



City of Long Beach Short-Term Rentals Ordinance

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

ND 07-19

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Planning Bureau

This page intentionally left blank.

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:

City of Long Beach Short-Term Rentals Ordinance

Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach
411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:

Anita Juhola-Garcia, Planner
(562) 570-6469

Project Location:

City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California.

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:

City of Long Beach, Long Beach Development Services
c/o Christopher Koontz
411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 570-6288

General Plan:

The proposed Short-Term Rentals Ordinance would cover all General Plan Land Use Districts that apply to any zoning district, Specific Plan (SP) or Planned Development (PD) District with residential uses.

Zoning:

The proposed Short-Term Rentals Ordinance applies to all zoning districts with residential uses, including all Planned Development (PD) Districts and Specific Plan (SP) Districts.

Project Description:

The proposed project will establish regulations, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned visitor serving residential dwelling units on a short-term basis in order to maintain the long-term rental housing stock in the City; ensure the collection and payment of Transient Occupancy Taxes ("TOT"); and provide safeguards to the residents of the City of Long Beach that such short-term rental activities do not become a nuisance, or threaten the public health, safety or welfare of neighboring properties.

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration ("IS/ND") evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed revisions to the City's regulations for transient residential use.

Certain aspects of the proposed amendments do not require environmental analysis under CEQA. For example:

- CEQA does not apply to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public agencies unless those charges would be used to fund capital projects (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15273). Therefore, establishment of City administrative fees associated with issuance of permits or licenses for the short-term rental of existing housing units do not require CEQA review.
- Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15309, inspections to check for performance of an operation, or quality, health, or safety of a project are exempt from CEQA.
- City actions to enforce or revoke a license or other entitlement for use or enforcement by a law, general rule, standard, or objective, administered or adopted by the regulatory agency are exempt from CEQA review pursuant to Guidelines Sec. 15321.
- Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15378, “Project means the whole of an action, which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment. However, “Project” does not include “*Organizational or administrative activities of governments that will not result in direct or indirect physical changes to the environment.*” Therefore, regulations that represent administrative activities are not subject to CEQA review.
- In evaluating potential economic or social effects of the proposed regulations, this IS/ND reflects CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15382, which states:

“Significant effect on the environment” means a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.

Economic or social changes (e.g., effects on property values or neighborhood social interactions) are not considered to be significant environmental impacts under CEQA unless those changes contribute to a significant physical impact.

The following sections of Title 21 (Zoning Code) shall be amended for the Short-Term Rental Ordinance (STRO):

Add the following underlined definition or reference:

- 21.15.2487 – Short-Term Rental.

“Short-Term Rental means a residential dwelling unit or portion thereof, that is offered or provided to a paying guest(s) by a short-term rental operator for thirty (30) or fewer consecutive nights. The term “short-term rental” shall not include hotels, motels or bed and breakfast inns.

- 21.15.060 Accessory use. “Short-term rentals” are not considered accessory uses.
- 21.51.235. – Home Occupations.

Add “short-term rentals” to the list of prohibited home occupation uses

- 21.51.276 – Accessory dwelling units.

E. Other Provisions.

1. Owner Occupants, Sales, Rentals, and Covenants. The following requirements shall apply to all accessory dwelling units:

d. The accessory dwelling unit or the primary dwelling may be rented. All rentals shall be for terms of longer than thirty (30) days unless a Short-Term Rental permit is obtained subject to Title 5.

Remove the following underlined definition or reference to:

- 21.15.1580 - Lodginghouse.

“Lodginghouse” means a house with three (3) or more guestrooms where lodging is provided for compensation and where meals are not served.

- 21.51.270 – Room Rental.

The conditions listed below shall apply to all room rentals. Any room rental use not conforming to these conditions shall be considered a boardinghouse, lodging house, hotel or motel, as applicable, and shall be subject to the requirements for that use.

A. The owner of the dwelling unit must live in the unit.

B. The rented room shall not contain more than three (3) plumbing facilities nor a kitchen. Such room shall not contain laundry facilities, a water heater or a wetbar-type sink.

