

II. Corrections and Additions



II. Corrections and Additions to the Draft EIR

This section of the Final EIR provides changes to the Draft EIR that have been made to clarify, correct, or add to the environmental impact analysis for the 2nd & PCH Project (Project). Such changes are a result of public and agency comments received in response to the Draft EIR and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. The changes described in this section do not result in any new or increased significant environmental impacts that would result from the Project. This section is divided into two parts: Section II.A, Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices, and Section II.B, Effect of Corrections and Additions.

A. Corrections and Additions to Draft EIR Sections and Appendices

Additional changes have been made to the Draft EIR based on comments and/or new information that has become available since publication of the Draft EIR. Deletions are shown with ~~striketrough~~ and additions are shown with underline. Such changes are presented by EIR section and are limited to a handful of Draft EIR sections.

I. Executive Summary

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-17, Table I-1, revise the fourth row of section K, Traffic and Access, as follows:

Construction—Public Transit	Less Than Significant <u>with Mitigation</u>
-----------------------------	----------------------------------------------

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-33, revise the first paragraph as follows:

As described in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, Project construction would commence with demolition of the existing hotel and associated amenities and surface parking areas, followed by grading and limited excavation for the placement of building footings. Building foundations would then be laid, followed by building construction, paving/concrete installation, and landscape installation. Project construction is anticipated to

occur over approximately 18-16 months with anticipated completion in 2019. Grading of the Project Site would require up to approximately 1,545 cubic yards of soil export (including export related to soil remediation).

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-44, add the following text to the first paragraph under Subsection c, Project Design Features:

The following project design features pertaining to air quality which are required in compliance with regulatory requirements would be implemented as part of the Project. Additional project design features and mitigation are set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR which also would serve to reduce air emissions.:

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-46, revise the first full paragraph as follows:

With regards to operational impacts, regional emissions from operation of the Project would exceed the SCAQMD daily threshold for NO_x. Therefore, the Project would result in a significant operational impact associated with regional emissions. It is noted that operational mobile criteria pollutant emissions make up a majority of these regional operational emissions. The average daily trips used to generate mobile criteria pollutant emissions are based on the Project's trip-generation estimates included in the Traffic Study (see Appendix R of this Draft EIR). The analysis of mobile emissions presented herein also incorporates vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction measures provided in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR (e.g., site-specific benefits resulting from the proposed mix of uses). These measures would reduce VMT by approximately 25-57 percent, as shown in Revised Table IV.E-12, as updated in the Final EIR in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. Also, the Project would incorporate project design features and mitigation to support and promote environmental sustainability as discussed further in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. While these features are designed primarily to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, they would also serve to reduce criteria air pollutants described herein. Similarly, project design features set forth in Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, of this Draft EIR would reduce VMT, thereby reducing NO_x emissions. No other project design features or feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce-substantially lessen the Project's operational impact associated with regional emissions. Therefore, Project impacts associated with regional operational emissions of NO_x would remain significant and unavoidable.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-46, revise the first sentence of the final paragraph as follows:

As discussed above, the Project would include project design features and mitigation measures provided in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions and ~~mitigation measures provided in Section IV.K, Traffic and Access,~~ of this Draft EIR that would serve to reduce air pollutant emissions.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-52, revise Mitigation Measures C-5 and C-6 as follows:

Mitigation Measure C-5: The Project Applicant shall allow access to the Project Site by a certified Native American tribal monitor during any and all ground-disturbing activities (including but not limited to pavement removal, post holing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching) to protect any cultural resources which may be affected during construction or development. Discovery of any archaeological resources shall trigger implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

Mitigation Measure C-6: Archaeological testing by a qualified archaeologist shall be conducted concurrently with geotechnical core testing for building foundations using hollow bits; the use of augur bits shall be prohibited. Discovery of any archeological resources shall trigger Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-56, revise the first sentence of the second paragraph of Subsection (1), Construction Impacts, as follows:

As presented in Table IV.E-5, construction of the Project is estimated to generate a total of 2,437–2,069 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent mass (MTCO₂e).

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-59, add the following CAPCOA measures after LUT-4:

Increase Transit Accessibility (LUT-5): Locating a project with high density near transit will facilitate the use of transit by people traveling to or from the Project Site. CAPCOA provides a range of effectiveness between 0.5 – 24.6

percent reduction in VMT for transit station/stops with high-quality, high-frequency bus service located within a 5-10 minute walk. The Project Site is well serviced by Long Beach Transit which operates 10 bus lines in the Project area and provides free Passport shuttle service connecting visitors to and around Downtown Long Beach attractions and destinations. However, the GHG analysis conservatively did not quantify the reduction from transit as the transit station is located at a distance greater than a 5-10 minute walk.

Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane (LUT-8): A Project that is designed around an existing or planned bicycle facility encourages alternative mode use. The Project Site is located adjacent to existing Class II bike lanes on PCH, Marina Drive, and 2nd Street. CalEEMod does not provide this measure under mitigation and, therefore, it was not quantified in the GHG analysis. However, CAPCOA provides a 0.625 percent reduction in VMT for this measure.

Improve Walkability Design (LUT-9): Improved design elements to enhance walkability and connectivity within a neighborhood include street accessibility and a pedestrian-oriented environment. CAPCOA provides a range of effectiveness between 3.0 – 21.3 percent reduction in VMT. The Project Site is located in an area of the City with a mature network of pedestrian facilities including sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian safety features along PCH, Marina Drive, and 2nd Street. The existing sidewalk system within the Project vicinity provides direct connectivity to the existing shopping center to the immediate south and public transit stops along PCH and 2nd Street. CalEEMod requires the number of intersections within a square mile of the Project Site, which is 46 intersections. This number was then doubled to account for the adjacent marina which would provide additional walking opportunities. (Note: This measure results in a 14.1-percent reduction in VMT.)

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-60, revise measure SDT-1 as follows:

Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements (SDT-1): Project design would provide pedestrian access that minimizes barriers and links the Project Site with the existing street

network to encourage people to walk instead of drive. The Project would provide direct access to the existing off-site pedestrian network to encourage and increase pedestrian activities in the area, which would further reduce VMT and associated transportation-related emissions. (Note: This measure results in a ~~0.6~~ 3.6-percent reduction in VMT.)

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-60, add the following CAPCOA measures and paragraph after measure SDT-1:

Proximity to Traffic Calming Measures (SDT-2): Providing traffic calming measures encourages people to walk or bike instead of using a vehicle. CAPCOA provides a range of effectiveness between 0.25 – 1.0 percent reduction in VMT. As discussed above, the City is undertaking the Marina Drive Project which will include a mid-block pedestrian crossing adjacent to the 2nd & PCH frontage; new sidewalk where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks thereby providing a continuous sidewalk on the east side between 2nd Street and Studebaker Road. This measure was not quantified in the Draft EIR. CalEEMod requires the percentage of streets with sidewalks (100 percent) and the percentage of intersections (25 percent) with improvements (e.g., cross walks or other pedestrian safety features) in the Project vicinity. (Note: This measure results in a 0.2-percent reduction in VMT.)

Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects (SDT-6): A non-residential project that provides bicycle parking facilities encourages alternative mode use. Bicycle parking spaces for the Project would be provided in compliance with LBMC requirements. Based on LBMC Section 21.64.030(B)(2)(c), a minimum of eight bicycle parking spaces would be required. CalEEMod does not provide this measure under mitigation and, therefore, it was not quantified in the GHG analysis. However, CAPCOA provides a 0.625 percent reduction in VMT for this measure.

