

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 SUMMARY AND SCOPE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This joint Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and Program Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) has been prepared by the City of Long Beach (City) to evaluate the potential environmental effects that could result from development of the proposed Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project). This PEIR/PEIS has been prepared in conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) statutes (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, Section 21000 et. seq., as amended) and implementing guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15000 et. seq.).

In 2015, the City applied for and was awarded a grant from the United States Department of Defense (DoD) Office of Economic Adjustments (OEA) to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Program. Federally funded projects must follow the procedural requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (Title 42 of the United States Code [U.S.C.] § 4321 et seq: “NEPA”). As such, this PEIR/PEIS has been prepared in conformance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

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

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

Building on the legacy of the Boeing aircraft manufacturing industry and the high-quality jobs it provided, the GCSP aims to continue to attract and optimize new work opportunities to retain the regional skills base, expertise, and competitive economies of Long Beach Airport, the City of Long Beach, and the Southern California region. The GCSP represents the next step in the overall transition of the former Boeing C-17 Site and surrounding Plan Area. The GCSP assigns

appropriate land use districts for land properties within the Plan Area, including six districts and two overlay zones. The GCSP establishes a land use and mobility plan, development regulations, design guidelines, infrastructure requirements, and implementation strategies necessary to becoming a flexible commercial and industrial district in the City. No residential component is included in the GCSP.

1.2 BACKGROUND

Impacts of the C-17 Site Closure

In September 2013, the Department of Defense notified Boeing, manufacturer of the C-17 Globemaster III military aircraft, that it would no longer place future orders for the C-17. In April 2014, Boeing announced it would close C-17 production plants by mid-2015 due primarily to the termination of Department of Defense contracts, which represented the single largest demand for the aircraft. Boeing closed the C-17 Site in December 2015. At its peak, the C-17 Site employed up to 5,000 people; however, since 2010, Boeing has steadily downsized the C-17 workforce in anticipation of the closure.

In anticipation of the C-17 Site closure and the potential effects the closure would have on the City and its surroundings, the City applied for and was awarded a grant from the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustments (OEA) to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Program.

The C-17 Transition Master Plan resulted in a detailed analysis of existing economic, land use, and infrastructure conditions in the Plan Area; alternative land use scenarios for the C-17 Site; and a planning and urban design framework for the Plan Area's C-17 Transition Master Plan. Other recently completed or current City plans include the 2019 Land Use Element/Urban Design Element Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the recently completed EIRs for the Midtown Specific Plan and Southeast Area Specific Plan (SEASP), and the Noise Element and Climate Action and Adaptation Plans that are currently underway in the City.

As the results of the C-17 Transition Master Plan revealed the need for comprehensive planning that addressed land use, economic development, and infrastructure improvements in the Plan Area, the City determined that a Specific Plan was the appropriate tool to approach each need holistically. The GCSP provides a combined land use and mobility plan, development regulations, and design guidelines, as well as implementation measures that work together to advance the objectives of the C-17 Transition Master Plan.

The GCSP builds upon the C-17 Transition Master Plan to provide a strategic planning framework for attracting quality industries and improving the character, design, and functionality of the Plan Area.

EIRs are informational documents “which will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effect of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project” (14 CCR 15121). The purpose of this PEIR/PEIS is to present the evaluation of the anticipated environmental effects of the Proposed Project.

1.3 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

1.3.1 CEQA Compliance

As set forth in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA),¹ the purpose of an EIR is to identify a project’s significant effects on the environment, identify alternatives to a project, and indicate the manner in which significant impacts can be mitigated or avoided (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1).

In order to be approved and implemented, the Proposed Project requires that discretionary action be taken by the City of Long Beach. Therefore, in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21080, the Proposed Project is subject to environmental review requirements under CEQA. For purposes of complying with CEQA, the City of Long Beach is the lead agency for the Proposed Project (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15050–15053).²

In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this PEIR is an informational document that will inform the City of Long Beach and the public of: (1) the significant environmental effects of the proposed project, (2) possible ways to minimize any significant effects, and (3) reasonable alternatives to the project. Thus, the PEIR is an important document that is ultimately used by the City of Long Beach when considering whether to approve, deny, or modify the Proposed Project.