C. The rented room shall not contain an independent exterior entrance.

- D. The rented room may not be detached from the principal dwelling unit.
- E. Not more than two (2) rooms shall be rented in a single dwelling unit.

- 21.52.271 – Special Group Residence (board and care, convalescent home, half-way house, boardinghouse/lodginghouse, communal housing and the like).

Remove the term "lodginghouse" from Special Group Residence.

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 completely surrounded by the City of Long Beach.

Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach Planning Commission (recommend City Council approve the changes to Title 21 Zoning Ordinance and submit a Local Coastal Program Amendment to revise the Long Beach Municipal Code)

Long Beach City Council (adopt Negative Declaration 07-19, approve the Short-Term Rentals Ordinance, and adopt the Short-Term Rental Zoning Code Amendments)

California Coastal Commission

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:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 **NEGATIVE 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.

(Original Signature on File)
Anita Juhola-Garcia
Planner

9/12/19
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 were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than 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 for, 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

a. Would the project 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 Short-Term Rental Ordinance (STRO) would not result in significant adverse effects to any scenic vistas or public view of scenic vistas. (The City of Long Beach General Plan Scenic Routes Element, 1975). 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 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 STRO involves amendments to Title 5 Regulation of Businesses, Trades and Professions, and Title 21 Zoning of the Long Beach Municipal Code. Implementation of the STRO will utilize existing residential units with a framework of operational standards. This proposed project would not result in any negative impacts to the City's visual environment. Therefore, no further analysis of the environmental issue is necessary.

b. Would the project 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, rock outcroppings or historic buildings would be damaged as a result of STRO implementation. There would therefore be no impact to any natural scenic resource and no further analysis is required.

c. In nonurbanized 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

The STRO applies to existing residential properties within the City of Long Beach, which is an urbanized area, and is surrounded by other urbanized areas. As discussed in I.a. and I.b., the proposed project is not anticipated to degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views and is not in conflict with applicable zoning to other regulations governing scenic views and is not in conflict with applicable zoning or other regulations governing scenic quality.

d. Would the project 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

The proposed implementation of the STRO will establish regulations, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. The Long Beach Municipal Code Title 21 includes development standards that prevent and reduce light and glare. Since STRO 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. Would the project 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 nonagricultural use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Would the project 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. Would the project 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

d. Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

e. Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For Sections II. a., b., c., d. and e. - 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 (California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program 2016). 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.

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality 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 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. Since the STRO does not propose any new development or growth inducing projects that would conflict with the SCAG growth forecasts, it would be consistent with the AQMP and therefore no additional 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

Please see Section III. a. above for discussion.

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

- 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 implementation of the STRO would not have any significant adverse effects on sensitive receptors. Please see Section III. a. 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 included 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 STRO would not allow or involve land uses 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 STRO 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

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

c. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (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

Implementation of the STRO 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

Implementation of the STRO would occur in established urbanized areas and would not promote or involve alteration of any protected wetland areas. 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

Implementation of the STRO 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, 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 STRO 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 as defined in Section §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 (with the exception of areas such as park lands) have been previously disturbed and/or developed. The STRO relates to occupancy regulations of existing structures, it would not promote, encourage or enable projects or 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

The implementation of STRO would not result in new development, but rather establish regulations, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The STRO does not propose any development that would involve extensive excavation that could result in the disturbance of any designated cemetery or other burial ground or place of interment.

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 implementation of the STRO would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, but rather establish regulation, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. The implementation would not significantly increase consumption of energy resources.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The implementation of the STRO would not directly result in new development, but rather establish regulation, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. The City of Long Beach is in the process of developing a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). This plan would provide framework for updating policies, programs, practices, and incentives for residents and businesses to reduce emissions and will include various energy efficiency measures. The STRO would not conflict with any state or local plan for renewable energy.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential 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

The City of Long Beach is located in a seismically active region of Southern California. An active fault line, Newport-Inglewood, extends 47 miles from Culver City southeast through Long Beach and other coastal communities. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City. Development would comply with applicable California Building Standards Code (Title 24) which requires various measures of all construction to account for hazards from seismic shaking. 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 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 located 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) 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

The project will establish regulations and standards for the short-term rental of existing residential units and not authorize new development. 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.

