

CHAPTER 5.0 OTHER CEQA REQUIREMENTS

5.1 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section is prepared in accordance with Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines, which requires the discussion of any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if a project is implemented. These include impacts that can be mitigated, but cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. An analysis of environmental impacts caused by the Proposed Project has been conducted and is contained in this PEIR/PEIS. Fifteen issue areas were analyzed in detail in Chapter 3.0, Environmental Analysis. According to the environmental impact analysis presented in Chapter 3.0, the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable adverse impacts to air quality (refer to Section 3.2, Air Quality, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), cultural resources (refer to Section 3.3, Cultural Resources, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), greenhouse gas emissions (refer to Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), and Transportation (refer to Section 3.11, Transportation, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS).

The reason why the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan (GCSP; Proposed Project) is being considered, notwithstanding the potential significant unavoidable adverse impacts, are related to the project objectives described in Section 2.5, Project Objectives, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS. As indicated, the Proposed Project is being proposed to create a 21st century employment district that fosters innovation; stimulate economic development and job growth to replenish jobs lost from the closure of the former Boeing C-17 manufacturing plant; cultivate the existing human capital of Long Beach; establish Cherry Avenue as a multimodal unifying corridor; and increase mobility choices throughout the Globemaster Corridor District.

5.1.1 Air Quality

As discussed in Section 3.2, Air Quality, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts with regard to violating an air quality standard, resulting in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria pollutant and exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Conflict with Air Quality Management Plan

The Proposed Project would potentially result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or cause or contribute to new violations, and would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1. Implementation of the Proposed Project would not exceed the demographic growth forecasts in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2016 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Survey (RTP/SCS); therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District

(SCAQMD) 2016 Air Quality management Plan (AQMP), which based future emission estimates on the SCAG 2016 RTP/SCS. Thus, the Proposed Project would not conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 2. However, because the Proposed Project would potentially conflict with Consistency Criterion No. 1, impacts related to the Proposed Project’s potential to conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan is considered potentially significant and mitigation is required. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-2** (Fugitive Dust Control)¹, and **MM-AQ-3** (Architectural Coating VOC Emissions) would be required to reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions and mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-8** (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1** would reduce various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-2** would reduce dust-related PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions generated during construction and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-3** would reduce VOC emissions generated the application of architectural coating during construction. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4**, **MM-AQ-5**, and **MM-AQ-6** aim to reduce operational mobile source emissions of various air pollutants. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-7** focuses on reducing energy-related operational emissions and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-8** encourages reduction of operational area source VOC emissions. Mitigation measure **MM-AQ-9** would reduce criteria air pollutants by replacing diesel-fueled forklifts with electric forklifts and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-10** would reduce criteria air pollutants generated by TRU idling. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, due to the magnitude of emissions associated with buildout of the Proposed Project, potential impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Nonattainment Criteria Air Pollutants

Because construction specifications are not currently available, under a conservative scenario where maximum emissions from each assessed construction phase would occur concurrently, estimated Proposed Project emissions would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for VOC and NO_x. Emissions of CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} are not estimated to exceed SCAQMD thresholds. The implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** through **MM-AQ-3** would be required to reduce Proposed Project construction-related emissions. As described previously, mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1** would reduce various air pollutant emissions associated with construction equipment operation, mitigation measure **MM-AQ-2** would reduce dust-related PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions generated during construction (even though estimated Proposed Project mass daily

¹ Even though estimated Proposed Project mass daily emissions do not exceed the PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}.

emissions do not exceed the PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}), and mitigation measure **MM-AQ-3** would reduce VOC emissions generated the application of architectural coating during construction. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, Proposed Project-generated construction criteria air pollutant emissions would remain **significant and unavoidable**, under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

During operations, Proposed Project-generated VOC, CO, and PM₁₀ would exceed the SCAQMD thresholds. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-8** (Low-VOC-Green Cleaning Product Education Program), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins) would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, potential impacts during operation of the Proposed Project would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Sensitive Receptor Impacts

Sensitive receptors are those individuals more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. To determine the Proposed Project's potential to impact nearby sensitive receptors, a Localized Significance Thresholds (LST) analysis, Carbon Monoxide (CO) hotspots screening evaluation, Toxic Air Contaminants (TAC) exposure analysis, and criteria air pollutant health effect evaluation were conducted. The determinations were as follows:

According to the LST analysis, construction activities associated with the Proposed Project would generate PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions in excess of site-specific LSTs; therefore, localized construction impacts would be potentially significant and mitigation is required. Mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** and **MM-AQ-2** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reduction and Fugitive Dust Control, respectively) would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions. Nonetheless, site-specific impacts during construction of the Proposed Project would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

The CO hotspots screening evaluation determined the Proposed Project would not negatively affect the LOS of intersections in the Proposed Project vicinity and would not significantly contribute to a CO hotspot.

The potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily DPM, is considered potentially significant and mitigation is required. Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-AQ-1**, which would result in reductions in exhaust PM₁₀ emissions from construction equipment, would be required. Nonetheless, the potential health risk of exposing sensitive receptors to construction-generated TAC emissions, primarily DPM, is considered **significant and unavoidable**. Operational TAC exposure could not be identified due to the uncertainty of future

sensitive receptor locations and the effectiveness of TAC reduction measures. However, to reduce the potential for the Proposed Project to expose sensitive receptors to TACs and the associated health risk, mitigation measures **MM-AQ-11** (Health Risk Siting), **MM-AQ-12** (Toxic Air Contaminant Reduction) and **MM-AQ-13** (Health Risk Assessment Requirements) would be implemented. Note that mitigation measures that reduce criteria air pollutants also reduce TACs, specifically mitigation measures **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), and **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins).

Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, which cannot be quantified at this time, the Proposed Project would have a **significant and unavoidable** health risk impact as a result of operation under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

Based on the criteria air pollutant evaluation, because construction and operation of the Proposed Project could result in exceedances of the SCAQMD significance thresholds for VOC, NO_x, CO, and PM₁₀, the potential health effects associated with criteria air pollutants are considered potentially significant. The implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** through **MM-AQ-3** would be required to reduce the Proposed Project's construction-related emissions, and the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-4** through **MM-AQ-10** would be required to reduce emissions generated during operation of the Proposed Project. Nonetheless, even with the implementation of mitigation, potential impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** during both construction and operation under CEQA, and potential effects would remain **adverse** under NEPA.

5.1.2 Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section 3.3, Cultural Resources, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts with regard to the built environment. Implementation of the GCSP has the potential to result in the modification or demolition of historic-age structures over 45 years of age in the Plan Area.

There are known historical resources in the Plan Area and the potential for more properties that have not been evaluated and could be CEQA historical resources. In particular, the Plan Area includes resources that are recently reaching 45 years or more of age and are associated with periods of Long Beach history not fully documented in the Historic Context Statement. Preservation of these modern buildings may not be feasible or consistent with the goals of the GCSP. Furthermore, as these resources are not listed, may be eligible for local listing but not the state or national register, impacts under CEQA will differ from NEPA.

Implementation of mitigation measure **MM-CUL-1**, which requires future project proponents to ensure that potential impacts to historical resources be assessed at the project level, and that properties 45 years old or older be evaluated for historical significance prior to initiation of

any project-related activities that could identify significant impacts to historic properties. Development under the proposed GCSP has a potential for demolishing structures that are eligible for historic significance.

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

5.1.3 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As discussed in Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the Proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts related to a cumulatively considerable GHG contribution, and would also conflict with applicable GHG emissions reductions plans, policies, or regulations.

As shown in Table 3.4-2 (see Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), the estimated total GHG emissions during construction of would total approximately 28,492 MT CO_{2e} over the assumed 20-year construction period. Estimated Proposed Project-generated construction emissions amortized over 30 years would be approximately 950 MT CO_{2e} per year. As shown in Table 3.4-3 (see Section 3.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS), estimated annual Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions would be approximately 120,999 MT CO_{2e} per year as a result of Proposed Project operations only. As the Existing Scenario is estimated to generate 57,783 MT CO_{2e} per year, the net change in emissions is estimated to be 63,216 MT CO_{2e} per year. After accounting for amortized Proposed Project construction emissions, total net GHGs generated by the Proposed Project would be approximately 64,166 MT CO_{2e} per year. As such, annual operational GHG emissions with amortized construction emissions would exceed the SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year.

