2019029083

City of Long Beach
Drive-Through Use
Zoning Code Amendment

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND 03-19

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:
City of Long Beach Drive-Through Use Zoning Code Amendment

Lead Agency name and address:
City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:
Cynthia de la Torre, Planner IV
(562) 570-6559

Project Location:
Citywide, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California.

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:
City of Long Beach, Long Beach Development Services Department
c/o Cynthia de la Torre
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6559

General Plan:
The proposed Zoning Code Amendment would cover all General Plan Land Use Districts that apply to any zoning district, Specific Plan area, or Planned Development (PD) district in the City of Long Beach.

Zoning:
The proposed Zoning Code Amendment would cover all zoning districts and all Planned Development districts in the City of Long Beach.

Project Description:
The proposed Drive-Through Use Zoning Code Amendment (Project) would consist of the following changes to Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) collectively referred to as the "Project":

1) create a zoning code definition for drive-through facilities;
2) update the commercial and industrial zones permitted use tables with the new drive-through facility definition;
3) require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for new fast food drive-throughs and expansions in industrial zones and in all Planned Development districts for consistency with the existing review process in the commercial zones that allow this use;
4) make reference to the design guidelines that will be developed at a later time and will supplement the drive-through regulations in the zoning code;

5) include a provision to address the demolition and/or rebuilding of a drive-through facility approved under a previous CUP and subsequently, made legally nonconforming with the Project; and
6) provide new required findings specific to the drive-through use.

Surrounding land uses and settings:
The City of Long Beach is adjacent to the following municipalities: City of Los Angeles (Wilmington, Port of Los Angeles), Carson, Compton, Paramount, Bellflower, Lakewood, Hawaiian Gardens, Cypress, Los Alamitos and Seal Beach. It is also adjacent to the unincorporated communities of Rancho Dominguez and Rossmoor. In addition, the City of Signal Hill is completed surrounded by the City of Long Beach. Long Beach and its surrounding cities are fully urbanized and characterized by moderate to dense commercial, industrial, and residential development.

Public agencies whose approval is required:
Long Beach Planning Commission (recommend City Council adopt Negative Declaration 03-19 and approve the Zoning Code Amendment for the Drive-Through Use Regulations Update Ordinance)

Long Beach City Council (adopt Negative Declaration 03-19 and approve the Zoning Code Amendment for the Drive-Through Use Regulations Update Ordinance)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use/Planning	☐ Transportation
		☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Service Systems
☐ Energy		☐ Wildfire
☐ Geology/Soils	☐ Noise	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed Project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIAVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Cynthia de la Torre
Planner IV

2/13/19
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are supported adequately by the information sources a Lead Agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the Lead Agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) "Negative Declaration; Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (per Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effect was addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less that Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) the significance criteria or threshold. If any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The proposed Drive-Through Use Zoning Code Amendment (Project) would not result in significant adverse effects to any scenic vistas or public views of scenic vistas. The City topography is relatively flat, with scenic vistas of the ocean to the south and Palos Verdes to the west. In addition, distant views of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino Mountains to the north as well as the Santa Ana Mountains to the east are occasionally available to the public on days of clear visibility (primarily during the winter months).

The Project involves amendments to Title 21 of the City's Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) regarding the drive-through use and the processing of drive-through uses in industrial zones, where they are allowed by-right if they are not located within 300' of the nearest residential district. While every future development scenario cannot be anticipated at this time, any future development would be subject to more restrictive requirements and findings as a result of the proposed code amendment. As a result, future development would be more restricted and less impactful than the baseline of anticipated development under the current zoning code. The proposed Project would not result in any negative impacts to the City's visual environment. Therefore, no further analysis of this environmental issue is necessary.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

There are no State scenic highways located within the City. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged due to Project implementation. There would therefore be no impact to any natural scenic resource and no further analysis is required.

c. In non-urbanized areas, would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area,

would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section I.a. and b. above for discussion.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

All future developments and land use activities would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Title 21 (Long Beach Zoning Ordinance). Since Project implementation would not directly or indirectly create any adverse light or glare impacts, no further analysis is required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

For Sections II. a., b. and c. - There are no agricultural zones within the City of Long Beach, which is a fully urbanized community that has been built upon for over half a century. The Project would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to some of the worst air pollution in the nation, attributable to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, large population base, and dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric forces such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, determine how air pollutant emissions affect air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona, and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen,

and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are produced mostly by sources other than automobile exhaust.

