stabilization techniques, the paleontologist shall prepare a PRIMP for the proposed Project. The PRIMP should be consistent with the guidelines of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists (SVP, 1995 and 2010) and shall include but not be limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attendance at the pre-grade conference or weekly tailgate meeting if the PRIMP is initiated after the commencement of grading, in order to explain the mitigation measures associated with the Project.</li> <li>• During construction excavation, a qualified vertebrate paleontological monitor shall initially be present on a full-time basis whenever excavation shall occur within the sediments that have a high paleontological sensitivity rating. Based on the significance of any recovered specimens, the qualified paleontologist may set up conditions that shall allow</li> </ul>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>for monitoring to be scaled back to part-time as the Project progresses. However, if significant fossils begin to be recovered after monitoring has been scaled back, conditions shall also be specified that would allow increased monitoring as necessary. The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and/or matrix samples as they are unearthed in order to avoid construction delays. The monitor shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment in the area of the find in order to allow removal of abundant or large specimens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The underlying sediments may contain abundant fossil remains that can only be recovered by a screening and picking matrix; therefore, these sediments shall occasionally be spot-screened through 1/8 to 1/20-inch mesh screens to determine whether microfossils exist. If microfossils are encountered, additional sediment samples (up to 6,000 pounds) shall be collected and processed through 1/20-inch mesh screens to recover additional fossils. Processing of large bulk samples is best accomplished at a designated location within the Project that shall be accessible throughout the Project duration but shall also be away from any proposed cut or fill areas. Processing is usually completed concurrently with construction, with the intent to have all processing completed before, or just after, Project completion. A small corner of a staging or equipment parking area is an ideal location. If water is not available, the location should be accessible for a water truck to occasionally fill containers with water.</li> <li>• Preparation of recovered specimens to a point of identification and permanent preservation. This includes the washing and picking of mass samples to recover small invertebrate and</li> </ul>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>vertebrate fossils and the removal of surplus sediment from around larger specimens to reduce the volume of storage for the repository and the storage cost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification and curation of specimens into a museum repository with permanent retrievable storage, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County (LACM).</li> <li>• Preparation of a report of findings with an appended itemized inventory of specimens. When submitted to the City Development Services Director, or designee, the report and inventory would signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Cumulative Cultural Resource Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Future development in the City of Long Beach (City) could include excavation and grading that could potentially impact archaeological and paleontological resources and human remains. The cumulative effect of the proposed Project would be the continued loss of these resources. The proposed Project, in conjunction with other development in the City, has the potential to cumulatively impact archaeological and paleontological resources; however, each development proposal received by the City undergoes environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If there is a potential for significant impacts to archaeological or paleontological resources, an investigation would be required to determine the nature and extent of the resources and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. If subsurface cultural resources are assessed and/or protected as they are discovered, impacts to these resources would</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.4.1, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>be less than significant. In addition, applicable City ordinances and General Plan policies would be implemented as appropriate to reduce the effects of additional development within the City.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 4.4.1 would be implemented during construction of the proposed Project to reduce potential Project impacts by ensuring avoidance, evaluation, and, as applicable, scientific recovery and study of any resources encountered. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.4.1, the contribution of the proposed Project to the cumulative loss of known and unknown cultural resources throughout the City would be considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<p><b>4.5: GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b></p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b></p> <p><b>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to DM&amp;G Pub. 42).</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> According to the Geotechnical Evaluations prepared for the proposed Project, there are no known active fault or fault traces crossing the site. The Project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, nor is it currently identified by the regulatory community as being located within zones of either primary or secondary co-seismic surface deformation (e.g., pressure ridges,</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>escarpments, or fissures). Therefore, the site is not expected to experience primary surface fault rupture or related ground deformation, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b></p> <p><b>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The closest mapped active faults to the Project site are the Newport-Inglewood and Palos Verdes Fault Zones. Because the site is located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone, significant ground shaking or secondary seismic ground deformation effects could occur at the site should a major seismic event occur along the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone. As with most areas in Southern California, damage to the proposed Belmont Pool facilities and infrastructure could be expected as a result of significant ground shaking during a strong seismic event in the region. However, the proposed Project structures would be designed and built in conformance with the most current adopted California Building Code (CBC), including seismic safety standards. Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requires the City to comply with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Evaluations and the most current CBC, which stipulates appropriate seismic design provisions that shall be implemented with Project design and construction. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to seismic ground shaking would</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.5.1: Conformance with the Project Geotechnical Studies.</b> All grading operations and construction shall be conducted in conformance with the recommendations included in the Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for the Proposed Belmont Plaza Olympic Pool Revitalization Project, prepared by MACTEC (April 14, 2009); the Geotechnical Investigation for the Temporary Myrtha Pool and Associated Improvements, Belmont Plaza Revitalization, prepared by GMU Geotechnical, Inc. (April 3, 2013); the Preliminary Geotechnical Report for the Belmont Plaza Pool Rebuild-Revitalization prepared by AESCO (April 24, 2014); and Soil Corrosivity Evaluation for the Belmont Plaza Pool Facility Rebuild/Revitalization Project, prepared by HDR Schiff (April 23, 2014), which together are referred to as the Geotechnical Evaluations. Design, grading, and construction shall be performed in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code (Title 18) and the California Building Code (CBC) applicable at the time of grading, appropriate local grading regulations, and the requirements of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final written report, subject to review and approval by the Development Services Director, or designee, prior to commencement of grading activities.</p> <p>Specific requirements in the Final Geotechnical Report shall address:</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Seismic design considerations and requirements for structures and nonstructural components permanently attached to structures</li> <li>2. Foundations including ground improvements (deep soil mixing and stone columns) and shallow foundation design</li> <li>3. Earthwork, including site preparation for structural areas (building pad) and sidewalks, pavements, and other flatwork areas; fill material; temporary excavations; and trench backfill</li> <li>4. Liquefaction</li> <li>5. Site drainage</li> <li>6. Slabs-on-grade and pavements</li> <li>7. Retaining walls</li> </ol> <p>Additional site testing and final design evaluation shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant to refine and enhance these requirements, if necessary. The City shall require the Project geotechnical consultant to assess whether the requirements in that report need to be modified or refined to address any changes in the Project features that occur prior to the start of grading. If the Project geotechnical consultant identifies modifications or refinements to the requirements, the City shall require appropriate changes to the final Project design and specifications.</p> <p>Grading plan review shall also be conducted by the City’s Development Services Director, or designee, prior to the start of grading to verify that the requirements developed during the geotechnical design evaluation have been appropriately incorporated into the Project plans. Design, grading, and construction shall be conducted in accordance with the</p>	



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	specifications of the Project geotechnical consultant as summarized in a final report based on the CBC applicable at the time of grading and building and the City Building Code. On-site inspection during grading shall be conducted by the Project geotechnical consultant and the City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.	
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.1: Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</b></p> <p>iii) <b>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The Project site is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone as designated by the California Geological Survey (CGS). The Preliminary Geotechnical Report concluded that the proposed Project would experience a high liquefaction or lateral spreading potential due to its location, historical high groundwater levels, and the presence of soil conditions common to liquefaction areas. Compliance with applicable building codes and the incorporation of the design recommendations in the final geotechnical report into final design plans would reduce potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level. See also response to Threshold 4.5.3 (Lateral Spreading and Liquefaction), below.</p>	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, above.	Less than Significant.