This document is a joint PEIR/PEIS, as per the requirements of both CEQA and NEPA (see Section 1.3.2, below).

1.3.2 NEPA Compliance

NEPA (Title 42 of the United States Code [U.S.C.] § 4321 et seq) is required when a federal action is taken that may have impacts on the human and natural environment. Federal actions include projects that require federal funding. The Boeing C-17 Transition Program and subsequent development of the Plan Area may have a significant effect on the human and natural environment. An EIS is required for major federal actions with the potential to significantly affect the quality of

¹ CEQA is located at Section 21000 et seq. of the Public Resources Code.

² The CEQA Guidelines are located at Section 15000 et seq. of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations.

the human and natural environment. Since the City was awarded a grant from the DoD OEA to prepare and implement the Boeing C-17 Transition Program, including the Proposed Project, this denotes a federal action. The DoD OEA is the lead agency under NEPA. The City prepared this PEIR/PEIS in accordance with NEPA guidelines.

This document is a joint PEIR/PEIS and is prepared to meet the requirements of both CEQA and NEPA (see Section 1.3.1, above). A federal agency may use a completed CEQA review when it has participated in the preparation of the CEQA review and the CEQA review will meet the requirements of NEPA. As such, cooperation between the OEA and the City has occurred to integrate the environmental impact analysis to the satisfaction of applicable laws and requirements, as practical.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

The basic purposes of CEQA are to:

1. Inform governmental decision makers and the public about the potential, significant environmental effects of proposed activities;
2. Identify the ways that environmental damage can be avoided or significantly reduced;
3. Prevent significant, avoidable damage to the environment by requiring changes in projects through the use of alternatives or mitigation measures when the governmental agency finds the changes to be feasible; and
4. Disclose to the public the reasons why a governmental agency approved the project in the manner the agency chose if significant environmental effects are involved (14 CCR 15002).

The EIR process under CEQA typically consists of three parts: (1) the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS), (2) Draft EIR, and (2) Final EIR. The NOP and IS were intended to encourage interagency communication concerning the proposed action and provide sufficient background information about the proposed action so that agencies, organizations, and members of the public could respond with specific comments and questions on the scope and content of the EIR. Based upon the information contained within the NOP and IS, the City concluded that an EIR should be prepared.

The NOP and IS for this PEIR/PEIS was distributed to the State Clearinghouse, interested agencies, and groups on September 12, 2018. Pursuant to Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, recipients of the NOP and IS were requested to provide responses within 30 days after their receipt of the NOP. The 30-day NOP public review period ended October 11, 2018. The IS and NOP are contained in Appendix A-1, Initial Study; and Appendix A-2, Notice of Preparation, respectively. Comments received during the NOP public review period were considered during the preparation of this PEIR/PEIS. The NOP and IS comments are included in Appendix A-3, Notice

of Preparation Comment Letters, of this PEIR/PEIS. Based on the scope of analysis for this PEIR/PEIS, the following issues were determined to be potentially significant, and are therefore, addressed in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, of this document:

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

Twelve comment letters/emails were received during the NOP public review period and four written scoping meeting comments were received during the scoping meeting expressing concern about potential historic impacts, noise impacts, and traffic impacts. These comments were considered as part of the analyses prepared and presented in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS. Copies of the comment letters are included in Appendix A-3, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters, and are summarized in Table 1-1, Summary of Comments Received in Response to the NOP.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Comments Received in Response to the NOP**

Commenting Agency or Property Owner	Date	Summary of Comments	Chapter/Section Where Comment Is Addressed
<i>State Agencies</i>			
State Clearinghouse	09/12/2018	The commenter acknowledges receipt of the NOP.	N/A
Native American Heritage Commission	9/19/2018	The commenter notes that CEQA was amended significantly in 2014 to include a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources,” and provides that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Assembly Bill (AB) 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation is filed after July 1, 2015. AB 52 has tribal consultation requirements and certain timing requirements for notification that are outlined in the letter.	Section 3.12, Tribal Cultural Resources