Because the Proposed Project would exceed the Tier 3 SCAQMD threshold of 3,000 MT CO_{2e} per year, a Tier 4 analysis is conducted to evaluate the Proposed Project's efficiency on a service population basis. The Tier 4 efficiency metric threshold used is 1.92 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year consistent with the RDEIR prepared for the General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Elements Project (City of Long Beach 2019b), which is also a plan-level analysis with a 2040 buildout year. The efficiency metric threshold used is 1.92 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year is more stringent than the proposed SCAQMD 2035 efficiency metric of 4.1 MT CO_{2e}/SP/year for plan level analyses. As shown in Table 3.4-3, the Proposed Project would generate approximately 120,999 MT CO_{2e} per year as a result of

Proposed Project operations only; however, the net change between the Proposed Project and Existing, plus amortized Proposed Project construction emissions, is 64,166 MT CO₂e per year. The Proposed Project’s service population, which is defined as residents plus employees, consists solely of employees as the Proposed Project does not include a residential land use component. Per the Proposed Project’s job projection analysis, the estimated service population (i.e., employees) for the Proposed Project is 11,170 (Svesson 2020).² Accordingly, the Proposed Project is estimated to result in 5.74 MT CO₂e/SP/year (64,166 MT CO₂e/year ÷ 11,170 SP), which would exceed the applied efficiency metric threshold 1.92 MT CO₂e/SP/year.

Therefore, the Proposed Project’s GHG contribution would be cumulatively considerable and is potentially significant. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins), **MM-GHG-1** (Water Conservation), and **MM-GHG-2** (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions. However, even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable**.

The Proposed Project would potentially conflict with plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and as such, impacts are considered potentially significant. As discussed previously, implementation of mitigation measures **MM-AQ-1** (Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions), **MM-AQ-4** (Vehicle Miles Traveled Reduction Strategies), **MM-AQ-5** (Encourage Electric Vehicles), **MM-AQ-6** (Idling Restriction), **MM-AQ-7** (Energy Conservation), **MM-AQ-9** (Electric Forklifts), **MM-AQ-10** (TRU Plug-Ins), **MM-GHG-1** (Water Conservation), and **MM-GHG-2** (Solid Waste Reduction) would reduce Proposed Project-generated GHG emissions and associated impacts related to the potential to conflict with applicable GHG emissions reduction plans, policies, or regulations. In addition to the various mitigation measures required, the City is in the process of developing a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) to ensure that the City continues on a trajectory that aligns with the short-term, interim, and long-term State GHG reduction goals. Implementation of the CAAP would contribute to reducing GHG emissions resulting from Proposed Project implementation to the extent applicable to non-residential land use development. However, no credit for the Citywide emissions reduction plan was taken, as the implementation of the CAAP is speculative until its approved. Even with the implementation of mitigation, impacts would remain **significant and unavoidable** under CEQA.

² As explained in Section 2 and 3.2, in 2040, the estimated job absorption for the Proposed Project is 4,884; the remaining 6,286 jobs are anticipated to occur after 2040. However, the emission inventory for the Proposed Project, as presented in Table 3.4-3, assumes buildout of the entire GCSP by 2040. Therefore, it is appropriate to assume the full employment projection to estimate an efficiency metric when using full buildout emissions as the basis.

5.1.4 Transportation

Existing (Year 2018) Plus Project Conditions

The Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix D) evaluates the Proposed Project-related impacts at 28 key study intersections per City of Long Beach and City of Signal Hill significant impact criteria. Under the Existing (2018) Plus Project Intersection Peak Hour Levels of Service, six of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project Traffic. Five of these intersections are considered significantly impacted compared to LOS standards. With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-1** through **MM-TRAF-5**, all intersections would operate at acceptable LOS conditions under Existing (Year 2018) Plus Project conditions.

Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, the intersection is not considered affected when compared to the LOS standards utilized by City of Long Beach, which specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is considered to be significant if the project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Proposed Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost.

Year 2040 Plus Project Conditions

Under the Year 2040 Baseline Plus Project traffic conditions, 10 of the key intersections are forecast to operate adversely with the addition of Proposed Project traffic, and are considered significantly impacted when compared to the LOS standards utilized by City of Long Beach. Implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-5** through **MM-TRAF-13** at the significantly impacted intersections will completely offset the Proposed Project's impact and improve the LOS to acceptable conditions.

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

Caltrans Facilities Analysis

In conformance with the current Caltrans *Guide for the Preparation of Traffic Impact Studies*, dated December 2002, existing and projected peak hour operating conditions at the four state-controlled study intersections within the study area have been evaluated using the *Highway Capacity Manual* operations method of analysis.