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.2: Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</b></p>	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, below.	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      During construction of the proposed Project, there is a potential for disruption of the soils on the entire Project site. Construction activities could potentially result in erosion and loss of topsoil. However, all excavation, trenching, and compaction activities would be performed under the observation of a qualified engineer and the Project would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards with regard to erosion control. Standard Condition 4.2.2 (Applicable Rules 403 and 402 Measures) (refer to Section 4.2, Air Quality) and Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 (Construction General Permit) (refer to Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality) would be implemented to reduce potential significant impacts related to soil erosion. Therefore, with implementation of Standard Condition 4.2.2 and Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, impacts would be considered less than significant.</p>	<p>Refer to Standard Condition 4.2.2 in Section 4.2, Air Quality, above.</p>	
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.3: Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.</b></p> <p><b>Landslides and Unstable Slopes.</b>  <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      Because the site is located in a relatively flat area, landslides or other forms of natural slope instability do not represent a significant hazard to the Project. In addition, the site is not within a State-designated hazard zone for Earthquake-Induced Landsliding. Therefore, potential impacts related to landslides would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.5.2: Corrosive Soils.</b> Prior to issuance of any building permits, the City of Long Beach (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that structural design conforms to the requirements of the geotechnical study with regard to the protection of ferrous metals and copper that will come into contact with on-site soil. In addition, on-site inspections shall be conducted during construction by the Project geotechnical consultant and/or City Building Official to ensure compliance with geotechnical specifications as incorporated into Project plans.</p> <p>The measures specified in the geotechnical study for steel pipes,</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Although no indications of landslide activity or gross slope instability were observed at the Project site, grading activities during construction would produce temporary construction slopes in some areas. Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requires that planned grading and shoring conform to the recommendations of the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (2014), which contains specific recommendations for addressing potential slope instability during construction. With implementation of these recommendations in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential impacts related to slope instability during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p><b>Lateral Spreading and Liquefaction.</b>  <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      The Project site is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone as designated by CGS. The Preliminary Geotechnical Report concluded that the proposed Project would experience a high liquefaction or lateral spreading potential due to its location, historical high groundwater levels, and the presence of soil conditions common to liquefaction areas. Compliance with applicable building codes and the incorporation of the design recommendations in the final geotechnical report into final design plans would reduce potential impacts related to liquefaction to a less than significant level. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1, potential Project impacts related to liquefaction would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> <p>The Geotechnical Evaluations determined that several feet of</p>	<p>iron pipes, copper tubing, plastic and vitrified clay pipe, other pipes, concrete, post tensioning slabs, concrete piles, and steel piles shall be incorporated into the structural design and Project plans where ferrous metals (e.g., iron or steel) and/or copper may come into contact with on-site soils.</p>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>lateral spreading toward the Pacific Ocean could occur in the event of earthquake ground motions. However, the Geotechnical Evaluations concluded that the proposed Project is feasible with implementation of the final engineering design recommendations and compliance with the most current CBC. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 requiring compliance with the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical Evaluations and the final geotechnical report would ensure that potential impacts related to lateral spreading are reduced to less than significant levels.</p> <p><b>Subsidence.</b>  <b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Water injection was begun in 1958 to repressurize the former oil field and the area has since been stabilized (MACTEC 2009) and, therefore, is not expected to result in subsidence on the Project site. As a result, subsidence-related impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Corrosive Soils.</b>  <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Corrosive soils could potentially create a significant hazard to the Project by weakening the structural integrity of the concrete and metal used to construct the building and potentially lead to structural instability.</p> <p>Laboratory testing indicates that on-site soils contain a negligible concentration of sulfates and severe concentrations of chlorides. Thus, the on-site soils should be considered severely corrosive to ferrous metals. Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 requires protection of</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>ferrous metals and copper against corrosion. Corrosion protection may include, but is not limited to, sacrificial metal, the use of protective coatings, and/or cathodic protection. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.2, potential impacts related to corrosive soils would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.5.4: Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The on-site granular soil depths of at least 8 feet are non-expansive, while the underlying clay can be classified as having a moderate expansion potential based on the assessment of the soil classifications provided in the cone penetration test logs and results of expansion index testing contained in the Geotechnical Evaluations. A non-expansive potential should, therefore, be assumed for planning purposes for the proposed structures. Impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Geology and Soil Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The Project site is in a fully built out area in which new development is infrequent. Any new development projects would also be required to meet similar engineering standards to reduce their own potential geologic impacts to a less than significant level. In addition, there are no other known activities or projects with activities that would affect the geology and soils at the Project site (e.g., projects requiring significant structural blasting or drilling,</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.5.1 and 4.5.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>high vibration activities, or deep excavation).</p> <p>As discussed above, there are no geotechnical conditions on site that would prohibit construction, and no activities associated with the Project that would contribute to any cumulative geological effects (e.g., risk of ground failure, slope failure, or settlement problems) in the Project vicinity. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.5.1 ensures that the proposed Project complies with recommendations in the Geotechnical Evaluations and Mitigation Measure 4.5.2 requires protection of ferrous metals and copper against corrosion; adherence to these measures would ensure that the Project would have a less than significant impact on Geology and Soils. Therefore, with implementation of the proposed mitigation, the Project’s geological impacts are considered less than cumulatively considerable.</p>		
<b>4.6: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> During construction of the proposed Project, greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) would be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and vendor vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. Construction emissions are typically amortized over 30 years when considering their contribution to global climate change (GCC); therefore, construction impacts are assessed as part of the long-term operation of the Project.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Long-term operation of the proposed Project would generate GHG emissions from area and mobile sources and indirect emissions from stationary sources associated with energy consumption. The proposed Project would produce an estimated 1,600 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year above the existing condition. This does not include any credits for the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification Project features that would reduce energy use and, therefore, reduce GHG emissions from the Project. Even with the existing site emissions, the proposed Project would produce approximately 2,900 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year, which would not exceed the Tier 3 criterion of 3,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year for commercial/residential projects. Therefore, operational emissions would be below the screening threshold and Project operations would be considered to have a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.2: Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The proposed Project is estimated to produce approximately 1,600 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year over existing conditions, representing approximately 0.002 million metric tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year of the State’s reduction goals. Therefore, the proposed Project is not considered to result in GHG emission levels that would substantially conflict with implementation of the GHG reduction goals under Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Executive Order (EO) S-03-05, or other State regulations. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact related to</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>potential conflicts with regulations outlined in the California Green Buildings Standard Code and GHG emissions reduction goals in AB 32. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Emission Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> A project’s GHG emissions and the resulting significance of potential impacts are more properly assessed on a cumulative basis. Thus, the Project-specific analysis conducted in Thresholds 4.7.1 and 4.7.2 is essentially already a cumulative analysis because it takes into consideration Statewide GHG reduction targets and demonstrates that the proposed Project would be consistent with those targets.</p> <p>The proposed Project emphasizes energy efficiency and water conservation and would be consistent with the AB 32 goals for 2020; the proposed Project would not generate GHG emissions that exceed any applicable threshold of significance; and the proposed Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. As a result, the proposed Project’s climate change impacts with regard to GHG emissions would not be considered cumulatively considerable because they would not contribute to GHG emissions that exceed the AB 32 Statewide goals.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed Project’s long-term operational emissions would not exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds. The proposed Project would result in a GHG emission profile that would not exceed the Tier 3</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>critерion of 3,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year for commercial/residential projects, and is lower than the service population thresholds as allowed under Tier 4 analysis (4.8 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year per service population). Additionally, since climate change is a global issue, it is unlikely that the proposed Project would generate enough GHG emissions to influence GCC on its own. Because the proposed Project would be consistent with SCAQMD’s thresholds and because the Project’s impacts alone would not cause or significantly contribute to GCC, Project-related CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions and their contribution to GCC impacts in the State would not make a significant contribution to cumulatively considerable GHG emission impacts. Therefore, the contribution of the proposed Project to potential cumulative GHG emission impacts in the City of Long Beach is considered less than cumulatively significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>According to the Wave Uprush Study, wave run-up for the high 2060 and 2100 sea level rise scenarios (2.6 ft and 5.5 ft increase in sea level, respectively), would result in a run up elevation up to 8.2 ft and 10.4 ft (or greater) at the project site. However, the modeled scenario does not account for shore protection measures such as beach nourishment, storm berm construction, or other shore protection structures. Furthermore, because the main pool deck would be elevated 17 ft above mean sea level (amsl), the pool deck would be set 8.8 ft and 6.6 ft above the projected high water level in 2060 and 2100, respectively. Additional GHG reduction strategies implemented at the State, national, and international levels could reduce sea-level rise. Therefore, impacts related to climate change and sea level rise would not be cumulatively significant.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.7: HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.1: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Construction activities would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. All potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations to ensure that the amounts of these materials present during construction would be limited and would not pose a significant adverse hazard to workers or the environment. Furthermore, the construction contractor would be required to implement standard best management practices regarding hazardous materials storage, handling, and disposal during construction in compliance with the State Construction General Permit to protect water quality (refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality). Any associated risk would be reduced to a level that is less than significant through compliance with these standards and regulations; thus, the limited use and storage of hazardous materials during construction of the proposed Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Accordingly, potential impacts associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of potentially hazardous materials during construction of the proposed Project would be less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7.1: Contingency Plan.