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which it is located, it is consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP. The purpose of the proposed code amendment is to better analyze, prevent and if necessary, mitigate, impacts from drive-through facilities. It is anticipated that this code amendment will change the character of drive-through facilities and reduce future development of such facilities. The total amount of future development was contemplated in the General Plan, SCAG Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), and the resulting AQMP which was based on the RTP/SCS. Build-out within the projections within the AQMP does not create impacts beyond those already cleared in the RTP/SCS and AQMP. Since this Project does not propose any specific developments or growth-inducing projects that would conflict with the SCAG growth forecasts, it would be consistent with the AQMP and therefore no further analysis is required.

b. Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Implementation of the proposed Project would not significantly lower air quality standards or contribute to an air quality violation. The purpose of the proposed code amendment is to better analyze, prevent and if necessary, mitigate, impacts from drive-through facilities. It is anticipated that this code amendment will change the character of drive-through facilities and reduce future development of such facilities. Therefore, Project impacts on air quality would be less then significant and no further environmental analysis is required.

c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentration?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The CEQA Air Quality Handbook defines sensitive receptors as children, athletes, elderly and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including, schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City. The Project involves changes to the regulatory framework associated with the drive-through use in commercial and commercial zones, and in Planned Development districts. Among other features, the project will restrict the design and hours of drive-through facilities near residences, resulting in an improvement from the baseline of theoretical future projects built-out under the existing zoning code. Please see Sections III.a. and b. above for further discussion.

d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Potential sources of odors during construction include use of architectural coatings and solvents, and diesel-powered construction equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and solvents, which lowers odorous emissions.

The Project would not allow operations that could directly or indirectly result in any significant adverse odors or intensification of odors beyond those typically associated with construction activities. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Wildlife habitats within the City are generally limited to parks, nature preserves, and water body areas. The Project would not promote activities that would remove or impact any existing or planned wildlife habitats. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Land uses subject to this proposed Project would occur in established urbanized areas and would not remove or impact any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No further environmental analysis is required.

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Future implementation of the proposed Project would occur in established urbanized areas and would not promote or involve alteration of any protected wetland areas. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Project implementation would occur in established urbanized areas and would not alter or adversely impact any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, corridors or nursery sites. No further environmental analysis is required.

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Project implementation would be consistent with the General Plan and in conformity with all local policies and regulations. It would not alter or eliminate any existing or future policy or ordinance protecting biological resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project would not have any adverse effects on any existing or future habitat conservation plans. Please see Sections IV.a. through e. above for further discussion.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The City of Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties within the City (except for areas such as protected park lands) have been previously disturbed and/or developed. The proposed Project would not promote, encourage or enable activities that could remove, degrade or in any

way adversely impact local historic resources. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section §15064.5?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Implementation of the Project would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore would not be anticipated to affect or destroy any archaeological resources due its geographic location. Please see Section V.a. above for further discussion.

c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project does not propose any activities that would involve extensive excavation that could result in the disturbance of any designated cemetery or other burial ground or place of interment. Please see Sections V.a. through b. above for further discussion.

VI. ENERGY.

a. Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project involves amendments to the existing regulations pertaining to drive-through facilities. Among other regulatory changes, the proposed project would limit operations and hours within a proximity to residential zones, resulting in fewer hours of operations and energy use than would be permitted under the baseline of the existing municipal code. Future drive-through facilities subject to

the regulations of the Project would be required to comply with all applicable regulations, including Long Beach Municipal Title 21 (Long Beach Zoning Ordinance) and Part 6 (California Energy Code) of Title 24 (California Building Standards Code). Since Project implementation would not directly or indirectly result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation, no further analysis is required.

b. Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency—see Section VI.a. above.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Per Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the most significant fault system in the City is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City.