**Table 1-1
Summary of Comments Received in Response to the NOP**

Commenting Agency or Property Owner	Date	Summary of Comments	Chapter/Section Where Comment Is Addressed
		The commenter requested an appropriate records search to determine known traditional cultural resources, and preparation of an archaeological inventory survey if required. The commenter provided a list of appropriate Native American contacts for consultation concerning the Plan Area. According to the commenter, mitigation should be included in the EIR to identify and evaluate accidentally discovered archaeological resources pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CEQA Section 15064.5(f).	
<i>Regional Agencies</i>			
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	10/10/2018	Recommends that the CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993) be used for all air quality analysis and California Emissions Estimator Model land use emissions software be used to estimate pollutant emissions from typical land use developments. Air quality impacts from Proposed Project operations and construction should be calculated. The South Coast Air Quality Management District has developed regional and localized significance thresholds for criteria pollutants that should be compared to estimated Proposed Project emissions. A mobile source health risk assessment should be performed in the event that the Proposed Project generates or attracts vehicular trips. The California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective is recommended as guidance for siting incompatible land uses. Several resources are recommended to assist in the drafting of mitigation measures in the event that the Proposed Project generates significant adverse air quality impacts. CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by the law be used during Proposed Project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate these impacts. Any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must be discussed pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(D).	Section 3.2, Air Quality; Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	10/11/2018	According to the commenter, SCAG reviews environmental documents for consistency with regional plans and the adopted Regional Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The commenter suggests the EIR analyze consistency with the RTP/SCS goals and demographic and growth forecasts. The commenter also recommends reviewing existing	Section 3.7, Land Use and Planning

**Table 1-1
Summary of Comments Received in Response to the NOP**

Commenting Agency or Property Owner	Date	Summary of Comments	Chapter/Section Where Comment Is Addressed
		mitigation measures included in the Final PEIR for the 2016 RTP/SCS.	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWDSC)	10/11/2018	The commenter indicates the GCSP covers an area that includes MWDSC's Second Lower Feeder Pipelines and associated easements. The commenter indicates the Proposed Project must not impact MWDSC's ability access, operate, and maintain existing facilities. In addition, any proposed grading within MWDSC's easements will require MWDSC's review and written acceptance.	Section 3.6, Utilities and Service Systems
Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts (LACSD)	10/10/2018	The commenter indicates information regarding sewerage system deficiencies are available by contacting the City Department of Public Works. In addition, LACSD should review individual developments within the Plan Area to determine whether or not sufficient capacity is available. LACSD may charge a fee for connections to the existing sewer system.	Section 3.13, Utilities and Service Systems
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 7	10/08/2018	According to the commenter, Caltrans mandates that CEQA review of transportation impacts use vehicle miles traveled (VMT), and encourages the Lead Agency to evaluate the potential of Transportation Demand Management to reduce VMT and GHGs. An encroachment permit will be required for projects proposed within with Caltrans right-of-way.	Section 3.11, Traffic and Circulation
<i>Local Agencies</i>			
Walk Bike Long Beach	9/17/2018	The commenter suggests including a more detailed cross-section of future walkways and having pedestrian connections within blocks. The commenter also recommends having inviting and safe pedestrian connections between the Plan Area to Cherry Avenue and Spring Street.	Chapter 2.0, Project Description; Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation
Walk Bike Long Beach	10/11/2018	The commenter suggests correcting the auto-orientation of the existing Plan Area and including bike lanes, sidewalks, and other infrastructure to encourage active transportation. The commenter also indicates the GCSP should acknowledge the proximity to the Metro Blue Line and the larger residential area to the west of the Plan Area. According to the commenter, a TIA should be conducted and the results included in the PEIR/PEIS.	Chapter 2.0, Project Description; Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation
California Heights Neighborhood Association	10/11/2018	The commenter is generally pleased with the City for improving the Boeing property and the Cherry Avenue corridor, and requests the GCSP consider potential impacts to the California Heights Historic District. The commenter also request the traffic analysis include	3.3, Cultural Resources; Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation

Table 1-1
Summary of Comments Received in Response to the NOP

Commenting Agency or Property Owner	Date	Summary of Comments	Chapter/Section Where Comment Is Addressed
		appropriate measures to reduce potential traffic impacts.	
<i>Individual Comments</i>			
Julianna Robins	10/01/2018	The commenter requests adding more public open space to the GCSP, improving bicycle safety, and making Cherry Avenue and Wardlow Road more walkable. Because the City of Lakewood has businesses fronting Cherry Avenue, the commenter suggests coordinating with the City of Lakewood for improvements. The commenter also suggests incorporating housing.	Chapter 2.0, Project Description; Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation
Kristi von der Linden	10/04/2018	The commenter is concerned with noise and traffic associated with the Proposed Project during construction and operations.	Section 3.8, Noise; Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation
Russell McCurdy	10/09/2018	The commenter is concerned with increased traffic on Cherry Avenue resulting from new businesses and potential safety issues for pedestrians, bicycles, and scooters. The commenter is also concerned with reducing the lane width of Cherry Avenue, and the elimination of curbside parking.	Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation
<i>Scoping Meeting Comments</i>			
David Herley	10/11/2018	The commenter request to be added to the noticing list.	Not Applicable
Judith Anderson	10/11/2018	The comments is concerned about the amount of open-space for non-humans and requests more habitat open space be provided.	Chapter 2.0, Project Description
Elise Puritz	10/11/2018	The commenter expressed excitement in regards to the Proposed Project and the increase in jobs.	Chapter 2.0, Project Description
Silvia Quinones	10/11/2018	The commenter is concerned about available parking.	Section 3.11, Transportation and Circulation

The PEIR/PEIS will be made available for review to the public and public agencies for 45 days to provide comments on the “sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated” (14 CCR 15204). Digital Copies of the Draft PEIR/PEIS, Specific Plan, and Appendices are available from **August 3, 2020 through September 17, 2020** via the Department website <http://www.longbeach.gov/lbds/planning/environmental/reports/> or upon request by email or phone. Pursuant to the Governor’s Executive Order and the local, state and federal state of emergency, physical copies are not being made publicly available and distribution to libraries and other facilities is not possible do to the closure of those facilities. The City will make accommodations, upon request, to individuals not able to access the electronic version of the document. During this period, comments from the general public, organizations,

and agencies regarding environmental issues analyzed in the Draft PEIR/PEIS and the Draft PEIR/PEIS's accuracy and completeness may be submitted to the lead agency at the following address:

City of Long Beach
411 West Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, California 90802
Attn: Maryanne Cronin, Planner
LBDS-EIR-Comments@longbeach.gov

As the lead agency for the Proposed Project, the City has assumed responsibility for preparing this document. The decision to consider the Proposed Project within the purview of the City Planning Commission and City Council. The City will use the information included in this PEIR/PEIS to consider potential impacts to the physical environment associated with the GCSP when considering approval of the Proposed Project. As set forth in Section 15021 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City, as lead agency, has the duty to avoid or minimize environmental damage where feasible. Furthermore, 14 CCR 15021(d) states that:

CEQA recognizes that in determining whether and how a project should be approved, a public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors and in particular the goal of providing a decent home and satisfying living environment for every Californian. An agency shall prepare a statement of overriding considerations as described in Section 15093 to reflect the ultimate balancing of competing public objectives when the agency decides to approve a project that will cause one or more significant effects on the environment.

Prior to approval of the Proposed Project, the City, as the lead agency and decision-making entity, is required to certify that this PEIR/PEIS has been completed in accordance with CEQA and NEPA, that the Proposed Project has been reviewed and the information in this PEIR/PEIS has been considered, and that this PEIR/PEIS reflects the independent judgment of the City. CEQA also requires the City to adopt "findings" with respect to each significant environmental effect identified in the EIR) (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081; Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, Section 15091). For each significant effect, CEQA requires the approving agency to make one or more of the following findings:

- The Proposed Project has been altered to avoid or substantially lessen significant impacts identified in the Final EIR.
- The responsibility to carry out such changes or alterations is under the jurisdiction of another agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, which make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

If the City concludes that the Proposed Project will result in significant effects that cannot be substantially lessened or avoided by feasible mitigation measures and alternatives, the City must adopt a “statement of overriding considerations” prior to approval of the Proposed Project (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081 (b)). Such statements are intended under CEQA to provide a written means by which the lead agency balances in writing the benefits of the Proposed Project and the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. Where the lead agency concludes that the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts, the lead agency may find such impacts “acceptable” and approve the Proposed Project.