</b> Prior to issuance of any excavation or grading permits or activities, the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD), or designee, shall review and approve a contingency plan that addresses the potential to encounter on-site unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities. The plan shall require that if construction workers encounter underground tanks, gases, odors, uncontained spills, or other unidentified substances, the contractor shall stop work, cordon off the affected area, and notify the LBFD. The LBFD responder shall determine the next steps regarding possible site evacuation, sampling, and disposal of the substance consistent with local, State, and federal regulations.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.7.2: Predemolition Surveys.</b> Prior to commencement of demolition and/or construction activities, the City LBFD, or designee, shall verify that predemolition surveys for asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead (including sampling and analysis of all suspected building materials) shall be performed. All inspections, surveys, and analyses shall be performed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations (i.e., American Society for Testing and Materials E 1527-05, and 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR], Subchapter R, Toxic Substances Control Act [TSCA], Part 716). If the predemolition surveys do not find ACMs or lead-based pipes (LBPs), the inspectors shall provide documentation of the inspection and its results to the City LBFD, or designee, to confirm that no further abatement actions are required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Based on the distance to known oil wells in the vicinity of the Project site, the potential presence of methane at the Project site is low. The low potential for encountering methane during excavation for the pool would be managed through compliance with a Contingency Plan that addresses the potential to encounter unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities that would be approved by the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD). This Contingency Plan requirement is included as Mitigation Measure 4.7.1. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1, impacts related to the potential to encounter methane during construction would be less than significant.</p> <p>A site reconnaissance survey of the site revealed that asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) may be present in subsurface building materials at the site. While the majority of the buildings on the site were previously demolished under an emergency permit (Statutory Exemption SE14-01), several subsurface structures which may contain ACMs are currently present on the site. In addition to the potential to encounter ACMs in subsurface structures present on the site, the site reconnaissance survey indicated that the tile liners of the two outdoor pools to be demolished might contain lead. Mitigation Measure 4.7.2 requires the preparation of predemolition surveys to identify the presence of ACMs and lead in the existing on-site structures and outlines precautions to ensure the materials are properly removed. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation 4.7.2, potential hazardous impacts associated with ACMs and lead would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>	<p>If the predemolition surveys find evidence of ACMs or lead, all such materials shall be removed, handled, and properly disposed of by appropriately licensed contractors according to all applicable regulations during demolition of structures (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 745, 761, and 763). Air monitoring shall be completed by appropriately licensed and qualified individuals in accordance with applicable regulations both to ensure adherence to applicable regulations (e.g., South Coast Air Quality Management District [SCAQMD]) and to provide safety to workers. The City shall provide documentation (e.g., all required waste manifests, sampling, and air monitoring analytical results) to the LBFD showing that abatement of any ACMs or lead identified in these structures has been completed in full compliance with all applicable regulations and approved by the appropriate regulatory agencies (40 CFR, Subchapter R, TSCA, Parts 716, 745, 761, 763, and 795 and California Code of Regulations Title 8, Article 2.6). An Operating and Maintenance Plan shall be prepared for any ACM or lead to remain in place and shall be reviewed and approved by the LBFD.</p> <p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, below.</p>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>There is a potential to encounter dissolved metals levels in groundwater in excess of the allowable limits for discharge to the storm drain system. This will be addressed through compliance with the applicable National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit or the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (RWQCB’s) Groundwater Discharge Permit, which would require testing and treatment (as necessary) of groundwater encountered during groundwater dewatering prior to release to the storm drain system. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, groundwater would be disposed of in the sewer system and would have to meet Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) discharge limits prior to release to the storm drain system.</p> <p>The potential that groundwater is impacted by petroleum hydrocarbons beneath the site is low. The low potential for encountering petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater during excavation for the pool would be managed through compliance with a Contingency Plan that addresses the potential to encounter unknown hazards or hazardous substances during construction activities that would be approved by the LBFD. This Contingency Plan requirement is included as Mitigation Measure 4.7.1. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.7.1, impacts related to the potential to encounter petroleum hydrocarbons in groundwater during construction would be less than significant.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Operation of the proposed Project would not include uses with the potential to generate large quantities of hazardous and/or toxic materials, and would, therefore, have less than significant impacts related to the potential to cause fires or result in serious accidents from hazardous materials and substances. Pool and building maintenance associated with the proposed Project may include the use of chemicals that can be hazardous if not properly used, stored, or disposed. However, the use, storage, and handling of these pool maintenance hazardous materials is regulated by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Building Code, the County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, the LBFD and California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA). Compliance with applicable regulations would ensure that potential hazardous material impacts associated with the operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.2: Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Threshold 4.7.1, above.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 and 4.7.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.3: Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</b></p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.7.2, above.</p> <p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, under Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, below.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      Construction activities would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials, including vehicle fuels, oils, and transmission fluids. All potentially hazardous materials would be contained, stored, and used in accordance with manufacturers’ instructions and handled in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations to ensure that the amounts of these materials present during construction would be limited and would not pose a significant adverse hazard to workers or the environment.                      Furthermore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.1 of Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, as well as Mitigation Measure 4.7.2, any associated risk would be adequately reduced to a level that is less than significant through compliance with these mitigation measures and applicable standards and regulations. Therefore, the limited use and storage of hazardous materials during construction of the proposed Project would not pose a significant hazard to the public or the environment, including the Belmont Shore Children’s Center.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed Project would not include uses with the potential to generate large quantities of hazardous and/or toxic materials and, therefore, the potential to cause fires or result in serious accidents from hazardous materials and substances during operations is less than significant. Pool and building maintenance associated with the proposed Project may include the use of chemicals that can be hazardous if not properly used, stored, or disposed. However, the use, storage, and handling of these pool maintenance hazardous materials is regulated by the EPA, the California Building Code, the County of Los Angeles Department</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>of Environmental Health, the LBFD, and Cal/OSHA. Proper routine use of these hazardous products would not result in a significant hazard to the school, residents, or workers in the vicinity of the proposed Project. The proposed Project would not produce any significant amounts of hazardous emissions; any hazardous materials on site would be handled in accordance with all applicable regulations, including containment, reporting, and remediation requirements, in the event of a spill or accidental release. Therefore, operation of the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact associated with hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.7.4: Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The Hazardous Materials Assessment (HMA) prepared for the proposed Project (refer to Appendix F of this Draft EIR) determined that the Project site is not included on any hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, including the Cortese List, and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Hazard and Hazardous Material Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> There are no known projects adjacent to or in the vicinity of the</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 and 4.7.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Project site that could be affected by on-site handling of hazardous materials or that could result in significant hazards or hazardous materials impacts on site. The contribution of hazardous materials use and hazardous waste disposal with implementation of the Project is minimal, and combined hazardous materials effects from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects within the City would not be significant. As previously stated, the proposed Project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials related to pool and building maintenance (e.g., solvents, cleaning agents, paints, pesticides, and diesel and petroleum fuels), but these products would be used in small amounts and any spills that do occur would be cleaned up when they occur. Proper and routine use of these products would not result in a significant hazard to residents or workers in the vicinity of the proposed Project.</p> <p>Impacts associated with removal of unknown hazardous materials during construction and use of hazardous materials on site would be controlled through application of the procedures set forth in Mitigation Measures 4.7.1 and 4.7.2. Accordingly, the proposed Project’s contribution to hazardous materials impacts would be less than cumulatively significant with implementation of mitigation.</p>		
<b>4.8 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.1: Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Pollutants of concern during construction include sediments, trash, petroleum products, concrete waste (dry and wet), sanitary waste, and chemicals. During construction activities, it is anticipated that</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8.1: Construction General Permit.</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach (City) shall obtain coverage for the proposed Project under the State Water Resources Control Board National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Permit No. CAS000002), as amended by Order</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>the Project site would be graded and/or excavated, resulting in exposed soil. Consequently, there would be an increased potential for soil erosion compared to existing conditions. In addition, chemicals, liquid products, petroleum products (e.g., paints, solvents, and fuels), and concrete-related waste may be spilled or leaked and have the potential to be transported via storm runoff into downstream receiving waters (i.e., the beach and, ultimately, the Pacific Ocean). Furthermore, due to the anticipated depth of excavation and the depth of groundwater, groundwater is anticipated to be encountered during excavation, which would require groundwater dewatering. Groundwater may contain high levels of total dissolved solids and other constituents that could be introduced to surface waters. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, which require compliance with the General Construction Permit and the Groundwater Discharge Permit, including implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to target pollutants of concern, would reduce potential construction impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to less than significant levels.</p> <p>Pollutants of concern during operation of the proposed on-site uses could potentially include pathogens, metals, nutrients, pesticides, organic compounds, sediment, trash and debris, oxygen-demanding substances, and oil and grease. The proposed Project would result in a permanent decrease in impervious surface area of approximately 0.5 acre (ac) and an increase in pervious area of approximately 0.5 ac. A decrease in impervious area would decrease the volume of runoff during a storm. As specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, a Standard Urban Stormwater</p>	<p>Nos. 2010-0004-DWQ and 2012-0006-DWQ (Construction General Permit), or subsequent issuance. For projects with a disturbed area of 5 or more acres, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) with construction Best Management Plans (BMPs) is required to be submitted to both the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and the City.