All land uses subject to the provisions of this proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable building codes that account for the possibility of seismic events. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Newport-Inglewood fault zone could create substantial ground shaking if a seismic event occurred along that fault. Similarly, a strong seismic event on any other fault system in Southern California has the potential to create considerable levels of ground shaking throughout the City. However, numerous variables determine the level of damage to a specific location. Given these variables, it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. All land uses must conform to all applicable State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Per Plate 7 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of the City is in areas of either minimal or low liquefaction potential. The only exceptions are in the southeastern portion of the City, where there is significant liquefaction potential, and the western portion (most of the area west of Pacific Avenue and south of the 405 freeway), where there is either moderate or significant liquefaction potential. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

iv) Landslides?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Per the Seismic Safety Element, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The State Seismic Hazard Zone map of the Long Beach Quadrangle indicates that the lack of steep terrain (except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill) results in only about 0.1 percent of the City lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for this quadrangle. Therefore, no impact would be expected and no further environmental analysis is required. Please see Section VII.a.i. above for further discussion.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

All land uses subject to the regulations of the Project would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best management practices to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

c. Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section VII.b. above for discussion. All land uses subject to the regulations of the Project would be constructed in compliance with all applicable building code requirements regarding soil stability.

d. Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Sections VII.b. and c. above for explanation.

e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The entire City is served by an existing sewer system and therefore, has no need for septic tanks or any other alternative wastewater disposal systems. No further environmental analysis is required.

f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The Project does not propose any projects that would be anticipated to result in extensive excavation that could adversely impact any paleontological resources or geologic features.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide per year. Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit over the next century. Methane is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The Project would not result in direct or indirect significant GHG impacts, but rather would establish changes to the City's Zoning Ordinance related to the regulatory framework associated with drive-through facilities. These changes are anticipated to result in changes to the operation of future drive-through facilities and reduce the number and hours of such facilities. This change may result in decreased automobile idling, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and associated emissions, including criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases. No further environmental analysis is needed.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

Please see Section VIII.a. above for discussion. The proposed Project would not permit any land use operations that would conflict with any plans, policies or regulations related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. No further environmental analysis is needed.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Any future land uses or activities that would be subject to the provisions of this Project that involve the handling and disposal of hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be required to fully comply with Long Beach Municipal Code Sections 8.86 through 8.88, as well as all existing State safety regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Please see Section IX.a. above for discussion.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section IX.a. above for discussion. Furthermore, the Project would impose additional requirements for drive-through facilities located in close proximity to sensitive uses, such as schools.

d. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with CEQA requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Any future land uses that would be regulated by the provisions of this Project would not be permitted to create any significant hazards to the public or the environment by operating at a location included in the Cortese List. Please see Section IX.a. above for further discussion.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City, just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The Project would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. All future development near the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. Please see Section IX.a. above for further discussion.

f. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project would not encourage or otherwise set forth any policies or recommendations that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No further environmental analysis is required.

g. Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The City is a highly-urbanized community and there are no properties located adjacent to wild lands and there is no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. No further environmental analysis is required.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has produced a series of Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) designating potential flood zones (based on the projected inundation limits, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers).

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project would be consistent with all chapters of the General Plan, including the Conservation Element. All activities subject to the provisions of this Project would be required to be in full compliance with all applicable federal, State and

local water quality standards and regulations. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section X.a. above for discussion. The City is a highly-urbanized community with the water system infrastructure fully in place to accommodate future development consistent with the General Plan.

c. Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project does not encourage or enable any alterations to existing draining patterns or to the course of streams or rivers. Please see Section X.a. above for discussion.

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Sections X.a. and c. above for discussion.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐	Less Than Significant Impact	☒	No Impact

Please see Sections X.a. and c. above for discussion. The City's existing storm water drainage system is adequate to accommodate runoff from any future land uses subject to the provisions of this Project. The Project would not adversely affect provisions for retention and infiltration of stormwater consistent with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) policies.

(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐	Less Than Significant Impact	☒	No Impact

Please see Section X.a. and c. above for discussion.