In addition, public agencies, when approving a project, must also adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)/Environmental Commitments Record (ECR) describing the changes that were incorporated into the Proposed Project or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Pub. Res. Code Section 21081.6). The MMRP/ECR is adopted at the time of project approval and is designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. Upon approval of the Proposed Project, the City will be responsible for implementation of the Proposed Project’s MMRP/ECR. This document will be attached to the Final PEIR/PEIS.

In accordance with CEQA, if the City Council decides to approve the Proposed Project, it will be required to make findings for each environmental impact of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level. In accordance with NEPA, if the City Council approves the Proposed Project, the City would prepare a Record of Decision. If the City determines that the benefits of the Proposed Project outweigh unmitigated, significant environmental effects, the City will be required to adopt a statement of overriding considerations stating the reasons supporting its action notwithstanding the Proposed Project’s significant environmental effects.

1.5 PEIR/PEIS ORGANIZATION

This PEIR/PEIS is organized as follows:

An **Executive Summary** of the PEIR/PEIS is provided at the beginning of this document. This summary outlines the conclusions of the environmental analysis and provides a summary of the Proposed Project and the project alternatives analyzed in the PEIR/PEIS. This section also includes a table summarizing all environmental impacts identified in this PEIR/PEIS along with the associated mitigation measures proposed to reduce or avoid each impact.

Chapter 1.0, Introduction, serves as a forward to this PEIR/PEIS, introducing the project, the applicable environmental procedures, and the organization of the PEIR/PEIS.

Chapter 2.0, Project Description, provides a thorough description of the Proposed Project elements, the purpose and need for the project, project objectives, and required discretionary

approvals This chapter also includes a description of the intended uses of the PEIR/PEIS and public agency actions.

Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis, describes the potential environmental effects of the Proposed Project, as well as proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid any potentially significant impacts. The discussion in Chapter 3.0 is organized by seventeen environmental issue areas as follows:

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

For each environmental issue area, the analysis and discussion are organized into seven subsections as described below:

- **Existing Conditions** - This subsection describes the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the Proposed Project at the time of publication of the NOP. The environmental setting establishes the baseline conditions by which the City will determine whether specific Project-related impacts are significant.
- **Regulatory Setting** –This subsection describes the regulatory setting applicable to the environmental issue area and the Proposed Project at the time of publication of the NOP.
- **Thresholds of Significance** – This subsection identifies a set of thresholds by which the level of impact is determined. Thresholds that were eliminated from further review in the PEIR/PEIS as part of the IS analysis will be identified here.
- **Impacts Analysis** – This subsection provides a detailed analysis regarding the environmental effects of the Proposed Project evaluated under CEQA and NEPA guidance, and whether the impacts of the Proposed Project would meet or exceed the established significance criteria.
- **Cumulative Impacts** – This subsection discusses the cumulative effects of the Proposed Project in combination with the effects of other projects in the vicinity.

- **Mitigation Measures** – This subsection identifies potentially feasible mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially reduce significant adverse Proposed Project impacts.
- **Level of Significance After Mitigation** – This subsection discusses whether project-related impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the PEIR/PEIS. If applicable, this subsection also identifies any residual significant and unavoidable adverse effects of the Proposed Project that would result even with implementation of mitigation measures.

In addition to the seven subsections listed above, full citations for all documents referred to in each environmental issue area discussion are included at the end of each section or chapter (*References*).

Chapter 4.0, Alternatives, discusses alternatives to the Proposed Project, including a No Project Alternative. This subsection describes the rationale for selecting the range of alternatives discussed in the PEIR/PEIS and identifies the alternatives considered by the City that were rejected from further discussion as infeasible during the scoping process. Lastly, Chapter 4.0 includes a discussion of the environmental effects of the alternatives that were carried forward for analysis and identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

Chapter 5.0, Other CEQA Requirements, addresses if there are any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided, any significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the Proposed Project, and any growth-inducing impacts associated with the Proposed Project.

Chapter 6.0, List of Preparers, gives names and contact information of those responsible for writing this PEIR/PEIS.

Appendices include various technical studies prepared for the Proposed Project, as listed in the Table of Contents.

The City, as the designated lead agency for the Proposed Project, is responsible for enforcing and verifying that each mitigation measure is implemented as required; however, the future project applicants shall be responsible for implementing the mitigation measures as required by the Proposed Project. As part of the Final PEIR/PEIS process, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be prepared.