Limit Parking Supply (PDT-1): Reducing the number of parking spaces can encourage “smart growth” development and alternative transportation choices. As discussed in Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, of the Draft EIR, that the Project would provide parking at a reduced rate

relative to LBMC parking requirements. Specifically, LBMC Chapter 21.41, *Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements*, sets forth parking requirements for development projects based on the types and floor area of land uses. As detailed therein, community, regional, and neighborhood shopping centers require five spaces per 1,000 square feet plus additional parking for detached fast-food restaurants. Based on the Parking Analysis included as Appendix S of the Draft EIR, the proposed 1,150 parking spaces included in the Project (providing a ratio of approximately 4.7 per 1,000 gross square feet of floor area) would be adequate to meet Project-generated parking demand. (Note: This measure results in a 3.0-percent reduction in VMT.)

In addition, Project Design Feature K-8 would require implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage the use of public transit. These measures include the provision of appropriate bicycle parking facilities; vanpool/carpool loading/unloading and parking areas; preferential parking spaces for employee carpool/vanpool vehicles; a bulletin board/kiosk displaying information regarding bus schedules and routes, bike routes, carpool/vanpool opportunities; and a rideshare drop off/pickup area and concierge service that would be incorporated into the Project's design. Although a specific reduction in trips associated with these TDM measures has not been determined, a reasonable conservative estimate based on similar TDM plans would be a 10-percent reduction in trips.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-60, revise the first full paragraph as follows:

CalEEMod calculates VMT based on the type of land use, trip purpose, trip type percentages for each land use subtype in the project (primary, diverted, and pass-by). As shown in Revised Table IV.E-9, in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR as updated in the Final EIR, the Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would result in a total ~~10,609~~ 6,785 MTCO₂e per year as compared to 14,222 MTCO₂e per year for a standard project with similar land use characteristics within the air basin. This would represent a reduction of approximately ~~25~~ 52 percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario. This reduction from the NIERM scenario is attributable to the Project characteristics described above.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-61, revise the first paragraph of Subsection (3), Combined Construction and Operational Impacts, as follows:

As shown in Revised Table IV.E-12 in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, as updated in the Final EIR, when taking into consideration implementation of project design features provided throughout this Draft EIR, including the requirements set forth in the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance and the full implementation of current state mandates, the GHG emissions for the Project in 2019 would equal 81-69 MTCO₂e per year during construction and 44,033-10,011 MTCO₂e per year during operation of the Project with a combined total of 44,114-10,080 MTCO₂e per year.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-62, revise the paragraph in Subsection (4), NIERM Calculation, as follows:

Revised Table IV.E-12, as updated in the Final EIR, in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR calculates the GHG emissions that would occur under the NIERM scenario, which highlights the GHG emissions reductions achieved by regulatory requirements and design features. As shown in Table IV.E-12, the Project would result in a decrease in GHG emissions that represents an approximate 23-46-percent reduction from the NIERM scenario. The Project includes project design features and is subject to all applicable regulatory requirements that would reduce the Project's GHG emissions profile and would represent improvements vis-à-vis the NIERM scenario. These reductions in GHG emissions reflect the measures set forth in the applicable GHG reduction plans and policies and demonstrate the efficacy of these measures.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-63, revise the first paragraph as follows:

As shown in Revised Table IV.E-12 in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project would result in 14,114 MTCO₂e annually. The breakdown of emissions by source category shows approximately less than 1 percent from area sources; 20-28 percent from energy consumption; 76-67 percent from mobile sources; 3-5 percent from solid waste generation; 1 percent from water supply, treatment, and distribution; and less than 1 percent from construction activities. Provided in Table IV.E-13 in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR is an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category to determine how the Project's design features

comply with or exceed the reduction actions/strategies outlined in the *Climate Change Scoping Plan*.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-63, revise the second to last sentence of the second full paragraph as follows:

As shown in Revised Table IV.E-9, as updated in the Final EIR, in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, the Project results in a VMT reduction of approximately 28-57 percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario and a 25-52-percent reduction in GHG emissions from mobile sources and would be consistent with the reduction in transportation emission per capita provided in the 2016-2040 RTP/SCS.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-68, revise the Transportation Measures as follows:

Transportation Measures

- Provide bike parking on-site to reduce vehicle trips.
- Provide preferred parking for clean air, van pools, and fuel efficiency vehicles to encourage clean air vehicle use.
- Provide pre-wiring for electric vehicles in 3 percent of parking spaces on-site as required by the Green Building Standards Code (LBMC Chapter 18.47). (Refer to Project Design Features E-2 and E-3 for details.)

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-69, add the following sentence and project design features:

In addition, the following specific measures have been included to reduce GHG emissions:

Project Design Feature E-1: The design of new buildings shall incorporate features of the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) program to be capable of meeting the standards of LEED® Certified or equivalent green building standards. Specific sustainability features integrated into the Project design to enable the Project to achieve the

LEED® Certified level shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The Project's design shall make use of passive solar energy through appropriate building orientation and landscaping; minimizing heating during cool seasons and solar heat gain during hot seasons; and enhancing natural ventilation by taking advantage of prevailing winds.
- Utilize a paint and surface color palette that emphasizes light and off-white colors that reflect heat away from buildings.
- Provide education regarding energy efficiency to tenants, employees, and customers. Provide information on energy management services for large energy users.
- Provide energy storage where appropriate to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Increase insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized.
- Limit air leakage through the structures and/or within the heating and cooling distribution system(s).
- Install energy-efficient space heating and cooling equipment.
- Install electrical hook-ups at loading dock areas.
- Install dual-paned or other energy efficient windows.
- Install automatic devices to turn off lights when they are not needed.

Project Design Feature E-2: Upon buildout of the Project, at least 25 percent of the total code-required parking spaces provided for all types of parking facilities shall be capable of supporting future electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). Plans shall indicate the proposed type and location(s) of EVSE and also include raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to simultaneously charge all electric vehicles at all designated EV charging locations at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based upon Level 2 or greater EVSE at its maximum operating capacity. Only raceways and related components are required to be

installed at the time of construction. A label stating “EV CAPABLE” shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the service panel or subpanel and next to the raceway termination point.

Project Design Feature E-3: Upon buildout of the Project, at least 5 percent of the total code-required parking spaces shall be equipped with EV charging stations and/or outlets for plugin. Plans shall indicate the proposed type and location(s) of charging stations. Plan design for charging stations shall be based on Level 2 or greater EVSE at its maximum operating capacity.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-69, add the following in Subsection d, Mitigation Measures:

With implementation of the Project’s design, sustainability, site, and land use characteristics, combined with compliance with regulatory requirements, including those discussed above, impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measure would be incorporated into the Project to further reduce GHG emissions:

Mitigation Measure E-1: Upon buildout of the Project, the Project shall provide a minimum of 250 kilowatts of photovoltaic panels on the Project Site.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-69, add the following in Subsection e, Level of Significance After Mitigation:

Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant. The proposed mitigation measure would further reduce such impacts by 96 MTCO₂e per year.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-73, revise the final sentence of the first full paragraph as follows:

Other potential hazards associated with known and possible unknown oil wells include the sudden release of methane ~~or hydrogen sulfide~~ gas from a well that is disturbed during construction.