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐	Less Than Significant Impact	☒	No Impact

According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of Long Beach is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Potential tsunami hazards would be limited to properties and public improvements near the coastline. The proposed Project would not result in any increased risk of inundation to any properties.

e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Potentially Significant Impact	☐	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐	Less Than Significant Impact	☒	No Impact

The Project would not directly or indirectly conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan—see Section X.a. above.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project consists of the following changes to Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance):

1) create a zoning code definition for drive-through facilities;
2) update the commercial and industrial zones permitted use tables with the new drive-through facility definition;
3) require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for new fast food drive-throughs and expansions in industrial zones and in all Planned Development districts for consistency with the existing review process in the commercial zones that allow this use;
4) make reference to the design guidelines that will be developed at a later time and will supplement the drive-through regulations in the zoning code;
5) include a provision to address the demolition and/or rebuilding of a drive-through facility approved under a previous CUP and subsequently, made legally nonconforming with the Project; and
6) provide new required findings specific to the drive-through use.

The Project would not directly or indirectly divide any established community as a result of regulating drive-through uses. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

See Section XI.a. above for discussion. The Project would not conflict with the City's General Plan, the 2010 Strategic Plan, local coastal program, or any other applicable land use plans and policies. Rather, the Project is consistent with goals and objectives in the existing Land Use Element of the General Plan, such as Functional Transportation goals to improve on the City's current ability to move people and goods to and from development centers while preserving and protecting residential neighborhoods. Impacts to existing local regulations would, therefore, be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Historically, the primary mineral resources within the City of Long Beach have been oil and natural gas. However, oil and gas extraction operations have diminished over the last century as the resources have become depleted. Today, extraction operations continue but on a reduced scale compared to past levels.

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The Project does not propose any alteration of local mineral resource land uses and there are no mineral resource activities that would be altered or displaced by Project implementation. No further discussion is required.

b. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

Please see Section XII.a. above for discussion.

XIII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than commercial and industrial land uses.

a. Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Future construction activities related to land uses subject to the provisions of this Project could involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, earth-moving equipment, and paving equipment. However, all construction activities and land use operations must be performed in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). Project implementation would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or exempt any future land uses or improvements from local noise controls. The local Noise Ordinance would continue to regulate all future land use construction and operational noise levels. Furthermore, the proposed zoning code amendments would limit facilities and operational hours proximate to residential zones, thus further reducing any impacts to sensitive receptors. No further environmental analysis of this issue is necessary.

b. Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Please see Section XIII.a. above for discussion. Project implementation would occur in compliance with local noise and vibration controls.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

The Long Beach Airport is located within the City just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. All future development near the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance with all applicable local and FAA requirements. The Project would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage developments that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County. At the time of the 2000 Census, Long Beach had a population of 461,522, which was a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census. The 2010 Census reported a total City population of 462,257.

a. Would the project induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or directly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project involves various changes to Title 21 of the Long Beach Municipal Code (Zoning Ordinance) to amend the regulations pertaining to drive-through facilities. It is not intended or expected to directly or indirectly induce population growth. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project does not set forth or encourage any policies, activities or implementation measures that would directly or indirectly displace existing residential units in the City. No further environmental analysis is required.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection would be provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 stations in the City. The Department is divided into bureaus of Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, the Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community.

Police protection would be provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into bureaus of Administration, Investigation, and Patrol.

The City of Long Beach is served by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the City of Signal Hill, Catalina Island and a large portion of the City of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity during the past decade.

Would the proposed project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project involves changes to the City's Zoning Ordinance regarding drive-through uses and is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for fire protection services or fire protection facilities. New drive-through facilities will continue to be subject to fire code review during the building plan check process as well as subject to fire facilities impact fees. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Police protection?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Similar to Section XIV.a. above, since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not significantly increase demands for police protection service, nor require provision of new police facilities. New drive-through facilities will continue to the subject to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) review during the entitlement review process and subject to police facilities impact fees.

c. Schools?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not result in any significant increased demand for public school

services or facilities. New drive-through facilities will continue to be subject to school impact fees.

d. Parks?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Since the Project is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth, the Project would not generate any significant additional demand for provision of park services or facilities by the City.

e. Other public facilities?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

No other impacts have been identified that would require the provision of new or physically-altered governmental facilities. New drive-through facilities will continue to be subject to sewer, transportation, and storm water impact fees.