</p> <p>The City shall provide the Waste Discharge Identification Numbers to the Development Services Director to demonstrate proof of coverage under the Construction General Permit. A SWPPP shall be prepared and implemented for the proposed Project in compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit. The SWPPP shall identify construction BMPs to be implemented to ensure that the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is minimized and to control the discharge of pollutants in storm water runoff as a result of construction activities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8.2: Dewatering During Construction Activities.</b> During project construction, the City of Long Beach Development Services Director, or designee, shall ensure that any dewatering activities during construction shall comply with the requirements of the Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties (Order No. R4-2013-0095, Permit No. CAG994004) (Groundwater Discharge Permit) or subsequent permit. This Groundwater Discharge Permit shall include submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the permit to the Los</p>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would be developed for the proposed Project, which would include the BMPs that would be consistent with the requirements of the City of Long Beach (City) Low Impact Development (LID) BMP Design Manual and would target pollutants of concern from the Project site. In addition, the SUSMP would include an operations and maintenance plan for the bioswales, drywell, filtration strip, and an underground detention basin to ensure their long-term performance. Implementation of BMPs that target pollutants of concern in runoff from the Project site, as required by Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, would reduce potential operational impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and degradation of water quality to less than significant levels.</p>	<p>Angeles RWQCB at least 45 days prior to the start of dewatering and compliance with all applicable provisions in the permit, including water sampling, analysis, and reporting of dewatering-related discharges. If dewatered groundwater cannot meet the discharge limitations specified in the Groundwater Discharge Permit, a permit shall be obtained from the Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) to discharge groundwater to the sewer per LACSD’s Wastewater Ordinance.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8.3: Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan.</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a Final Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) for the proposed Project to the Development Services Director for review and approval. Project-specific site Design, Source Control, and Treatment Control BMPs contained in the Final SUSMP shall be incorporated into final design. The BMPs shall be consistent with the requirements of the <i>Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual</i>. Additionally, the BMPS shall be designed and maintained to target pollutants of concern and reduce runoff from the Project site. The SUSMP shall include an operations and maintenance plan for the prescribed Treatment Control BMPs to ensure their long-term performance.</p>	
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.2: Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which</b></p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>permits have been granted).</p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Due to the depth of groundwater (i.e., 6 to 9 feet [ft] below existing grades) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 ft below existing grade), groundwater dewatering is anticipated to be required during removal of the remaining wooden piles, and construction of the pools. However, groundwater-dewatering activities would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can decrease infiltration during construction. However, construction activities would be temporary, and the reduction in infiltration would not be substantial. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not substantially deplete groundwater or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Construction impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Operation of the proposed Project would not require groundwater extraction. The proposed Project would not directly utilize local groundwater but would continue to use water from the local municipal supply. Additionally, the proposed Project would replace the existing facility with a similar facility. As discussed previously, the proposed Project would decrease impervious surface by 0.5 ac, which would increase infiltration. As a result, the proposed Project would not constitute interference with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Operational impacts related to groundwater supplies would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.3: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b>                      During construction, there is the potential for the drainage pattern on the Project site to be altered temporarily. During a storm event, soil erosion and sedimentation could occur at an accelerated rate. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can increase runoff during construction. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.1, which requires compliance with the requirements of the Construction General Permit and implementation of BMPs during construction, would reduce potential construction impacts related to erosion, siltation, and flooding to less than significant levels.</p> <p>There are no on-site streams or rivers. Therefore, the proposed Project would not alter the course of a stream or river.</p> <p>The proposed Project would change on-site drainage patterns by adding impervious surface areas and structures. However, flows from the Project site would continue to discharge to the existing off-site storm drain system. The proposed Project would decrease the overall impervious area by 0.5 ac and increase the pervious area by 0.5 ac, resulting in an increase in filtration. The proposed</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.3, above.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8.4: Hydrology Reports.</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, the City shall submit a final hydrology report for the proposed Project to the City Development Services Director, or designee, for review and approval. The hydrology report shall demonstrate, based on hydrologic calculations, that the proposed Project’s on-site storm conveyance and detention and infiltration facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows, including on-site detention and infiltration BMPs. In the proposed condition, the impervious surface areas would not be prone to erosion or siltation. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, which requires the implementation of Treatment BMPs to control runoff, and Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, which requires the development of a hydrology report to ensure flows would not exceed existing storm drain facilities, the proposed Project would not contribute to an increase in downstream erosion, siltation, or flooding.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.4: Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Threshold 4.8.3, above.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.8.1, 4.8.3 and 4.8.4, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.5: Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The proposed Project has the potential to introduce pollutants into the storm water drainage system through erosion, siltation, and accidental spills. In addition, grading and construction activities would compact soil, which can increase runoff during construction. Furthermore, due to the depth of groundwater (i.e., 6 to 9 ft below</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 through 4.8.4, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>existing grades) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 ft below existing grade), groundwater dewatering is anticipated to be required during the removal of the remaining wooden piles and construction of the pools. However, groundwater-dewatering activities would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. With implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, which require compliance with the General Construction Permit and the Groundwater Discharge Permit, construction impacts related to exceeding the capacity of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to less than significant levels.</p> <p>The proposed Project would decrease impervious surface area by 0.5 ac and increase the pervious area by approximately 0.5 ac, which would decrease the volume and velocity of runoff on the site. The proposed Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.3 which requires the implementation of Treatment BMPs to control runoff, and Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, which requires the development of a hydrology report to ensure flows would not exceed existing storm drain facilities, operational impacts related to exceedance of the capacity of, and providing additional sources of polluted runoff to, storm water drainage systems would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.6: Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Threshold 4.8.1, above.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures 4.8.1 and 4.8.2, above.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.8: Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.</b></p> <p><b>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 06037C1970F (September 26, 2008), the eastern half of the Project site is located within Zone A, a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) subject to inundation by the 1-percent annual chance of flood, and the western half of the Project site is located within Zone X, areas determined to be outside the 0.2-percent chance (500-year) floodplain (see Figure 4.8.3). The City is a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), which allows City property owners to obtain federally backed flood insurance. FEMA requires that all projects within Zone A enforce NFIP floodplain management regulations and purchase mandatory flood insurance. In addition, implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.5 would require a floodplain report to be prepared in order to reduce impacts to the floodplain. Compliance with City and FEMA regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.5 would ensure that the proposed Project would not expose people or structures to the risk of flooding, create floodplains, or result in an increase in the base flood elevation. Therefore, impacts associated with flood hazard areas would be less than significant.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.8.5: Floodplain Report.</b> During final design, the Project engineer shall prepare and submit a floodplain/hydrology report to the City Development Services Director, or designee, to address any potential impacts to the floodplain and, if required, reduce those impacts. The report shall comply with City and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations and shall not increase the base flood elevation by more than 1 foot. Detailed analysis shall be conducted to ensure that the Project design specifically addresses floodplain issues so that the proposed Project complies with local and FEMA regulations on floodplains.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.9: Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> According to the City 2015 Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP), three flood control dams lie upstream of the City: Sepulveda Basin, Hansen Basin, and Whittier Narrows Basin. Sepulveda and Hansen Basins lie more than 30 miles upstream from where the Los Angeles River passes through the City, which is north of the Project site. According to the Sepulveda and Hansen Dam Failure Inundation Maps, the Project site is not located within the dam inundation area. In addition, flood waters from these dam failures are expected to dissipate before reaching the City, due to low and flat ground and their distances from the City.</p> <p>The Project site is located within the dam inundation area for the Whittier Narrows Dam.<sup>1</sup> According to the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Dam Safety Program, the Whittier Narrows Dam received a Dam Safety Action Class II rating in December 2008. This rating is assigned to dams where failure could begin during normal operations or be initiated as the consequence of a natural event (e.g., an earthquake). This classification indicates that the likelihood of failure, prior to remediation, is too high to assure public safety, or that the combination of life or economic consequences with probability of</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

<sup>1</sup> City of Long Beach. 2015. City of Long Beach Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan.