An analysis of Caltrans Facilities indicates that the Proposed Project would impact the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection under Existing Plus Project traffic conditions. Although the intersection of Orange Avenue/I-405 southbound ramps currently and is forecast to operate at unacceptable LOS F in the AM and PM peak hour, impacts are not considered significant. The significance impact criteria of the City of Long Beach specifies that an unsignalized intersection impact is considered to be significant if the project causes an intersection at LOS D or better to degrade to LOS E or F. Although this intersection is not considered significantly impacted, it does operate adversely under existing traffic conditions. Also, preliminary review of the existing volumes indicate that the intersection satisfies the criteria for the installation of a traffic signal. Should Caltrans or the City of Long Beach desire to install a traffic signal at this location, the Project may be expected to pay a fair-share of the total cost. With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-9**, the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

The Proposed Project would also impact the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection, along with I-405 Northbound Ramp/32nd Street intersection, under Year 2040 Plus Project. With the implementation of mitigation measures **MM-TRAF-9** and **MM-TRAF-14**, the I-405 Southbound Off-Ramp/Spring Street intersection and the I-405 Northbound Ramp/32nd Street intersection would operate at acceptable LOS conditions.

Mitigation measures in Section 3.11.6, Mitigation Measures (see Section 3.11, Transportation, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS) identify when the proposed improvements would fall under the authority of another jurisdiction or require additional right-of-way acquisition causing operational deficiencies or conflicts with the intent of the specific plan. All identified mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible, therefore, all impacts related to consistency with established LOS metrics are considered **significant and unavoidable**.

5.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR analyze the extent to which a project's primary and secondary effects would impact the environment and commit nonrenewable resources to uses that future generations will not be able to reverse. Nonrenewable resources that would be used on-site during construction and operation include natural gas, other fossil fuels, water, concrete, steel, and lumber. The Proposed Project would result in the commitment of such resources.

Electricity is provided to the Plan Area by Southern California Edison (SCE). SCE serves approximately 180 cities in 11 counties across Central and Southern California. SCE's electrical energy generation sources include natural gas, coal, nuclear, renewable energy (geothermal, small hydroelectric, solar, and wind), and large hydroelectric facilities. Based on an SCE interactive distribution map last updated on September 14, 2012, three substations (5738, 5753, and 5785) service the Plan Area with overlapping coverage. The amount of electricity used during construction would be minimal and would only occur during the hours of construction. The majority of energy used during construction would be from petroleum. Fuel consumed by construction equipment and associated with the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes would be the primary energy resource expended during construction. In addition, a variety of resource materials would be used during construction, including steel, wood, concrete, and fabricated materials. Once these materials and fuels are used for construction, the commitment of such materials and fuels would be considered irreversible. Further, the Proposed Project would be required to comply with the California Air Resources Board's Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes. Therefore, because petroleum use during construction would be temporary and minimal, the Proposed Project would not result in the excessive use of fuel or energy or the use of excessive amounts of power, and impacts would not be irreversible.

Operation of the Proposed Project would require the commitment of nonrenewable resources related to energy consumption. At full build out, the Proposed Project's operational phase would require electricity for operating the various buildings. Natural gas would be directly consumed throughout operation of the Proposed Project, primarily through building heating. The Proposed Project would also result in petroleum fuel consumption from motor vehicles traveling to and from the Plan Area, and uses affiliated with motorized transportation of goods. Although consumption of resources would necessarily occur, the Proposed Project would not result in the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of resources.

5.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR include a discussion of the growth-inducing impacts of a project. Growth-inducing impacts are those effects of the Proposed Project that might foster economic or population growth or the construction of new housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. According to CEQA, increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects.

Induced growth is any growth that exceeds planned growth and results from new development that would not have taken place without the implementation of the Proposed Project. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it results in growth or

population concentration that exceeds those assumptions included in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or projections made by regional planning authorities. However, the creation of growth-inducing potential does not automatically lead to growth, whether it would be below or in exceedance of a projected level.

The environmental effects of induced growth are secondary or indirect impacts of the Proposed Project. Secondary effects of growth could result in significant, adverse environmental impacts, which could include increased demand on community or public services, increased traffic and noise, degradation of air and water quality, and conversion of agricultural land and open space to developed uses. The Population and Housing section of the EIR discusses the potential growth inducement of the Proposed Project (Section 3.9, Population and Housing, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS). Population growth, in and of itself, does not constitute a physical impact on the environment. However, population growth is relevant in that it may generate secondary environmental impacts as defined under the CEQA, such as increased demands for public services, surpassing of infrastructure capacities, or increased traffic congestion and resulting air pollutant emissions. These indirect environmental effects related to population growth are addressed in the applicable sections of this Draft PEIR/PEIS.