Section I, Executive Summary, pages I-77 and I-78, strike the following language from Mitigation Measure F-3:

Mitigation Measure F-3: Soil Vapor Survey. Prior to construction, the Project Applicant shall conduct a systematic soil vapor survey of the Project Site to investigate the possible presence of volatile organic compounds in site soils. The soil vapor survey shall be performed according to the applicable standards of the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Environmental Protection Agency. Soil borings shall be placed at a depth of at least five (5) feet below the deepest excavation to occur during construction and soil vapor samples shall be collected at 5 to 10 foot intervals. Soil samples shall be collected at a five (5) foot interval from the soil borings to assess the soil for heavier petroleum hydrocarbons that may be present due to past oil field use of the Project Site. The Soil Vapor Survey shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) Evaluation of methane and ~~hydrogen sulfide~~ concentrations to a depth of at least five (5) feet below the deepest excavation to occur during site construction. These soil vapor boring shall be placed in the vicinity of any abandoned oil wells located during the geophysical survey; and
- (2) Additional soil vapor borings to test for volatile organic compounds on and in the vicinity of the land area where the former on-site gas station was located and in locations where the off-site gas station may have impacted the Project Site through lateral migration of soil vapors.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-111, revise Mitigation Measure I-1 as follows:

Mitigation Measure I-1: During the site demolition phase, a temporary and impermeable sound barrier shall be erected along the Project Site's northwestern and northeastern property line-lines between the construction area and ~~the residential uses located north of 2nd Street~~ nearby sensitive uses. The temporary sound barrier shall be a minimum of six feet tall and extend for a length of approximately 860 feet (specifically, 200 feet along Marina Drive south from 2nd Street, approximately 460 feet along 2nd Street, and 200 feet along Pacific Coast

Highway south from 2nd Street. The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a 5 dBA noise reduction at the residential uses to the northwest (Receptor R1) and the wetlands area to the northeast.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-123, revise the impact summary for Intersection No. 24 as follows:

- Intersection No. 24: Pacific Coast Highway at Main/Bolsa Avenue (LOS-~~E C~~-P.M.)

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-137, add the following bullet point at the end of Project Design Feature K-8:

- Provide a designated rideshare drop off/pickup area and concierge service to facilitate and encourage the use of rideshare programs.

Section I, Executive Summary, page I-137 and I-138, revise Mitigation Measure K-1 as follows:

Mitigation Measure K-1: Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant shall provide for the preparation of a detailed Construction Management Plan, including haul routes and a staging plan, and submit it to the City of Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau for review and approval. The Construction Management Plan would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.
- Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e. lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Project Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project.

- Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets.
- Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.
- Hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends or Federal holidays.
- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.
- Construction-related parking and staging of vehicles shall occur on-site to the extent possible, but may occur on nearby public parking lots, as approved by the City Engineer.
- The Construction Management Plan shall meet standards established in the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD) as well as City of Long Beach requirements.
- During periods when the public right-of-way is affected by Project construction activities, coordinate with the City of Long Beach and Long Beach Transit to ensure the provision of safe pedestrian and bicycle access and the temporary relocation of any affected transit stops, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and as feasible.

Section I, Executive Summary, pages I-139 through I-141, revise Mitigation Measures K-2 through K-12 as follows:

Mitigation Measure K-2: Intersection No. 8: Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps—Widen and restripe the westbound approach to provide a third westbound left-turn lane. Widen and restripe the southbound approach of Studebaker Road to provide a third southbound

through lane. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition at the on/off ramp and along the west side of Studebaker Road. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-3: Intersection No. 12: Studebaker Road at Loynes Drive—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Studebaker Road to provide a third northbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners along the east side of Studebaker Road. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-4: Intersection No. 14: Bay Shore Avenue at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Bay Shore Avenue to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition at the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing sidewalk and/or existing public restroom building. This improvement would also require the elimination of short-term parking on Bay Shore Avenue adjacent to the Bay Shore Neighborhood Library. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-5: Intersection No. 17: Pacific Coast Highway at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing Mobil gas canopy. Widen and restripe the eastbound approach of 2nd Street to provide

a fourth eastbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southwest corner and the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing Mobil gas canopy. Widen and restripe the westbound approach of 2nd Street to provide a third westbound left-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing In-N-Out burger drive-through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary and install an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-6: Intersection No. 19: Studebaker Road at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the eastbound approach of 2nd Street to provide a third eastbound left-turn lane. Widen and restripe Studebaker Road to provide a third northbound receiving lane. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition along the south side of 2nd Street and on the east side of Studebaker Road within the existing wetlands. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-7: Intersection No. 20: Seal Beach Boulevard at Westminster Avenue—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Seal Beach Boulevard to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-8: Intersection No. 22: Pacific Coast Highway at Studebaker Road—Convert the exclusive southbound right-turn lane on Pacific Coast Highway to a shared through/right-turn lane. Widen and restripe Pacific Coast Highway to provide a third southbound receiving lane. The third southbound receiving lane would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southwest corner of the intersection in order to maintain the existing bike lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-9: Intersection No. 23: Pacific Coast Highway at Marina Drive—Install a three-phase traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing in the northbound direction. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time. ~~It should be noted that these improvements cannot be guaranteed by the proposed Project or the City of Long Beach as the improvements would require approval from the City of Seal Beach and/or Caltrans.~~

Mitigation Measure K-10: Intersection No. 24: Pacific Coast Highway at Main Street/Bolsa Avenue—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide a third northbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northeast corner and the southeast corner of the intersection. This improvement may also affect the existing building located on the northeast corner of the intersection and the existing parking spaces within Seal Beach Center located on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-11: Intersection No. 25: Seal Beach Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway—Widen and restripe the

northbound approach of Seal Beach Boulevard to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-12: Intersection No. 29: Pacific Coast Highway at 1st Street—Widen and restripe the southbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide an exclusive southbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northwest corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

II. Project Description

Section II, Project Description, page II-24, revise the Transportation Measures as follows:

Transportation Measures

- Provide bike parking on-site to reduce vehicle trips.
- Provide preferred parking for clean air, van pools, and fuel efficiency vehicles to encourage clean air vehicle use.
- Provide pre-wiring for electric vehicles in ~~three percent of~~ parking spaces on-site as required by the Green Building Standards Code (LBMC Chapter 18.47). (Refer to Project Design Features E-2 and E-3 for details.)

Section II, Project Description, page II-26, revise footnote 12 as follows:

An additional estimated 651 cubic yards of export related to soil remediation could occur. Final earthwork numbers may change based on soil conditions.

Section II, Project Description, page II-26 to II-27, add the following to the list of necessary approvals, following Site Plan Review. This additional approval does not change or alter the physical nature of the Project.

- Lot Tie to merge 6400 E. Pacific Coast Highway and 6280 E. 2nd Street (APN 7242-011-004 and -005) into one contiguous parcel;

III. Environmental Setting

Section III, Environmental Setting, page III-6, revise line item 5 on Table III-1 as follows:

5	Ocean Place Residential Project	1st St. and Marina Dr.	Single-Family Home Neighborhood Park	4 8 ³⁰ du 6.4 ac
---	---------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------

IV.B. Air Quality

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-32, revise the first paragraph as follows:

The following project design features pertaining to air quality, which are required in compliance with regulatory requirements, would be implemented as part of the Project: Additional project design features and mitigation are set forth in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR which also would serve to reduce air emissions.