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>failure is very high. However, because of the Project site’s location at the furthest point away from the Whittier Narrows Dam within the inundation area, flooding would significantly dissipate by the time it reached the Project site. In addition, the City would have ample time to notify on-site users to evacuate and on-site users would have ample time to evacuate before waters reached the Project site. Additionally, the Project does not propose the development of habitable structures on site, thereby further minimizing the risk to life and property in the event of a dam failure. Furthermore, the USACE has implemented the following Interim Risk Reduction Measures to reduce impacts to life and property in the event of dam failure: remote monitoring, inspection and monitoring, flood mapping, updating the Emergency Action Plan annually, inspecting toe drain and gallery, and initiating a Dam Safety Modification Study. The City has also developed emergency preparedness plans that would help the public be prepared for these types of emergency situations. In addition, the County of Los Angeles has regional catastrophic preparedness planning and regional evacuation routes. Therefore, because the City and County have implemented mitigation plans, emergency preparedness plans, and evacuation routes, impacts associated with the failure of a dam or levee would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.8.10: Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> According to the Geotechnical Evaluations (Appendix E of this Draft EIR) prepared for the proposed Project, the Project site is not located in the vicinity of any large enclosed bodies of water that could adversely affect the</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Project site in the event of earthquake-induced seiches. Therefore, the risk associated with possible seiche waves is not considered a potential constraint or a potentially significant impact of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>The proposed Project is adjacent to the beach and the Pacific Ocean and is within a tsunami inundation zone. Up to 900 patrons are anticipated as part of typical daily operations of the Belmont Pool. Although there could be an increase in visitors to the site during special events, the proposed Project is replacing an existing use and would not create a new risk. Additionally, the proposed Project would not increase the risk of a tsunami occurring. Furthermore, the City has adopted the 2015 Draft Hazard Mitigation Plan (as well as emergency preparedness plans) for the purpose of protecting the lives, property, and facilities of citizens, employees, businesses, industry, infrastructure, and the environment from natural hazards. In addition, the County of Los Angeles has developed regional catastrophic preparedness planning and regional evacuation routes. Therefore, the risks associated with tsunamis are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The Project site is relatively level and the absence of nearby slopes precludes any slope stability hazards. Furthermore, the site is not in a State Earthquake-Induced Landslide Hazard Zone. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to exposure of people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of inundation by mudflow, and no mitigation is required.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> As with the proposed Project, future development within the Project vicinity would be subject to NPDES and Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit requirements for both construction and operation. Each project would be required to develop a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and/or a SUSMP to target site-specific pollutants of concern. Each project would also be evaluated individually to determine appropriate BMPs to minimize impacts to surface water quality. Furthermore, because the Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay WMA are along the Pacific Ocean, there is the potential for cumulative projects, individually and cumulatively, to result in an encroachment into the 100-year flood zone, similar to the proposed Project. However, as with the proposed Project, each of the cumulative projects would be required to comply with City and FEMA regulations and prepare a Floodplain Report during final design to address any potential impacts to the floodplain, and if required, reduce those impacts. In addition, the City Development Services Director reviews all development projects on a case-by-case basis to ensure that sufficient local and regional drainage capacity is available. Thus, the proposed Project's contribution to cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than cumulatively significant.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>4.9: LAND USE AND PLANNING</b></p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.9.2: Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the General Plan,</b></p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Specific Plan, Local Coastal Program, or Zoning Ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> In November 1961, the Long Beach City Council voted to place an item in the February 1962 municipal election for the use of Tidelands funds for the construction of the “Belmont Plaza Beach Center” (now Belmont Plaza) Project, which included a swimming pool, wading pool, and public parking lot. Proposition 7 was approved by the voters in February 1962, clearing the way for the use of the site for public purposes. The City Council ratified the election results in March 1962, paving the way for site acquisition and eventual construction of the “Belmont Plaza Beach Center.”</p> <p>In January 1967, plans were approved for a group of structures at Belmont Plaza, a site west of the Belmont Pier on the beach in Belmont Shore. The Belmont Pool opened in 1968 in time for the United States (U.S.) Olympic swimming trials. The facility hosted both the 1968 and the 1976 U.S. Olympic swimming trials, as well as the 1974 and 1978 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) swimming championships. Mark Spitz, Don Schollander, and Charles Hickox set men’s records during these trials. After the 1968 trials, the Belmont Pool facility was opened to the public for recreational purposes and has remained open for public use on the site for approximately 45 years. As such, the Belmont Pool facility has long been included in applicable land use and planning documents regulating the site.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>California Coastal Commission/California Coastal Act/Local Coastal Program:</b> The proposed Project is consistent with the policies and guidelines contained in the Local Coastal Program (LCP), which states, “Belmont Plaza Pool is a facility which was designed and is utilized for Olympic-class swimming and diving events. It is, therefore, unusually important in the training of U.S. athletes for international events.”</p> <p>The policies within Chapter 3 of the California Coastal Act are intended to provide protection for suitable oceanfront lands to be used for water-oriented and recreational purposes. The proposed Project is consistent with the intent of these policies. Because the proposed Project is consistent with applicable California Coastal Act policies, impacts are considered less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>SCAG RCP:</b> The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) maintains an Intergovernmental Review Criteria List to assist agencies in determining whether a project is considered regionally significant. The proposed Project is not listed by SCAG as a project of regional significance. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in impacts related to regional planning issues, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>SCAG’s Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) aims to reduce emissions and increase mobility through strategic land use changes. The proposed Project is a replacement/expansion of previous recreational facilities and would not alter the designated or previous land uses on the Project site. Therefore, these RCP</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>strategies are not applicable to the proposed Project. No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>General Plan Land Use Element:</b> The City of Long Beach (City) General Plan land use designations for the Project site are Land Use Division (LUD) No. 7, Mixed-Use, and LUD No. 11, Open Space and Parks. According to the City’s General Plan, LUD No. 7 is intended for large vital activity centers. Combinations of land uses intended in LUD No. 7 include employment centers, visitor-serving uses, high-density residential, personal or professional services, and recreation uses. Consistent with the intent of LUD No. 7, the proposed Project includes the replacement of the former facility and construction of the new Belmont Pool complex, which is a visitor-serving recreational use. The proposed Project also includes an open space/park area (a park use), an outdoor café (a retail use) and gathering area, and public restrooms, consistent with permitted land uses as allowed within LUD No. 7. Permitted uses within LUD No. 11 include employment centers (e.g., retail, offices, and medical facilities), high-density residential uses, visitor-serving facilities, personal and professional services, and recreational uses. LUD No. 11 is intended to provide for “preserving natural habitat areas and promoting the mental and physical health of the community through recreational, cultural, and relaxation pursuits. Parks are characterized by open spaces devoted to leisure activities including the enjoyment of nature, wildlife, cultural heritage, sports, and similar activities.” The proposed Project is a visitor-serving facility and provides recreational opportunities. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with both LUD No. 7 and LUD No. 11.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>The City’s General Plan Land Use Element also contains goals and policies that are applicable to the proposed Project. Although the proposed Project’s building height would be similar to the former Belmont Pool facility, the proposed Project would require a variance to allow for the proposed 71-foot (ft) high Belmont Pool structure. However, the former Belmont Pool facilities also exceeded the Zoning Code requirement with a maximum height of 60 ft. Additionally, because the proposed Project would be a domed structure, the maximum height would only be reached at one point and several portions of the structure would be lower in height than the former Belmont Pool facility. Replacing and improving the pool facilities and related ancillary uses on the Project site would also be consistent with the existing land uses in the area and would not conflict with the recreational objectives of the existing land use designations. Further, the proposed Project would improve the character of the recreation areas and would further the objective of supporting recreation uses. The proposed Project would result in a modern aquatics facility that is Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) compliant, which would increase the overall value of the Project site as a recreational resource consistent with the designations within the General Plan Land Use Element.</p> <p>The City is currently in the process of updating its General Plan Land Use Element. Under the new Land Use Element, the proposed Project would be in an area designated for waterfront uses which, among other things, would allow for redevelopment of the Belmont Pier and Pool Complex. As such, in the event that the proposed Project is approved after the General Plan is updated, the</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>proposed Project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan land use designation for the site. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in significant land use compatibility issues with the City’s General Plan Land Use Element.</p> <p><b>General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element:</b> The City’s Open Space and Recreation Element defines the Belmont Pool complex as a special-use park because of the numerous recreational amenities and specialized aquatic uses it has provided. The proposed Project would be consistent with the objectives and policies established in the General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element for the Project area because the proposed Project would enhance recreation opportunities and facilities on the Project site. Therefore, no adverse impacts to open space and recreation amenities would result, and mitigation would not be required.</p>		
<p><b>Cumulative Land Use and Planning Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The Project site is currently designated as LUD No. 7 and LUD No. 11 by the City’s General Plan Land Use Element and General Plan Land Use Map. These land use designations allow for parks and open space and the development of a mix of commercial, recreation, and retail uses. As such, development of the proposed Project would be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations. The land use patterns around the Project site have been long established with recreational, open space, and small areas of retail (food and concession areas) development. The proposed Project involves</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>replacement of a former pool facility and would be compatible with development in the immediate area surrounding the Project site. Therefore, the construction of the new Belmont Pool facilities would not result in a potential inconsistency with the City General Plan or other land planning documents, nor would the proposed Project result in significant land use compatibility issues.</p> <p>Land use compatibility is a combination of other impacts, including potential aesthetic, air quality, noise, and traffic impacts. Potential cumulative impacts associated with traffic generation and related air quality and noise impacts are addressed in those topical sections of this Draft EIR. None of these related environmental topics were found to have significant cumulative effects. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in, or contribute to, a cumulatively significant land use impact, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<b>4.10: NOISE</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.11.1: Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b></p> <p><b>Traffic Noise.</b> Project-related traffic noise levels would have a traffic noise increase of up to 2.4 A-weighted decibels (dBA), except for Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard. Although traffic noise levels along Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard would increase by up to 7.2 dBA, this roadway segment is the entrance to the proposed Project, and there are no off-site</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.10.1:</b> Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit, the City of Long Beach’s (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that a sound engineer has designed the permanent and temporary sound systems such that the City’s exterior noise standards (daytime exterior noise level of 50 dBA L<sub>50</sub>) are not exceeded at the surrounding sensitive land uses. Measures capable of reducing the noise levels include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing the source levels;</li> <li>• Reducing the speaker elevations;</li> <li>• Directing the speakers away from adjacent noise-sensitive</li> </ul>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to this segment of the road. The traffic noise increases of up to 2.4 dBA along other roadway segments in the vicinity of the Project are less than the 3 dBA threshold normally perceptible by the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impacts would occur on off-site noise-sensitive land uses. No mitigation measures for off-site uses would be required. Also, on-site traffic noise impacts would not occur because the Project is not considered to be noise sensitive, and mitigation measures for on-site uses are not required.</p> <p><b>Long-Term Operation.