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 Section VII. b. for discussion.

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 will establish regulations and standards for the short-term rental of existing residential units and does not propose any excavation or construction and, as such, is not expected to 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 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 STRO would not result in direct or indirect GHG impacts, but would rather establish regulations and standards for the short-term rental of existing residential units.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulations 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 an 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

The implementation of the STRO would provide regulations for the short-term rental of existing residential units that may use household cleaners and fertilizer, but would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. 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. 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. for discussion.

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

Please see Section IX. a. for 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 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 STRO would not alter air traffic patterns or encourage future projects that could conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protections zones. All future development in the vicinity of the Long Beach Airport would be in compliance will

all applicable local and FAA requirements. Please see Section IX. a. 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 STRO 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 to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The City is 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 wild land 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 STRO would provide regulations for the short-term rental of existing residential units and would not authorize additional development. The City's existing development regulations codified in the Long Beach Municipal Code adequately address potential effects related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, no further 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

See Section X. a. 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 a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed STRO does not encourage or enable any alterations to existing drainage patterns or the course of streams or rivers. Please see Section X. 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 for discussion.

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial 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. for discussion.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

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

d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project 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 susceptible to tsunami run up or seiche and strong currents. Potential tsunami hazards would be limited to properties and public improvements near the coastline, while harbor and channel areas would be susceptible to seiche and strong currents. The proposed project does not include new development, so it will not result in any increased risk of inundation to any properties.

e. Would the project 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 STRO 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. for discussion.

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 proposed project will establish regulations, standards, and registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned visitor serving residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. The proposed project would not directly or indirectly divide any established community as a result of these changes. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to 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. for discussion. The proposed project would not conflict with the City's General Plan, Local Coastal Program, or any other applicable land use plans and policies. Because the proposed project would not result in a change in land use or authorize new development that is not already permitted by existing regulations; it would not conflict with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan.

The following STRO provisions are intended to support the compatibility of short-term rentals with adjacent properties and maintain neighborhood character.

- The owner or operator shall ensure that the short-term rental is used in a manner that complies with all applicable laws, rules and regulations pertaining to the use and occupancy of a short-term rental.
- The STRO shall not supersede or interfere with a dwelling unit subject to a homeowners' or condominium association restrictions regarding short-term rental.
- Property owners of residential property in any census tract within the City may petition to prohibit un-hosted STRs (where host resides off-site) within that census tract.

- The maximum number of persons who may occupy the short-term rental (STR) shall be limited to two (2) persons per bedroom, plus two (2). This calculation includes children. The maximum occupancy shall not exceed ten (10) persons in any STR.
- Large-scale events such as commercial parties, weddings, etc. are prohibited unless a STR occasional event permit has been issued.
- The STR operator shall identify, to the satisfaction of the City, a local contact person who shall be available twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days a week for responding within one (1) hour to complaints regarding the conditions, operation, or conduct of the STR or its occupants, and take any remedial action necessary to resolve such complaints.
- A short-term rental shall not change the outside residential character of the neighborhood including all applicable development, design and landscaping standards. No exterior signage relating to the STR allowed.
- Guests of the short-term rental shall comply with the City of Long Beach Municipal Chapter 8.80 Noise Regulations, including quiet hours between 10 P.M. and 7 AM. In addition, the use of outside pools, spas, hot tubs are prohibited between the hours of 10 P.M. and 7 A.M.
- The operator shall post the following information in a prominent location within the short-term rental:
 - 1) The maximum number of occupants permitted in the unit.
 - 2) Parking capacity, location of parking spaces, and parking rules, if any;
 - 3) Trash and recycling pickup information;
 - 4) The name of the local contact and a telephone number at which that person may be reached on a twenty-four (24) basis;
 - 5) Emergency contact information for summoning police, fire, emergency medical services; and
 - 6) Evacuation plan for the unit showing emergency exit routes, exits, and fire extinguisher locations.

These provisions of the proposed STRO would substantially reduce potential impacts to a level that is less than significant and mitigation measures are required.