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-33, revise the final paragraph as follows:

As described in Section II, Project Description, of this Draft EIR, Project construction would commence with demolition of the existing hotel and associated amenities and surface parking areas, followed by grading and limited excavation for the placement of building footings. Building foundations would then be laid, followed by building construction, paving/concrete installation, and landscape installation. Project construction is anticipated to occur over approximately ~~18~~¹⁶ months with anticipated completion in 2019. Grading of the Project Site would require up to approximately 1,545 cubic yards of soil export (including export related to soil remediation).

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-35, replace Table IV.B-4 with Revised Table IV.B-4 as follows:

Revised Table IV.B-4
Estimate of Regional Project Construction Emissions^a
(pounds per day)

Construction Year	VOC ^b	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2017	9	<u>9199</u>	<u>5052</u>	<1	13	7
2018	<u>3934</u>	<u>8976</u>	<u>40466</u>	<1	<u>3816</u>	<u>137</u>
2019	28	33	28	<1	2	2
Maximum Construction Emissions	<u>3934</u>	<u>9199</u>	<u>40466</u>	<1	<u>3816</u>	<u>137</u>
SCAQMD Daily Significance Thresholds	75	100	550	150	150	55
Over/(Under)	(<u>3641</u>)	(<u>91</u>)	(<u>446484</u>)	(150)	(<u>112134</u>)	(<u>4248</u>)
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No	No

^a The CalEEMod model printout sheets and/or calculation worksheets are presented in Appendix B of this document.

^b Please note that the SCAQMD significance threshold is in terms of VOC while CalEEMod calculates reactive organic compounds (ROG) emissions. For purposes of this analysis, VOC and ROG are used interchangeably since ROG represents approximately 99.9 percent of VOC emissions.

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-38, replace Table IV.B-6 with Revised Table IV.B-6 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.B-6
Project Regional Operational Emissions—Project Buildout (2019)
(pounds per day)**

Emission Source	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Proposed Uses						
Area	6	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Energy (Natural Gas)	<1	5	5	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	3731	444115	320244	1	5738	4611
Stationary (Emergency Generator)	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Total Proposed Uses:	4337	449121	325248	1	5739	4611
Existing Uses						
Area	8	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Energy (Natural Gas)	<1	3	3	<1	<1	<1
Mobile	2	8	20	<1	4	1
Stationary (Emergency Generator)	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1
Total Existing Uses	10	11	22	<1	5	<1
Project Emissions (Increment)	3328	438110	303226	1	5334	4510
SCAQMD Significance Threshold	55	55	550	150	150	55
Over/(Under)	(2227)	8355	(247324)	(149)	(97116)	(4045)
Exceed Threshold?	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
<i>Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.</i>						

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.46, revise the second paragraph of Subsection 5, Mitigation Measures, as follows:

With regards to operational impacts, regional emissions from operation of the Project would exceed the SCAQMD daily threshold for NO_x. Therefore, the Project would result in a significant operational impact associated with regional emissions. It is noted that operational mobile criteria pollutant emissions make up a majority of these regional operational emissions. The average daily trips used to generate mobile criteria pollutant emissions are based on the Project’s trip-generation estimates included in the Traffic Study (see Appendix R of this Draft EIR). The analysis of mobile emissions presented herein also incorporates vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction measures provided in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR (e.g., site-specific benefits resulting from the proposed mix of uses). These measures would reduce VMT by approximately ~~25~~ 57 percent, as shown in ~~Revised Table IV.E-12 in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR, as updated in the Final EIR.~~ Also, the

Project would incorporate project design features and mitigation to support and promote environmental sustainability, as discussed further in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft EIR. While these features are designed primarily to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, they would also serve to reduce criteria air pollutants described herein. Similarly, project design features set forth in Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, of this Draft EIR would reduce VMT, thereby reducing NO_x emissions. No other project design features or feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce substantially lessen the Project's operational impact associated with regional emissions. Therefore, Project impacts associated with regional operational emissions of NO_x would remain significant and unavoidable.

Section IV.B, Air Quality, page IV.B-47, revise the first sentence of the first paragraph of Subsection 6.b, Operation, as follows:

As discussed above, the Project would include project design features and mitigation measures provided in Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and ~~mitigation measures provided in~~ Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, of this Draft EIR that would serve to reduce air pollutant emissions.

IV.C. Cultural Resources

Section IV.C, Cultural Resources, page IV.C-16, revise the third sentence of the second full paragraph as follows:

While Roy Anthony Roy Sealy Sealey was a recognized African American architect, the hotel is not a notable design of Roy Anthony Sealey's, and the hotel was not recognized at the time of its completion or in subsequent years as an important or notable work of the firm in architectural journals.

Section IV.C, Cultural Resources, page IV.C-27, revise Mitigation Measures C-5 and C-6 as follows:

Mitigation Measure C-5: The Project Applicant shall allow access to the Project Site by a certified Native American tribal monitor during any and all ground-disturbing activities (including but not limited to pavement removal, post holing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation, and trenching) to protect any cultural resources which may be affected during construction or development. Discovery

of any archaeological resources shall trigger implementation of Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

Mitigation Measure C-6: Archaeological testing by a qualified archaeologist shall be conducted concurrently with geotechnical core testing for building foundations using hollow bits; the use of augur bits shall be prohibited. Discovery of any archeological resources shall trigger Mitigation Measures C-1 through C-3, as applicable.

IV.E. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-40, revise the Transportation Measures as follows:

Transportation Measures

- Provide bike parking on-site to reduce vehicle trips.
- Provide preferred parking for clean air, van pools, and fuel efficiency vehicles to encourage clean air vehicle use.
- Provide pre-wiring for electric vehicles in ~~three percent of~~ parking spaces on-site as required by the Green Building Standards Code (LBMC Chapter 18.47). (Refer to Project Design Features E-2 and E-3 for details.)

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-41, add the following text and project design features after the list of Water Measures:

In addition, the following specific measures have been included to reduce GHG emissions:

Project Design Feature E-1: The design of new buildings shall incorporate features of the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED®) program to be capable of meeting the standards of LEED® Certified or equivalent green building standards. Specific sustainability features integrated into the Project design to enable the Project to achieve the LEED® Certified level shall include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The Project's design shall make use of passive solar energy through appropriate building orientation and landscaping; minimizing heating during cool seasons and solar heat gain during hot seasons; and enhancing natural ventilation by taking advantage of prevailing winds.
- Utilize a paint and surface color palette that emphasizes light and off-white colors that reflect heat away from buildings.
- Provide education regarding energy efficiency to tenants, employees, and customers. Provide information on energy management services for large energy users.
- Provide energy storage where appropriate to optimize renewable energy generation systems and avoid peak energy use.
- Increase insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging is minimized.
- Limit air leakage through the structures and/or within the heating and cooling distribution system(s).
- Install energy-efficient space heating and cooling equipment.
- Install electrical hook-ups at loading dock areas.
- Install dual-paned or other energy efficient windows.
- Install automatic devices to turn off lights when they are not needed.