</b> Noise levels generated from the outdoor pool under normal operations would be less than 50 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math> (equivalent continuous sound level measured in A-weighted decibels) at the perimeter of the facility. Noise levels generated from the indoor pool would not impact the closest residences at the Belmont Shore Condominiums, which is approximately 180 feet (ft) from the building edge of the proposed Project because the combination of building attenuation and distance attenuation would be 46 dBA. Therefore, noise generated under normal operations and from the indoor pool would not have the potential to impact nearby noise-sensitive uses.</p> <p><b>Crowd, Spectator, and Public Address System Noise.</b></p> <p>Noise levels generated from the outdoor pool during special events would have the potential to impact nearby noise-sensitive uses because these events would involve a substantial number of spectators, whistles from officiating water polo games, starting</p>	<p>land uses; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Using highly directional speakers.</li> </ul>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>horns, and the use of a public address sound system.</p> <p><b>Interior Noise.</b> Classrooms associated with the Belmont Shores Children’s Center, the residences to the northeast, and the residences to the northwest may be subject to interior noise levels from crowd noise, speaker noise, and combined noise levels, with windows and doors open. However, noise levels at the outdoor seating area would not exceed any of the City’s daytime interior standards at either the Belmont Shores Children’s Center or the two residential locations. In addition, because the proposed Project is not expected to be used after 10:00 p.m., no nighttime operational noise would occur and, therefore, no violation of the City’s nighttime noise standards would occur.</p> <p><b>Exterior Noise.</b> The playground associated with the Belmont Shores Children’s Center, the residences to the northeast, and the residences to the northwest may be subject to exterior noise levels from crowd noise. However, spectator noise levels from the temporary outdoor seating would not exceed any of the City’s daytime exterior noise levels at the Belmont Shores Children’s Center or the closest residences, therefore, no violation of the City’s daytime noise standards would occur.</p> <p>The playground associated with the Belmont Shores Children’s Center, outdoor living areas associated with residences to the northeast (across from Ocean Boulevard), and residences to the northwest (across from Termino Avenue) may be subject to exterior noise levels from speaker noise and combined noise levels from the crowd and speaker noise. Speaker noise levels would</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>potentially exceed the City’s daytime exterior standard at the playground of the Belmont Shores Children’s Center, and at the two residential locations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.10.1, which requires measures to reduce noise levels from the speakers, would reduce the combined noise level to less than the City’s exterior noise standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant after mitigation.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.11.2: Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The primary source of vibration during construction would be generated by front-end loaders, small bulldozers, dump trucks, hydraulic hammers, and pile drivers. The estimated vibration level at the closest receptors would be 0.049 inches/second and 0.097 inches/second, for residences to the northeast and northwest, respectively, and 0.101 inches/second at the Belmont Shores Children’s Center and other commercial buildings. These construction vibration levels are below the damage threshold of 0.3 inches/second for older residential buildings and 0.5 inches/second for modern industrial commercial buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.11.3: Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Project-related traffic noise levels would have a traffic noise increase of up to 2.4 dBA, except for Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard. Although traffic noise</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>levels along Bennett Avenue south of Ocean Boulevard would increase by up to 7.2 dBA, this roadway segment is the entrance to the proposed Project and there are no off-site noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to it. The traffic noise increases of up to 2.4 dBA along other roadway segments in the Project area are less than the 3 dBA threshold normally perceptible by the human ear in an outdoor environment. Therefore, no significant traffic noise impacts or permanent increase in ambient noise levels would occur in the Project vicinity or to off-site noise-sensitive land uses. No mitigation measures are required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.11.4: Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b></p> <p><b>Construction Noise.</b> Two types of short-term noise impacts would occur during Project construction.</p> <p>The first type would be from construction crew commutes and the transport of construction equipment and materials to the Project site. A high single-event noise exposure potential at a maximum level of 84 dBA <math>L_{max}</math> from trucks passing at 50 ft will exist. However, the projected construction traffic will be minimal when compared to existing traffic volumes on Ocean Boulevard and other affected streets, and its associated long-term noise level change will not be perceptible. Therefore, short-term construction-related worker commutes and equipment transport noise impacts</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.10.2.</b> Prior to issuance of demolition or grading permits, the City of Long Beach’s (City) Development Services Director, or designee, shall verify that construction and grading plans include the following conditions to reduce potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During all site excavation and grading, the construction contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards;</li> <li>• The construction contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the Project site;</li> <li>• The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging to create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the Project site during all Project construction;</li> <li>• The construction contractor shall ensure that engine idling from construction equipment (i.e., bulldozers and haul trucks)</li> </ul>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>would be less than significant.</p> <p>The second type of short-term noise impacts is related to the noise generated by heavy construction equipment operating at the Project site. The closest existing sensitive receptors would be subject to short-term noise levels that would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the Project area but would no longer occur once construction of the Project is completed. In addition, noise generated from construction activities would be intermittent and temporary. Section 8.80.202 of the City of Long Beach (City) Municipal Code allows elevated construction-related noise levels as long as the construction activities are limited to the hours specified. Adherence to the City’s noise regulations and implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.10.2 and 4.10.3, which require standard conditions for construction and conducting a preconstruction community meeting, would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors. Therefore, temporary increases in ambient noise levels in the proposed Project vicinity associated with Project construction would be reduced to less than significant levels.</p>	<p>is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes at any given time; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The construction contractor shall ensure that all construction activities are scheduled to avoid operating several pieces of heavy equipment simultaneously.</li> <li>• Construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Saturday. In accordance with City standards, no construction activities are permitted outside of these hours.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.10.3.</b> Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach Tidelands Capital Improvement Division shall hold a community preconstruction meeting in concert with the construction contractor to provide information to the public regarding the construction schedule. The construction schedule information shall include the duration of each construction activity and the specific location, days, frequency, and duration of the pile driving that will occur during each phase of the Project construction. Public notification of this meeting shall be undertaken in the same manner as the Notice of Availability mailings for this Draft Environmental Impact Report.</p>	
<p><b>Cumulative Noise Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Currently, there are no proposed or approved but not yet fully constructed projects within the cumulative noise study area for the proposed Project. Because construction noise and vibration are localized and rapidly attenuate within an urban environment, other related projects are located too far from the Project site to contribute to cumulative impacts related</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>to noise levels due to construction activities. Construction activity at any related project site would not result in a noticeable increase in noise to sensitive receptors adjacent to the proposed Project site. Furthermore, all related projects would be required to comply with the City Noise Control Ordinance. Therefore, construction impacts would be less than cumulatively significant.</p> <p>Operations associated with the proposed Project are not anticipated to lead to a substantial increase in the number of visitors and vehicles to the Project site. Therefore, the long-term ambient noise levels associated with increased traffic are not anticipated to be significant as a result of the proposed Project, would not contribute substantially to cumulative roadway noise impacts, and would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact. Also, since no cumulative projects were identified for the cumulative noise study area, the proposed Project would not contribute to off-site cumulative noise impacts from on-site activities and would have a less than cumulatively considerable noise impact.</p>		
<b>4.11: RECREATION</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.11.2: Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Construction activities would occur in close proximity to the temporary pool. However, it is anticipated that the temporary pool would remain open until completion of the new pool complex in order to accommodate the ongoing pool activities.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Although access to the Belmont Veteran’s Memorial Pier, parking lots, beach areas, and the pedestrian/bicycle path may be subject to disruption during construction of the proposed Project, Mitigation Measure 4.12.2 (see Section 4.12, Traffic and Circulation, of this Draft EIR) requires that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be implemented to ensure that construction activities do not prevent access to the Belmont Veteran’s Memorial Pier, beach access, and nearby pedestrian/bicycle path facilities in the Project vicinity. With implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, construction activities are expected to have less than significant impacts on access to the surrounding off-site recreational facilities. Therefore, even though construction staging would occur in the Beach Parking Lot, access to recreational activities would not be significantly adversely impacted during the construction phases of the Project because access to the temporary pool and recreational uses in the surrounding areas would remain available. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.2, short-term construction-related impacts on recreational resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>The proposed Project would result in construction of new recreation facilities on site to replace the previous pool facilities. The primary goal of the proposed Project is to develop a state-of-the-art aquatic facility to serve as an important recreational and competitive venue for the City, region, and State. The proposed Project would replace the previous facility with a more modern pool complex that better meets the needs of recreational and competitive swimmers, divers, and recreational pool users. The proposed Project would redesign the existing passive park and</p>		



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>open space areas to be situated along the western and northern portions of the Project site. The current passive park and open space areas occupy approximately 118,790 square feet (sf) and 45,160 sf of the site, respectively, but would increase to approximately 127,085 sf and 55,745 sf, respectively, as a result of the proposed Project. The passive park and open space areas would be intended for general park uses, similar to the uses at the existing passive park. The passive park and open space areas would also provide for linkages from the beach to the East Olympic Plaza area and other surrounding pathways, including the rerouted bicycle and pedestrian path. The modifications to the passive park and open space areas would adapt to the proposed Belmont Pool facilities while maintaining the site’s open space and recreational benefits. Therefore, no long-term significant recreational impacts related to the operation of the proposed Project are anticipated, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>California Coastal Act Policies.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Thresholds 4.9.2, under Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning.</p> <p><b>City of Long Beach General Plan, Open Space and Recreation Element.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Thresholds 4.9.2, under Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning.</p> <p><b>The City Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine Strategic Plan.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Thresholds 4.9.2, under Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning.</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Cumulative Recreation Impacts.</b> The Project site was previously developed as a community pool facility and would be replaced with similar recreational uses. The proposed Project would be consistent with the City’s General Plan policies and with California Coastal Commission policies. In addition, the proposed Project would expand the former pool amenities and integrate the existing public open space areas into the site design. As the replacement of a recreational facility, the proposed Project, in conjunction with the cumulative projects in the City, would contribute to the recreational opportunities in the City. The proposed Project is not anticipated to significantly increase the use or need for additional City park facilities. Compliance with City and California Coastal Commission policies and an increase in public amenities demonstrates the proposed Project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts on such resources.