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 STRO 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 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. 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 are 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

The STRO would not authorize new development or change existing regulations regarding construction or mechanical equipment noise. The City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80) addresses issues of construction and land use operation. However, potential noise impacts could occur if occupants were to engage in activities or behavior that is disruptive to adjacent residents, such as playing loud music outdoors. It is not possible to quantify or predict in any meaningful way the differences between long-term tenants and short-term tenants with regard to human-generated noise. However, in order to address this concern, the proposed regulations include the following provisions intended to minimize such noise impacts:

- Limit on the maximum number of persons who may occupy the STR;
- Prohibit large-scale events as part of the short-term rental use, unless a STR occasional event permit has been issued;
- All activities must comply with the Municipal Code, including, but not limited to Chapter 9.31 (Loud Parties on Private Property) and Chapter 8.80.190 (Noise Disturbances – Prohibited). It is unlawful for any STR host, operator, occupant, renter, lessee, person present upon to make any loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood;
- A local contact person who shall be available twenty-four (24) hours per day, seven (7) days a week for responding within one (1) hour to complaints regarding the conditions, operation, or conduct of the STR or its occupants, and take any remedial action necessary to resolve such complaints.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

See Section XIII. a. for discussion.

c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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

See Section XIII. a. for discussion.

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 population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (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 proposed STRO would not authorize new development or induce substantial population growth. No further analysis 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 proposed STRO will not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units. The STRO will allow primary residence short-term rentals where the owner resides at the same property as the short-term rental (STR,) but place limitations on the number of non-primary short-term residences in the City. The total number of non-primary residence STR registrations allowed will be limited to not exceed one (1) percent of the City's total number of housing units. In 2018,

the total number of housing units in the City of Long Beach was approximately 177,378. Based on that estimate, the non-primary STR registrations would be limited to approximately 1,774.

XV. 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 is divided into four Patrol Divisions: East, West, North and South.

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 STRO establishes regulations, standards, and registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately-owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased demand for fire protection services or fire protection facilities. 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 XV. a. above, the STRO would not significantly increase demands for police protection service, nor require provision of new police facilities. The STRO includes operating standards with an enforcement process if violations occur, including but not limited to fines, suspensions, additional conditions, and ultimately revocation of STR registrations for short-term rentals that constitute a public nuisance.

c. Schools?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Similar to Section XV. a. above, the STRO would not significantly increase demands for public school services or facilities.

d. Parks?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Similar to Section XV. a. above, the STRO would not significantly increase demands for 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 required the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities.

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 STRO establishes regulations, standards, and registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately-owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. It 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 for discussion. 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 STRO establishes regulations, standards, and a registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately-owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis. It is not intended to directly or indirectly induce population growth that could result in increased number of vehicle trip, volume to capacity ratios, or traffic congestion. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. Would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 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 STRO would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth, there would be no significant impact on levels of service.

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

Please see Section XVII. a. for discussion. Since the STRO would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth, there would be no significant increase of hazards due to geometric design features or incompatible uses.

d. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section XVII. a. for discussion. The STRO would not encourage or plan for significant traffic growth or transportation network modifications that would have the potential to result in deficient or inadequate emergency access routes. No further environmental analysis is required.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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:

- a. 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), or**

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Please see Section V. (Cultural Resources) above. STRO 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. No further environmental analysis is required.

b. 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 the STRO. 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, electric 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 foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|

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

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> 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?

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|

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

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|--|--|------------------------------------|

For Sections XIX. a. through e., the STRO requirements 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 development projects, will result in water demand equal 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:

a. Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Would the project, 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. Would the project 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. Would the project 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 Fire¹, nor is the City in or near a State Responsibility Area². The project will establish regulations,

¹ http://fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention_wildland_zones_maps_citylist

² http://www.fire.ca.gov/firepreventionfee/srviewer_launch

standards, and registration process governing the renting or leasing of privately owned residential dwelling units on a short-term basis, and would not be expected to impair emergency plans, exacerbate wildfire risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or 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. Finally, as discussed in Section VII. iv., 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 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 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, 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 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 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.