Project Design Feature E-2: Upon buildout of the Project, at least 25 percent of the total code-required parking spaces provided for all types of parking facilities shall be capable of supporting future electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE). Plans shall indicate the proposed type and location(s) of EVSE and also include raceway method(s), wiring schematics and electrical calculations to verify that the electrical system has sufficient capacity to simultaneously charge all electric vehicles at all designated EV charging locations at their full rated amperage. Plan design shall be based upon Level 2 or greater EVSE at its maximum operating capacity. Only raceways and related components are required to be installed at the time of construction. A label stating "EV CAPABLE" shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the

service panel or subpanel and next to the raceway termination point.

Project Design Feature E-3: Upon buildout of the Project, at least 5 percent of the total code-required parking spaces shall be equipped with EV charging stations and/or outlets for plugin. Plans shall indicate the proposed type and location(s) of charging stations. Plan design for charging stations shall be based on Level 2 or greater EVSE at its maximum operating capacity.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-42, replace Table IV.E-5 with Revised Table IV.E-5 as follows:

Revised Table IV.E-5
Combined Construction-Related Emissions
(MTCO₂e)

Year	MTCO ₂ e ^a
2017	<u>371442</u>
2018	<u>2,4381,536</u>
2019	<u>8891</u>
Total	<u>2,8972,069</u>
Amortized Over 30 Years	<u>9769</u>
<p>^a CO₂e was calculated using CalEEMod and the results are provided in Section 2.0 of the Construction CalEEMod output file within Appendix B of this Draft EIR. Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.</p>	

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-42, revise the first sentence of the final paragraph as follows:

As presented in Table IV.E-5, construction of the Project is estimated to generate a total of 2,8972,069 MTCO₂e.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-47, add the following CAPCOA measures after LUT-4:

- **Increase Transit Accessibility (LUT-5):** Locating a project with high density near transit will facilitate the use of transit by people traveling to or from the Project Site. CAPCOA provides a range of

effectiveness between 0.5 – 24.6 percent reduction in VMT for transit station/stops with high-quality, high-frequency bus service located within a 5-10 minute walk. The Project Site is well serviced by Long Beach Transit which operates 10 bus lines in the Project area and provides free Passport shuttle service connecting visitors to and around Downtown Long Beach attractions and destinations. However, the GHG analysis conservatively did not quantify the reduction from transit as the transit station is located at a distance greater than a 5-10 minute walk.

- **Locate Project near Bike Path/Bike Lane (LUT-8):** A Project that is designed around an existing or planned bicycle facility encourages alternative mode use. The Project Site is located adjacent to existing Class II bike lanes on PCH, Marina Drive, and 2nd Street. CalEEMod does not provide this measure under mitigation and, therefore, it was not quantified in the GHG analysis. However, CAPCOA provides a 0.625 percent reduction in VMT for this measure.
- **Improve Walkability Design (LUT-9):** Improved design elements to enhance walkability and connectivity within a neighborhood include street accessibility and a pedestrian-oriented environment. CAPCOA provides a range of effectiveness between 3.0 – 21.3 percent reduction in VMT. The Project Site is located in an area of the City with a mature network of pedestrian facilities including sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian safety features along PCH, Marina Drive, and 2nd Street. The existing sidewalk system within the Project vicinity provides direct connectivity to the existing shopping center to the immediate south and public transit stops along PCH and 2nd Street. CalEEMod requires the number of intersections within a square mile of the Project Site, which is 46 intersections. This number was then doubled to account for the adjacent marina which would provide additional walking opportunities. (Note: This measure results in a 14.1-percent reduction in VMT.)

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-47, revise measure SDT-1 as follows:

- **Provide Pedestrian Network Improvements (SDT-1):** Project design would provide pedestrian access that minimizes barriers and links the Project Site with the existing street network to encourage people to walk instead of drive. The Project would provide direct access to the existing off-site pedestrian network to encourage and increase pedestrian activities in the area, which

would further reduce VMT and associated transportation-related emissions. (Note: This measure results in a ~~0.6~~3.6-percent reduction in VMT.)

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-47, add the following CAPCOA measures and text after measure SDT-1:

- **Proximity to Traffic Calming Measures (SDT-2):** Providing traffic calming measures encourages people to walk or bike instead of using a vehicle. CAPCOA provides a range of effectiveness between 0.25 – 1.0 percent reduction in VMT. As discussed above, the City is undertaking the Marina Drive Project which will include a mid-block pedestrian crossing adjacent to the 2nd & PCH frontage; new sidewalk where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks thereby providing a continuous sidewalk on the east side between 2nd Street and Studebaker Road. This measure was not quantified in the Draft EIR. CalEEMod requires the percentage of streets with sidewalks (100 percent) and the percentage of intersections (25 percent) with improvements (e.g., cross walks or other pedestrian safety features) in the Project vicinity. (Note: This measure results in a 0.2-percent reduction in VMT.)
- **Provide Bike Parking in Non-Residential Projects (SDT-6):** A non-residential project that provides bicycle parking facilities encourages alternative mode use. Bicycle parking spaces for the Project would be provided in compliance with LBMC requirements. Based on LBMC Section 21.64.030(B)(2)(c), a minimum of eight bicycle parking spaces would be required. CalEEMod does not provide this measure under mitigation and, therefore, it was not quantified in the GHG analysis. However, CAPCOA provides a 0.625 percent reduction in VMT for this measure.
- **Limit Parking Supply (PDT-1):** Reducing the number of parking spaces can encourage “smart growth” development and alternative transportation choices. As discussed in Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, of the Draft EIR, that the Project would provide parking at a reduced rate relative to LBMC parking requirements. Specifically, LBMC Chapter 21.41, *Off-Street Parking and Loading Requirements*, sets forth parking requirements for development projects based on the types and floor area of land uses. As detailed therein, community, regional, and neighborhood shopping centers require five spaces per 1,000 square feet plus additional parking for detached fast-food restaurants. Based on the Parking Analysis included as Appendix S of the Draft EIR, the proposed 1,150 parking spaces included in the Project (providing a ratio of

approximately 4.7 per 1,000 gross square feet of floor area) would be adequate to meet Project-generated parking demand. (Note: This measure results in a 3.0-percent reduction in VMT.)

In addition, Project Design Feature K-8 would require implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicle trips and encourage the use of public transit. These measures include the provision of appropriate bicycle parking facilities; vanpool/carpool loading/unloading and parking areas; preferential parking spaces for employee carpool/vanpool vehicles; a bulletin board/kiosk displaying information regarding bus schedules and routes, bike routes, carpool/vanpool opportunities; and a rideshare drop-off/pickup area and concierge service that would be incorporated into the Project's design. Although a specific reduction in trips associated with these TDM measures has not been determined, a reasonable conservative estimate based on similar TDM plans would be a 10-percent reduction in trips.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-47, revise the paragraph above Subsection (d), Solid Waste Generation Emissions, as follows:

CalEEMod calculates VMT based on the type of land use, trip purpose, trip type percentages for each land use subtype in the project (primary, diverted, and pass-by). As shown in Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would result in a total ~~10,609~~ 6,785 MTCO₂e per year as compared to 14,222 MTCO₂e per year for a standard project with similar land use characteristics within the air basin. This would represent a reduction of approximately ~~25~~ 52 percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario. This reduction from the NIERM scenario is attributable to the Project characteristics described above.