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed Project does not include any residential housing or a substantial increase in long-term employment opportunities that would increase the population in the City. Therefore, the proposed Project would not, with any other planned or proposed projects, cumulatively contribute to the increased use of or need for additional or expanded recreational facilities in the City. Based on these factors, the proposed Project would not contribute to adverse cumulative impacts related to recreation when combined with other foreseeable projects that are planned or expected to occur in Long Beach or the region.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<b>4.12 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</b>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.12.1: Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b></p> <p><b>Construction Traffic.</b> Construction traffic is not anticipated to exceed the 100 inbound and 200 outbound trips already analyzed in the a.m. peak hour or the 200 inbound and 130 outbound trips already analyzed in the p.m. peak hour that would be expected with operation of the completed pool facility. Therefore, similar to operation of the completed pool facility, intersection operation is expected to remain at an acceptable level of service (LOS) during construction. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to construction traffic, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Operational Traffic.</b> All study area intersections are anticipated to operate at LOS C or better in the future with new traffic generated as a result of the proposed Project. All study area intersections would operate at an LOS that is considered acceptable by the City of Long Beach (City) (LOS D or better). Therefore, the proposed Project is not anticipated to conflict with an applicable plan,</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12.1: Event Traffic Management Plan.</b> In the event that a large special event (defined as more than 450 spectators) is held at Belmont Pool, the City of Long Beach (City) Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop an Event Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address potential impacts to traffic circulation and the steps necessary to minimize potential impacts (e.g., active traffic management and/or off-site parking and shuttles) during the large special event.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and it would have a less than significant impact relative to this threshold. No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Special Event Traffic.</b> In the event that a large special event (i.e., any event with more than 450 spectators) is held at Belmont Pool, an Event Traffic Management Plan would need to be developed that addresses potential impacts to traffic circulation and the steps necessary to avoid potential significant traffic congestion and parking impacts. Mitigation Measure 4.12.1 requires the City to prepare and implement an Event Traffic Management Plan that requires traffic and control measures for special events to be reviewed and approved by the City Traffic Engineer. Implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.1 would reduce construction traffic impacts to the surrounding residences and businesses to less than significant levels.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.12.2: Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> None of the arterial monitoring stations identified in Appendix A of the 2010 Congestion Management Plan (CMP) for the County of Los Angeles are located near the proposed Project, and the Project is not anticipated to conflict with standards established for designated roads or highways. The proposed Project would have a less than significant</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>impact relative to the adopted CMP and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.12.5: Result in inadequate emergency access.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated.</b></p> <p><b>Construction.</b> Potential temporary lane closures could restrict access for emergency vehicles. Mitigation Measure 4.12.2 requires that a Construction Traffic Management Plan be prepared for the proposed Project, which would ensure that emergency vehicles would be able to navigate through streets adjacent to the Project site that may experience congestion due to construction activities. With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.12.2, potential impacts related to emergency access during construction would be less than significant.</p> <p><b>Operation.</b> The emergency access to/from the site will be designed to meet all applicable City Codes and standards and would be subject to review by the City Fire and Police Departments for compliance with fire and emergency access standards and requirements. The redesign of Olympic Plaza will meet fire access lane standards. The final site plan will be subject to Site Plan Review by all relevant City Departments, and Site Plan Review approval by the Planning Commission. No changes to the existing parking lots (Pier Parking Lot and Beach Parking Lot) are included as part of the proposed Project. Therefore, operational impacts of the proposed Project to emergency access are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p><b>Mitigation Measure 4.12.2: Construction Traffic Management Plan.</b> Prior to the issuance of any demolition permits, the City Parks and Recreation Director, or designee, shall develop a Construction Traffic Management Plan for review and approval by the City Traffic Engineer. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes and shall ensure that emergency vehicle access is maintained. The plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles shall use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, and off-site staging areas. The plan shall also require that a minimum of one travel lane in each direction on Ocean Boulevard be kept open during construction activities. Access to Belmont Veterans’ Memorial Pier, the Shoreline Beach Bike Path, and the beach shall be maintained at all times. The Construction Traffic Management Plan shall also require that access to the pier, the bike path, and the beach be kept open during construction activities. The plan shall also require the City to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>Threshold 4.12.6: Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> The proposed Project reconstructs the Belmont Pool at the existing location, which is near a public transit stop and a Class I bike path. Existing pathways through the passive park would be rerouted to East Olympic Plaza to allow for utilization of the proposed pedestrian and bicycle enhancements. The facility would continue to be accessible for users of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian modes of travel because the site design allows for pedestrian linkages. The proposed pool facility would continue to be accessed via Long Beach Transit bus service (Routes 121 and 131) as well as sidewalks and the Shoreline Beach Bike Path (Class I off-street bike path). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with adopted plans supporting alternative transportation. The proposed Project would have less than significant impacts relative to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and no mitigation is required.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p><b>Cumulative Traffic/Traffic Impacts.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> According to the City, one project was identified within the cumulative Project study area; the Leeway Sailing Center Pier Replacement. The City proposes to demolish and rebuild the existing Leeway Sailing Pier, Dock, and Gondola Shed Structure in its general same location and footprint. The existing gondola shed structure will be replaced in its general same location on the pier and will provide the same uses. A new</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>80-foot (ft) accessible gangway will connect the pier to a new 2,094-square-foot (sf) timber floating dock to improve Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) access. This project is proposing to reconstruct the existing pier without expanding the size of the existing operation. Therefore, this project will not contribute new traffic to any of the study area intersections. Because no additional traffic from cumulative projects is anticipated at the study area intersections, no additional cumulative operational traffic impacts would occur. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>4.13: UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b></p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.1: Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Wastewater from the Project site would be treated at the Los Angeles County Sanitation District’s (LACSD) Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). LACSD’s JWPCP is responsible for adhering to Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulations as they apply to wastewater generated by the Project. As discussed in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, due to the depth to groundwater (between 6 and 9 ft below ground surface [bgs]) and the anticipated depth of excavation (up to 13 feet [ft] below existing grade), there is a potential for the groundwater table to be encountered during excavation, which may require groundwater dewatering. As specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.2, any groundwater dewatering during excavation would be conducted in accordance with the Los Angeles RWQCB’s Groundwater Discharge Permit, which would require testing and treatment (as</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.2, under Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, above.</p>	

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>necessary) of groundwater encountered during groundwater dewatering prior to release to a storm drain. If groundwater used during construction of the proposed Project cannot meet discharge limitations specified in the Ground Water Discharge Permit, a permit would be obtained from LACSD to dispose of the groundwater in the sewer system. The groundwater would have to meet LACSD discharge limitations prior to discharge to the sewer system. In addition, LACSD would ensure they have adequate capacity to accommodate the discharged groundwater prior to issuing a permit. Therefore, since the capacity and discharge limitations of the treatment facility that serve the Project would not be exceeded, impacts regarding the ability of the treatment facility to treat and dispose of wastewater would be less than significant, and no mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>The proposed Project would comply with all applicable sections of Title 15, Public Utilities, of the City of Long Beach Municipal Code (LBMC), and as such, would generate wastewater flows typical of similar uses in the City. In addition, the Project site has been developed with a recreational pool facility for approximately 45 years and has been provided wastewater service during that time. Although the proposed Project expands the size of the existing pool structure, the proposed Project would not produce wastewater atypical of flows received at the LACSD’s JWPCP previously received from the Project site. Therefore, the proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or the expansion of existing facilities and would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the</p>		



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Project’s projected demand in addition to existing commitments. Thus, Project impacts related to exceeding wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable RWQCB are considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.2: Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</b> <b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Threshold 4.13.4 and 4.13.5, below.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.3: Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.</b>  <b>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> The proposed Project would result in a permanent decrease in impervious surface area of 0.5 acre (ac) and an increase of 0.5 ac in pervious area. As a result, in the proposed condition, the Project site would consist of 1.6 ac of impervious surface area and 4.2 ac of pervious surface. A decrease in impervious area would decrease the volume of runoff during a storm. The proposed Project would also include a comprehensive drainage system to convey on-site storm flows, including on-site detention and infiltration systems. A detailed hydrology report would be prepared for the proposed Project to ensure that the on-site storm drain facilities are designed in accordance with the requirement of the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works Hydrology Manual to ensure that the runoff from the project site does not exceed existing conditions</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, under Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>(refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.4 in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality). With implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.4, runoff from the Project site would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system and the proposed Project would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. Therefore, impacts related to new or expanded storm water facilities would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure 4.8.4.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.4: Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or require new or expanded entitlements.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> A short-term demand for water would occur during construction associated with excavation, grading, and other construction-related activities on the Project site. The temporary demand for water supplies for soil watering (fugitive dust control), clean up, masonry, and other related activities is not anticipated to result in water demand atypical of the size and scale of this construction Project. Therefore, impacts associated with short-term construction activities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The Long Beach Water Department (LBWD) provided water services to the previous pool complex and pool facilities. Proposed water service to the Project site would include a connection to an existing 6-inch line which connects to an existing water main under East Olympic Plaza. No new off-site water mains or laterals</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>would be required to serve the proposed Project.