The GCSP does not include any zoning for residential land uses that could directly induce population growth. The Plan Area is highly urbanized, already built out, and has the infrastructure to support new zoning designations and development regulations for commercial and industrial realted land uses as proposed under the GCSP. While the GCSP could increase the number of jobs available relative to the number of jobs that are currently available, increase in employment during construction and operation are not expected to cause people to move into the City or the County from areas outside the City or County. Further, the future zoning and development regulations as propsod under the GCSP would be consistent with what was planned for and envisioned in the City’s 2019 Land Use Element.

The extent to which new jobs created by a project are filled by existing residents is a factor that tends to reduce the growth-related effect of a project. While the GCSP is a planning document and does not include any physical improvements or projects at this time, future development facilitated by Proposed Project approval would create a number of temporary, construction-related jobs, as well as permanent jobs associated with the new future developments. As discussed in Section 3.9, Population and Housing, of this Draft PEIR/PEIS, the City of Long Beach is expected to have a jobs-to-housing ratio of 1.04 by 2040, which is lower than Los Angeles County and the SCAG region by 0.28 and 0.27, respectively. This means that the City is considered to be “jobs poor,” indicating that many of the residents must commute to places of employment outside of the City. While it is uncertain where future place of residence would be for employees working within the Plan Area, due to the City’s projected jobs-to-housing ratio (1.04 by 2040), it is reasonable to assume that a large percentage of these jobs would be filled by persons already living within the

City. Therefore, a substantial increase in population as a result of future employment opportunities potentially facilitated by the GCSP is not anticipated.

In addition, due to the significant job loss that resulted in the area from closure of the C-17 Site, which is evident by the number of manufacturing jobs lost from 2010 to 2016, the new jobs created by the GCSP would likely be replacing those that were lost in the area due to closure of the C-17 Site. A principal goal of the GCSP is to stimulate economic growth and attract businesses that replenish high-quality jobs lost from the closure of the former Boeing C-17 manufacturing plant.

Furthermore, although the GCSP would allow for new employment opportunities in the City of Long Beach through the year 2040, it would be consistent with SCAG's regional growth forecasts for employment in the same horizon year. Thus, the Proposed Project would not foster growth in excess of what was assumed in projections made by regional planning agencies (e.g., SCAG). As such, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse secondary effects related to induced growth.

5.4 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires a statement that briefly indicates the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. As stated in the State CEQA Guidelines, such a statement may be contained in an attached copy of an Initial Study. An Initial Study was prepared for the Proposed Project and is included in Appendix A-1. As described and substantiated in the Initial Study (Appendix A-1), all threshold questions related to Agriculture and Forestry Resources, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Mineral Resources, and Recreation were not found to be significant, and no additional analysis in the PEIR/PEIS was required. Threshold questions not further analyzed in the PEIR/PEIS within the other fourteen issue areas are discussed throughout Chapter 3.0.

5.4.1 Wildfire

On December 28, 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency finalized the updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Proposed Project was issued September 12, 2018, and the environmental analysis was initiated at the same time. As such, the analysis included within this PEIR/PEIS considers the State CEQA Guidelines that were effective at the time the NOP was issued and environmental analysis began. The new State CEQA Guidelines (adopted December 28, 2018) now include a discussion in Appendix G on Wildfire, and for the reasons discussed previously, are not included within the analysis provided throughout this PEIR/PEIS. The following discussion describes the Proposed Project's environmental impact as it relates to wildfire, which was found to be less than significant:

According to Cal Fire’s Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer, the Plan Area and surrounding area is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone (VHFHSZ) (Cal Fire 2019). The Plan Area is located within a fully developed area and is not located adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, wildland areas. There are no designated open space areas surrounding the Plan Area. As such, prevailing winds and other factors would not create or exacerbate wildfire risks. The Plan Area is highly disturbed and consists primarily of commercial and industrial uses with some vegetation and small amounts of unpaved areas. Due to the highly disturbed nature of the Plan Area, the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, or other utilities) would not create or exacerbate a fire risk. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not install fuel breaks or emergency water sources that may. The Plan Area is relatively flat, and thus, would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Future development under the Proposed Project would not conflict with existing plans governing emergency access. Therefore, impacts related to wildfire are considered **less than significant**, and no cumulative impacts related to wildfires would occur.

5.5 REFERENCES

- CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2019. “FHSZ Viewer.” Accessed July 22, 2019. <http://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>.
- City of Long Beach. 2019. General Plan. Land Use Element. December 2019. <http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/lueude/land-use-element-final-adopted-december-2019>.