Section IV.E., Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-48, replace Table IV.E-9 with Revised Table IV.E-9 as follows:

**Revised Table IV.E-9
Mobile Source Emissions**

Scenario	Daily Weekday Trips ^a	Annual VMT ^b	Total MTCO ₂ e ^c (per year)
No Project	957	1,991,580	1,031
NIERM	17,915	29,383,773	14,222
Project	17,915	21,065,774 <u>12,635,022</u>	40,609 <u>6,785</u>

^a Average daily trips are based on the Project's trip-generation estimates in the Traffic Study (see Appendix R of this Draft EIR). Please note that the rate does not include the reduction from pass-by trips included in the Traffic Study since CalEEMod calculates the reduction in those trips internally.

^b VMT was calculated using CalEEMod and the results are provided in Section 2.0 of the Operation CalEEMod output file within Appendix B of this Draft EIR. In addition, measures LUT-8, SDT-6, and TDM features were included in the Project estimate; an updated CalEEMod output file is provided in Appendix FEIR-D of the Final EIR.

^c The reduction from the NIERM scenario is attributable to vehicular trip reduction measures provided in CAPCOA guidelines and implementation of TDM features; see the updated CalEEMod output file provided in Appendix FEIR-D of the Final EIR.

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-49, revise the first paragraph of Subsection (3), Combined Construction and Operational Impacts, as follows:

As shown in Revised Table IV.E-12 on page IV.E-51, as updated in the Final EIR, when taking into consideration implementation of project design features provided throughout this Draft EIR, including the requirements set forth in the City of Long Beach Green Building Ordinance and the full implementation of current state mandates, the GHG emissions for the Project in 2019 would equal ~~97-69~~ MTCO₂e per year during construction and ~~44,033~~ 10,011 MTCO₂e per year during operation of the Project, with a combined total of ~~44,130-10,080~~ MTCO₂e per year.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-49, revise the paragraph in Subsection (4), NIERM Calculation, as follows:

Table IV.E-12 calculates the GHG emissions that would occur under the NIERM scenario, which highlights the GHG emissions reductions achieved by regulatory requirements and design features. As shown in Table IV.E-12, the Project would result in a decrease in GHG emissions that represents an approximate ~~23-46~~-percent reduction from the NIERM scenario. The Project includes project design features and is subject to all

applicable regulatory requirements that would reduce the Project’s GHG emissions profile and would represent improvements vis-à-vis the NIERM scenario. These reductions in GHG emissions reflect the measures set forth in the applicable GHG reduction plans and policies and demonstrate the efficacy of these measures.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-51, replace Table IV.E-12 with Revised Table IV.E-12 as follows:

Revised Table IV.E-12
Annual GHG Emissions Summary (Year 2019)^a
(metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent [MTCO₂e])

Scope	No Project	“NIERM” Scenario	Project	Project’s Reduction from the “NIERM” Scenario ^b
Area	<1	<1	<1	N/A
Energy	1,712	3,354	2,775	17%
Mobile	939	14,222	10,609 <u>6,785</u>	25 <u>52</u> %
Solid Waste	47	476	476	0%
Water/Wastewater	26	226	174	23%
<u>EV Chargers</u>			<u>(199)</u>	
Construction	0	69	97 <u>69</u>	0%
Total Emissions	2,723	18,375	14,130 <u>10,080</u>	23 <u>46</u> %

^a CO₂e was calculated using CalEEMod and the results are provided in Section 2.0 of the Operation CalEEMod output file within Appendix B of this Draft EIR. Total emissions for the “NIERM” Scenario and the Project reflect emission from operation of the proposed buildings less existing uses to be removed.

^b The total break from NIERM percent reduction represents the average reduction applied to the total emissions generated by the Project in comparison to the NIERM scenario.

Source: Eyestone Environmental, 2017.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-51, revise the paragraph below Table IV.E-12 as follows:

As shown in Table IV.E-12, the Project would result in ~~14,130~~10,080 MTCO₂e annually. The breakdown of emissions by source category shows approximately less than 1 percent from area sources; ~~20~~28 percent from energy consumption; ~~76~~67 percent from mobile sources; ~~3~~5 percent from solid waste generation; 1 percent from water supply, treatment, and

distribution; and less than 1 percent from construction activities. Provided in Table IV.E-13 on page IV.E-52 is an evaluation of applicable reduction actions/strategies by emissions source category to determine how the Project's design features comply with or exceed the reduction actions/strategies outlined in the *Climate Change Scoping Plan*.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-55, in Table IV.E-13, revise the consistency discussion regarding SB 375 as follows:

Consistent. SB 375 requires SCAG to direct the development of the SCS for the region, which is discussed further below. The Project represents an infill development within an existing urbanized area that would concentrate new retail and restaurant uses within a HQTAs. Therefore, the Project would be consistent with SCAG's 2016–2040 RTP/SCS as it is located within a HQTAs. Furthermore, the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS would result in an estimated 18 percent decrease in per capita GHG emissions by 2035 and 21 percent decrease in per capita GHG emissions by 2040. As project-related transportation emissions are reduced by approximately 25–52 percent (see Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR), therefore the Project would be consistent with SB 375 and the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-59, revise the second to last sentence of the first paragraph as follows:

As shown in Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project results in a VMT reduction of approximately 28–57 percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario and a 25–52-percent reduction in GHG emissions from mobile sources and would be consistent with the reduction in transportation emission per capita provided in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-67, in Table IV.E-14, revise the consistency discussion regarding the measure beginning “Encourage transit fare discounts...” as follows:

Consistent. The Project would not impair the City's ability to encourage transit fare discounts and local vendor product and service discounts for residents and employees of TOD/HQTAs. Moreover, as shown in Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project's GHG emissions from mobile sources would represent a reduction of approximately 25–52 percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-68, in Table IV.E-14, revise the consistency discussion regarding the first measure under “Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Actions and Strategies” as follows:

Not Applicable. The responsible party identified in the 2016–2040 RTP/SCS for implementation of this action/strategy is SCAG. However, as shown in Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would represent a reduction of approximately ~~25-52~~-percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-69, in Table IV.E-14, revise the consistency discussion regarding the measure beginning “Support work-based programs...” as follows:

Consistent. The Project would not impair the City’s or SCAG’s ability to support work-based programs that encourage emission reduction strategies and incentivize active transportation community or ride share-modes. Moreover, as shown in Revised Table IV.E-9 on page IV.E-48, as updated in the Final EIR, the Project GHG emissions from mobile sources would represent a reduction of approximately ~~25-52~~ percent in comparison to the NIERM scenario.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-73, in Table IV.E-15, revise the consistency discussion regarding the measure listed under “Focus Area: Transportation” as follows:

Consistent. As discussed above in Table IV.E-13 on page IV.E-52, several regulations from the Climate Change Scoping Plan would serve to reduce vehicle emissions. Specifically, with implementation of the Advanced Clean Cars Program, new automobiles will emit 34 percent fewer global warming gases and 75 percent fewer smog-forming emissions. Furthermore, the Project characteristics described above reduce VMT by ~~28-57~~ percent, which results in a ~~by 25-52~~-percent reduction in emissions, as shown in Revised Table IV.E-12 on page IV.E-54, as updated in the Final EIR.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-75, revise Subsection 5, Mitigation Measures, as follows:

With implementation of the Project’s design, sustainability, site, and land use characteristics, combined with compliance with regulatory requirements, including those discussed above, impacts related to GHG

emissions would be less than significant. Nonetheless, the following mitigation measure would be incorporated into the Project to further reduce GHG emissions:

Mitigation Measure E-1: Upon buildout of the Project, the Project shall provide a minimum of 250 kilowatts of photovoltaic panels on the Project Site.

Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, page IV.E-75, revise Subsection 6, Level of Significance After Mitigation, as follows:

Project impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant. The proposed mitigation measure would further reduce such impacts by 96 MTCO₂e per year.

IV.F. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The following two changes to Section IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, correct errors concerning the potential for hydrogen sulfide gas to be present on-site. No such threat was identified in either the Phase I or Phase II Environmental Site Assessments, and it was confirmed with Northgate Environmental Management, Inc. on July 28, 2017 that hydrogen sulfide is unlikely to be present on the Project Site.¹

Section IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, page IV.F-26, revise the final sentence of the first full paragraph as follows:

Other potential hazards associated with known and possible unknown oil wells include the sudden release of methane ~~or hydrogen sulfide~~ gas from a well that is disturbed during construction.

Section IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, page IV.F-30, strike the following text from Mitigation Measure F-3:

Mitigation Measure F-3: Soil Vapor Survey. Prior to construction, the Project Applicant shall conduct a systematic soil vapor survey of the Project Site to investigate the possible presence of volatile organic compounds in site

¹ Telephone conversation with Derrick Willis, Principal, Northgate Environmental Management, Inc., July 28, 2017.

soils. The soil vapor survey shall be performed according to the applicable standards of the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the California Environmental Protection Agency. Soil borings shall be placed at a depth of at least five (5) feet below the deepest excavation to occur during construction and soil vapor samples shall be collected at 5 to 10 foot intervals. Soil samples shall be collected at a five (5) foot interval from the soil borings to assess the soil for heavier petroleum hydrocarbons that may be present due to past oil field use of the Project Site. The Soil Vapor Survey shall include, at a minimum, the following:

- (1) Evaluation of methane and ~~hydrogen sulfide~~ concentrations to a depth of at least five (5) feet below the deepest excavation to occur during site construction. These soil vapor boring shall be placed in the vicinity of any abandoned oil wells located during the geophysical survey; and
- (2) Additional soil vapor borings to test for volatile organic compounds on and in the vicinity of the land area where the former on-site gas station was located and in locations where the off-site gas station may have impacted the Project Site through lateral migration of soil vapors.

IV.H. Land Use

Section IV.H, Land Use, page IV.H-15, add the following to the list of necessary approvals, following Site Plan Review. This additional approval does not change or alter the physical nature of the Project.

- Lot Tie to merge 6400 E. Pacific Coast Highway and 6280 E. 2nd Street (APN 7242-011-004 and -005) into one contiguous parcel;

IV.I. Noise

Section IV.I, Noise, page IV.I-47, revise Mitigation Measure I-1 as follows:

Mitigation Measure I-1: During the site demolition phase, a temporary and impermeable sound barrier shall be erected along the Project Site's northwestern and northeastern property line-lines between the construction area and ~~the residential uses located north of 2nd Street~~

nearby sensitive uses. The temporary sound barrier shall be a minimum of six feet tall and extend for a length of approximately 860 feet (specifically, 200 feet along Marina Drive south from 2nd Street, approximately 460 feet along 2nd Street, and 200 feet along Pacific Coast Highway south from 2nd Street. The temporary sound barrier shall be designed to provide a 5 dBA noise reduction at the residential uses to the northwest (Receptor R1) and the wetlands area to the northeast.

IV.J.1. Public Services—Protection

Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, page IV.J.1-6, add the following paragraph at the bottom of the page:

The City of Long Beach maintains a Joint Mutual Assistance agreement with the Orange County Fire Authority (OCFA) which necessitates OCFA to respond to emergencies within the Project area from Fire Station 44 located in the City of Seal Beach. Likewise, LBFD responds to emergencies within the City of Seal Beach when needed.

IV.K. Traffic and Access

Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, page IV.K-32, add the following bullet point at the end of Project Design Feature K-8:

- Provide a designated rideshare drop off/pickup area and concierge service to facilitate and encourage the use of rideshare programs.

Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, page IV.K-41, revise the impact summary for Intersection No. 24 as follows:

- Intersection No. 24: Pacific Coast Highway at Main/Bolsa Avenue (LOS E C—P.M.)

Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, page IV.K-65 and IV.K-66, add the following to Mitigation Measure K-1:

Mitigation Measure K-1: Prior to the start of construction, the Project Applicant shall provide for the preparation of a detailed Construction Management Plan, including haul routes and a staging plan, and submit it to the City of

Long Beach Department of Public Works, Traffic and Transportation Bureau for review and approval. The Construction Management Plan would formalize how construction would be carried out and identify specific actions that would be required to reduce effects on the surrounding community. The Construction Management Plan shall be based on the nature and timing of the specific construction activities and shall include, but not be limited to, the following elements, as appropriate:

- Traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.
- Identify the routes that construction vehicles would utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e. lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.), to access the Project Site, traffic controls and detours, and proposed construction phasing plan for the Project.
- Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets.
- Require the Applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The Applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.
- Hauling or transport of oversize loads shall be allowed between the hours of 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends or Federal holidays.
- Haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.
- Construction-related parking and staging of vehicles shall occur on-site to the extent possible, but may occur on nearby public parking lots, as approved by the City Engineer.
- The Construction Management Plan shall meet standards established in the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device (MUTCD) as well as City of Long Beach requirements.

- During periods when the public right-of-way is affected by Project construction activities, coordinate with the City of Long Beach and Long Beach Transit to ensure the provision of safe pedestrian and bicycle access and the temporary relocation of any affected transit stops, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and as feasible.

Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, pages IV.K-66 through IV.K-68, revise Mitigation Measures K-2 through K-12 as follows:

Mitigation Measure K-2: Intersection No. 8: Studebaker Road at SR-22 Westbound Ramps—Widen and restripe the westbound approach to provide a third westbound left-turn lane. Widen and restripe the southbound approach of Studebaker Road to provide a third southbound through lane. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition at the on/off ramp and along the west side of Studebaker Road. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-3: Intersection No. 12: Studebaker Road at Loynes Drive—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Studebaker Road to provide a third northbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners along the east side of Studebaker Road. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-4: Intersection No. 14: Bay Shore Avenue at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Bay Shore Avenue to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition at the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing sidewalk and/or existing public restroom building. This

improvement would also require the elimination of short-term parking on Bay Shore Avenue adjacent to the Bay Shore Neighborhood Library. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-5: Intersection No. 17: Pacific Coast Highway at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing Mobil gas canopy. Widen and restripe the eastbound approach of 2nd Street to provide a fourth eastbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southwest corner and the southeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing Mobil gas canopy. Widen and restripe the westbound approach of 2nd Street to provide a third westbound left-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northeast corner of the intersection and may affect the existing In-N-Out burger drive-through lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary and install an eastbound right-turn overlap phase. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-6: Intersection No. 19: Studebaker Road at 2nd Street—Widen and restripe the eastbound approach of 2nd Street to provide a third eastbound left-turn lane. Widen and restripe Studebaker Road to provide a third northbound receiving lane. These improvements would require right-of-way acquisition along the south side of 2nd Street and on the east side of Studebaker Road within the existing wetlands. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City

of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-7: Intersection No. 20: Seal Beach Boulevard at Westminster Avenue—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Seal Beach Boulevard to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-8: Intersection No. 22: Pacific Coast Highway at Studebaker Road—Convert the exclusive southbound right-turn lane on Pacific Coast Highway to a shared through/right-turn lane. Widen and restripe Pacific Coast Highway to provide a third southbound receiving lane. The third southbound receiving lane would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southwest corner of the intersection in order to maintain the existing bike lane. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-9: Intersection No. 23: Pacific Coast Highway at Marina Drive—Install a three-phase traffic signal with protected left-turn phasing in the northbound direction. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time. ~~It should be noted that these improvements cannot be guaranteed by the proposed Project or the City of Long Beach as the improvements would require approval from the City of Seal Beach and/or Caltrans.~~