</p> <p>The proposed Project would replace and update the former pool facility, resulting in an increase of 18,040 square feet (sf) of surface water (from a previous surface area of 18,410 sf total to the proposed 36,450 sf) and an additional 79,905 sf of building area, each of which would require a periodic increase in water service/supply. The increase in water demand associated with the proposed Project represents approximately 0.027 percent of the LBWD water supply in 2015. Given that the proposed Project is not changing the land use on the Project site and due to the relatively small increase in water demand, the increase in water demand attributable to the proposed Project is anticipated to fall within the available and projected water supplies of the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The proposed Project would not necessitate new or expanded water entitlements or infrastructure as significant increases in water demands would not result from the proposed Project. In addition, like all new development in California, the proposed Project would comply with State law regarding water conservation measures, including pertinent provisions of Title 24 of the California Government Code (Title 24) regarding the use of water-efficient appliances. The proposed Project would also incorporate additional water conservation measures and would be built to meet the standards associated with the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold rating, which includes features that would greatly enhance water conservation (see Section 3.0, Project Description, of this Draft EIR). Therefore, because it is anticipated that the increase in water demand attributable to the proposed</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Project would fall within the available and projected water supplies of the 2010 UWMP and the proposed Project would incorporate additional water conservation features, impacts associated with the long-term operation of the proposed Project would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Furthermore, with the payment of fees pursuant to Chapter 18.23 of the Fire Code and the implementation of applicable building code requirements in accordance with the California Fire Code, including fire flow requirements, the City of Long Beach (City) Fire Department (LBFD) would be able to maintain acceptable performance ratios and fire flow requirements without requiring a new fire protection facility or expansion to the existing fire protection facility. Potential impacts related to fire flow would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.5: Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b>  <b>Construction.</b> No significant increase in wastewater flows is anticipated as a result of construction activities on the Project site. As discussed above under Threshold 4.13.1, if dewatered groundwater cannot be disposed of in the storm drain system, a permit would be obtained from LACSD to dispose of the groundwater to the sewer system. Groundwater-dewatering activities would be temporary, and the volume of groundwater removed would not be substantial. In addition, LACSD would ensure they have adequate capacity to accommodate the discharged</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>groundwater prior to issuing a permit. Therefore, during construction, potential impacts to wastewater treatment and wastewater conveyance infrastructure would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Operation.</b> The anticipated increase in daily wastewater flow from the proposed Project would require approximately 0.33 percent of the existing available design capacity of the Anaheim Street Trunk Sewer and 0.27 percent of the existing available design capacity Joint Outfall C Unit Trunk Sewer. Both trunk sewers have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated wastewater flows from the proposed Project. As such, the proposed Project is not anticipated to cause a substantial increase in wastewater flows at a point where, and a time when, a sewer’s capacity is already constrained or that would cause a sewer’s capacity to become constrained. Impacts upon the local wastewater infrastructure system would, therefore, be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Wastewater Treatment.</b> The anticipated increase in daily wastewater flow that would result from Project implementation would represent 0.06 percent of the anticipated available daily capacity of the JWPCP. The anticipated increase in daily wastewater flow from the proposed Project could be accommodated within the existing design capacity of the JWPCP. The proposed Project would not substantially or incrementally exceed the current or future scheduled capacity of the JWPCP by generating flows greater than those anticipated. In addition, the projected wastewater flow calculations for the proposed Project do not account for the implementation of water conservation measures</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>proposed by the City, which would further reduce wastewater flows beyond the projections noted above. Potential Project impacts related to wastewater treatment would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.6: Be served by a landfill with insufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Construction of the new Belmont Pool facilities would generate construction and demolition waste, including, but not limited to, soil, wood, asphalt, concrete, paper, glass, plastic, metals, and cardboard. The total amount of construction and demolition of waste that would be generated by the proposed Project has not been determined; however, the Project is required to comply with the City’s 2007 Ordinance requiring that at least 60 percent of construction and demolition waste be recycled. In order to comply with the City’s Ordinance, the City would implement a Construction &amp; Demolition (C&amp;D) Debris Recycling Program. In accordance with the C&amp;D Debris Recycling program, a Waste Management Plan (WMP) must be completed. The WMP would detail how the Project will meet the requirement to divert 60 percent of construction and demolition waste through recycling, salvage, or deconstruction. At the conclusion of the Project, a final report detailing the amount of reuse, recycling, and disposal actually generated from the proposed Project must be submitted and approved by the City’s Development Services Department.</p> <p>Solid waste generated by construction of the proposed Project</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>would be served by Southeast Resource Recovery Facility (SERRF), which currently has sufficient permitted capacity. Solid waste generated during construction of the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts related to landfill capacity or prevent compliance with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, impacts related to short-term construction and demolition waste would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>The Project site was previously developed with the former Belmont Pool facilities. Based on the California Emission Estimator Model (CalEEMod), the total solid waste that would be generated during Project operation was estimated at 2.01 tons per day, which is an increase of 1.01 tons per day from the former uses.</p> <p>The Solid Waste Facility Permit from the County of Los Angeles Solid Waste Management Program for the SERRF authorizes the disposal of a maximum of 2,240 tons of waste per day. Currently, the SERRF accepts approximately 1,290 tons of waste per day. The anticipated increase in solid waste disposal attributable to the proposed Project would require 0.11 percent of the available daily disposal capacity at SERRF. The Mesquite Landfill is authorized to accept approximately 20,000 tons of waste per day. The anticipated increase in solid waste disposal attributable to the proposed Project would require 0.005 percent of the available daily disposal capacity at the Mesquite Landfill. Therefore, both SERRF and the Mesquite Landfill have adequate capacity to serve the proposed Project, and impacts related to operational solid waste</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b>Compliance with Federal, State, and Local Statutes and Regulations related to Solid Waste.</b> Waste diversion for the proposed Project is anticipated to be consistent with other similar development within the City and divert a high percentage of trash from landfills based on compliance with standard City practices and regulations. In addition, the City would be required to implement a C&amp;D program during construction. The City’s C&amp;D Debris Recycling Program required at least 60 percent of C&amp;D waste (e.g., concrete, metals, and asphalt) to be recycled.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed Project would include on-site recycling containers and adequate storage area for such containers. All containers and storage areas on the Project site would be sized in accordance with the applicable provisions in the LBMC, including Sections 8.60.025 and 8.60.020, which establish standards and guidelines regarding refuse and recycling receptacles. Based on these considerations, the proposed Project would be consistent with the State Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991. No mitigation is required.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.7: Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b> Refer to the impact discussion under Threshold 4.13.6, above.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.8: Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g., water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetland), the operation of which could result in significant</b></p>	Refer to Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, under Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, above.	Less than Significant.



**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p><b>environmental effects (e.g., increased vectors and odors). Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> As discussed in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, treatment Best Management Practices (BMPs) are anticipated to include biofiltration swales (bioswales), filtration strip, an underground detention basin, and a drywell. In addition, as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3, a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would be prepared for the proposed Project. The SUSMP would include an operations and maintenance plan for the bioswales, drywell, filtration strip, and an underground detention basin to ensure their long-term performance and prevent odor and vector issues from developing. Because the BMPs would be designed, inspected, and maintained as specified in Mitigation Measure 4.8.3 to prevent vectors and odors, impacts related to operation of storm water BMPs would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>		
<p><b>Threshold 4.13.9: Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered energy transmission facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service.</b></p> <p><b>Less than Significant Impact.</b></p> <p><b>Electricity.</b> New development on site would result in an increase in long-term demand for electricity. However, because the Project site is currently served by all utilities and has previously operated with the same land use as proposed, no new off-site service lines or substations would be required to serve the proposed Project.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less than significant.</p>

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>In May 2013, the California Energy Commission (CEC) published preliminary California Energy Demands for the years 2014 through 2024. Based on CEC projections for the Southern California Edison (SCE) service area in 2024, the anticipated increase in Project-related annual electricity consumption would represent approximately 0.0004 percent of the forecasted net energy load. Based on these estimates, sufficient transmission and distribution capacity exists, and off-site improvements would not be necessary.</p> <p>The supply and distribution of electricity to the proposed Project would not disrupt power to the surrounding area or adversely affect service levels because the Project involves the continuation of a previous land use. Therefore, impacts related to the provision of electricity services to the proposed Project would be less than significant, and the proposed Project would not require new or physically altered transmission facilities (other than those facilities needed for on-site distribution and hook-up into the existing system). Similarly, no significant impacts to local or regional supplies of electricity would occur as a result of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is necessary.</p> <p><b>Natural Gas.</b> The proposed Project, which has a larger building area than the former pool complex, would result in an increase in long-term demand for natural gas. However, no new off-site service lines or substations would be required to serve the proposed Project.</p> <p>The proposed Project would generate an annual natural gas</p>		

**Table 1.B: Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts, Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions, and Level of Significance**

Potential Environmental Impact	Project Design Features, Mitigation Measures, Standard Conditions	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>demand of 0.00229 billion cubic feet (bcf) per year, which is an increase of 0.00133 bcf per year. According to the 2014 California Gas Report, the City’s gas use is expected to remain relatively constant, increasing from 9.0 bcf in 2014 to 9.6 bcf by 2035. Therefore, the increase in annual natural gas demand associated with the proposed Project would be a negligible percent of the estimated available withdrawal capacity of Long Beach Gas &amp; Oil (LBGO) in 2035. Consequently, the supply and distribution of natural gas within the area surrounding the proposed Project would not be reduced or inhibited as a result of the proposed Project, and levels of service to off-site users would not be adversely affected. Furthermore, the proposed Project would reduce natural gas consumption through the installation of high-efficiency direct fire heating and pool blankets.</p> <p>Therefore, impacts related to the provision of natural gas services to the proposed Project would be less than significant, and the proposed Project would not require new or physically altered transmission facilities (other than those facilities needed for on-site distribution and hook-up into the existing system). Similarly, no significant impacts to local or regional supplies of natural gas would occur as a result of the proposed Project, and no mitigation is required.</p>		

**This page intentionally left blank**