XVI. RECREATION

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project sets forth a regulatory framework for drive-through uses and is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for recreational facilities. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Please see Section XVI.a. above. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

a. Would the project conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

The Project involves amending the drive-through use regulations and is not intended to conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system. Instead, the Project includes provisions that take into account pedestrian and bicycle accessibility and amenities, for example, in accordance with the City's Land Use strategies/policies and the Mobility Element. Such strategies in the Mobility Element, for example, call for supportive features to support active living (MOP IM-5); ensuring that all planning processes identify where pedestrian, bike, and transit improvements can be made (MOP IM-30); and continuing to implement pedestrian streetscape designs (MOP IM-33). No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Please see Section XVII.a. for discussion. Since the Project would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth, there would be no significant impacts on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). The proposed zoning code amendment is anticipated to reduce the number of and hours of potential future drive-through facilities as compared to the baseline of future construction under the existing zoning code.

c. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The Project would not create or encourage any hazardous transportation-related design features or incompatible uses. The proposed zoning code amendment will require consideration of pedestrian safety and transportation that is not required in the baseline of the existing zoning code. No further environmental analysis is required.

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☐ Less Than Significant Impact ☒ No Impact

The Project would not propose or encourage any specific land uses or developments or transportation network modifications that would have the potential to result in deficient or inadequate emergency access routes. New drive-through facilities will continue to be subject to fire code review during the building plan check process, as well as subject to fire and police facilities impact fees. The proposed changes to the zoning code are anticipated to improve pedestrian and vehicular safety. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation ☒ Less Than Significant Impact ☐ No Impact

Please see Section V. above. Project implementation would not result in any specific construction activities involving extensive excavation, and therefore

would not be anticipated to significantly affect or destroy any Native American tribal cultural resources. Construction of fast-food restaurants with drive-through facilities is typically characterized by shallow footings to support one-story buildings. While the probability of encountering a tribal cultural resource or human remains is low, any occurrence or discovery is subject to existing protections under California law. No further environmental analysis is required.

ii. A resource determined by the Lead Agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

Please see Section XVIII.a. above. The City has no substantial evidence of any significant resource impacted by this change to the zoning code. During the discretionary review of any future drive-through facilities the City will provide locational information to potentially impacted tribal officials and will conduct formal consultation, as may be requested. No further environmental analysis is required at this time.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a. Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably forseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

c. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

e. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

For Sections XIX.a. through e.: The Project involves amending the drive-through use regulations and would not be expected to place an undue burden on any utility or service system. The City of Long Beach is an urbanized setting with all utilities and services fully in place. Future demands for utilities and service systems have been anticipated in the General Plan goals, policies and programs for future growth. The City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) anticipates a level of population growth in excess of the General Plan, therefore the buildout of the General Plan, including any future drive-through facilities, will result in water demand equal to or less than that already anticipated in the UWMP. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency plan?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

d. 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?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

For Sections XX.a. through d.: The City of Long Beach has not been identified as a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Project by CAL Fire[1] nor is the City in or near a State Responsibility Area[2]. The Project involves amending the drive-through use regulations and would not be expected to impair emergency plans, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire place. The Project would not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. Lastly, as discussed in Section VII.iv. above, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to

[1] http://fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps_citylist
[2] http://www.fire.ca.gov/firepreventionfee/sraviewer_launch

vertical). The Project would not be expected to expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. No further environmental analysis is necessary.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

As determined in Section IV. Biological Resources and Section V. Cultural Resources, the Project would have no significant adverse impacts on biological or cultural resources. The proposed Project would not degrade the quality of the environment, impact any natural habitats, effect any fish or wildlife populations, threaten any plant or animal communities, alter the number or restrict the range of any rare or endangered plants or animals, or eliminate any examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☒ Less Than Significant Impact	☐ No Impact

The Project regulatory provisions for drive-through uses would not contribute to any cumulative growth effects beyond what is anticipated for the City's future in the General Plan.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact	☐ Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	☐ Less Than Significant Impact	☒ No Impact

The land use requirements of this Project would not directly or indirectly cause any substantial adverse effects on human beings. For this reason, the City has concluded that this Project can be implemented without causing significant adverse environmental effects and determined that the Negative Declaration is the appropriate type of CEQA documentation.