Mitigation Measure K-10: Intersection No. 24: Pacific Coast Highway at Main Street/Bolsa Avenue—Widen and restripe the

northbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide a third northbound through lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northeast corner and the southeast corner of the intersection. This improvement may also affect the existing building located on the northeast corner of the intersection and the existing parking spaces within Seal Beach Center located on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-11: Intersection No. 25: Seal Beach Boulevard at Pacific Coast Highway—Widen and restripe the northbound approach of Seal Beach Boulevard to provide an exclusive northbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the southeast corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Mitigation Measure K-12: Intersection No. 29: Pacific Coast Highway at 1st Street—Widen and restripe the southbound approach of Pacific Coast Highway to provide an exclusive southbound right-turn lane. This improvement would require right-of-way acquisition from property owners on the northwest corner of the intersection. Modify the existing traffic signal as necessary. The installation of these improvements is subject to the approval of the City of Seal Beach and Caltrans. Since publication of the Draft EIR, the City of Long Beach has determined this mitigation measure to be infeasible at this time given the issues attendant to acquisition of private right-of-way.

Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, page IV.K-69, revise Level of Significance After Mitigation, Subsection a, Construction, as follows:

As shown above in Table IV.K-9 on page IV.K-35, Project construction would result in temporary or short-term construction-related impacts to six study intersections, including Intersection Nos. 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, and 30. The Project would implement Mitigation Measure K-1, which would ensure that adequate and safe access remains available within and surrounding the Project Site and would minimize potential conflicts between construction activity and pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the vicinity of the Project Site. With implementation of Mitigation Measure K-1, impacts to access and public transit during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, impacts with respect to Intersection Nos. 10, 17, 18, 19, 23, and 30 would remain significant and unavoidable.

IV.L.2. Utilities and Service Systems—Energy

Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy, page IV.L.2-15, revise the Transportation Measures as follows:

Transportation Measures

- Provide bike parking on-site to reduce vehicle trips.
- Provide preferred parking for clean air, van pools, and fuel efficiency vehicles to encourage clean air vehicle use.
- Provide pre-wiring for electric vehicles in ~~three percent of~~ parking spaces on-site as required by the Green Building Standards Code (LBMC Chapter 18.47). (Refer to Project Design Features E-2 and E-3 for details.)

V. Alternatives

Section V, Alternatives, page V-56, revise the final line of the third paragraph as follows:

Notwithstanding, of the alternatives analyzed in this Draft EIR, Alternative 1, the No Project/~~No-Build~~ Reoccupation of Existing Hotel Alternative is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative as it would reduce most of the impacts anticipated under the Project.

VIII. List of Preparers

Section VIII, List of Preparers, page VIII-2, add the following:

Northgate Environmental Management, Inc.
24411 Ridge Route Drive, Suite 130
Laguna Hills, CA 92653-7904

- Derrick S. Willis, Principal
- Nicky E. Galloway, Project Engineer
- Dana R. Brown, Senior Geologist

Section VIII, List of Preparers, page VIII-2, add the following:

Psomas
3 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 200
Santa Ana, CA 92707-8794

- Bruce Kirby, Vice President
- Mike Swan, Senior Project Manager

B. Effect of Corrections and Additions

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 requires that an EIR which has been made available for public review, but not yet certified, be recirculated whenever significant new information has been added to the EIR. The entire document need not be circulated if revisions are limited to specific portions of the document.

The relevant portions of CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 read as follows:

- (a) A lead agency is required to recirculate an EIR when significant new information is added to the EIR after public notice is given of the availability of the draft EIR for public review under Section 15087 but before certification. As used in this section, the term “information” can include changes in the project or environmental setting as well as additional data or other information. New information added to an EIR is not “significant” unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an

effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement. "Significant new information" requiring recirculation include, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- (1) A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
 - (2) A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
 - (3) A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it.
 - (4) The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded. (*Mountain Lion Coalition v. Fish and Game Com.* (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1043)
- (b) Recirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR.

The information contained in this section clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant changes to the Draft EIR. In addition, the information added to the Draft EIR is not considered significant because the Draft EIR has not been changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project. Specifically:

- The modifications to Section II, Project Description, revise a transportation-related sustainability measure for increased accuracy, clarify the amount of grading, and specify an additional administrative approval required by the City, none of which would cause a physical impact nor affect the analyses provided in the Draft EIR (the corrected grading volume was already evaluated in the appropriate EIR analyses, including air quality).
- The modification to Section III, Environmental Setting, corrects the number of dwelling units on a related project. However, it should be noted that the Draft

EIR assumed a larger number of dwelling units, so the impact analysis contained therein is conservative.

- The modifications to Section IV.B, Air Quality, and Section IV.E, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, reflect revised analyses stemming from additional project design features and mitigation that have been incorporated into the Project in response to public comments on the Draft EIR. The results indicate that impacts would be comparable to or less than those originally cited in the Draft EIR. Accordingly, no changes to the conclusions in the Draft EIR are necessary.
- The modifications to Section IV.C, Cultural Resources, and Section V, Alternatives, correct typos in these sections. Additionally, two mitigation measures in Section IV.C, Cultural Resources, are revised to provide additional clarity and accuracy.
- The modification to Section IV.H, Land Use, specifies the additional administrative approval required by the City, which would not cause a physical impact nor affect the analyses provided in the Draft EIR.
- The modification to Section IV.I, Noise, revises Mitigation Measure I-1 in order to reduce noise potentially affecting other nearby uses.
- The modification to Section IV.J.1, Public Services—Fire Protection, clarifies that the City of Long Beach maintains a Joint Mutual Assistance agreement with the Orange County Fire Authority, with response to the Project area provided by Fire Station 44 in the City of Seal Beach.
- The modification to Section IV.L.2, Utilities and Service Systems—Energy, revise the same transportation-related sustainability measure for accuracy.
- The modification to Section IV.F, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, removes reference to an evaluation that was not required by the Project’s Phase I or Phase II Environmental Site Assessments.
- The modifications to Section IV.K, Traffic and Access, correct typos and inadvertent omissions in this section and add specificity in one of the project design features and several mitigation measures. In particular, Mitigation Measures K-2 through K-12 have been revised to indicate the City of Long Beach has determined such measures to be infeasible at this time. Such changes do not affect the traffic impact conclusions of significance after mitigation, as the related impacts were preemptively concluded to be significant and unavoidable.
- The modifications to Section VIII, List of Preparers, adds the names of two preparers.

Based on the above, the corrections and additions do not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in an impact already identified in the Draft EIR. Any new or modified project design features and mitigation measures set forth herein are reflected in Section IV, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, of this Final EIR. In addition, the corrections and additions to the Draft EIR clarify, amplify, or make insignificant refinements to the Draft EIR. Thus, none of the conditions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 have been met, and recirculation of the Draft EIR is not required.