

## **Appendix B. Environmental Compliance Assessment**

*PLEASE NOTE: The information, analysis, assessments and opinions contained in this document are intended for general evaluation purposes only. This document is intended for use only by its specified client and is NOT intended for use, reliance or in making financial/investment decisions by outside parties.*

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

# **Feasibility Study for a Federal Inspection Service Facility at Long Beach Airport**

## **Environmental Compliance Assessment**

Prepared for | Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc.  
1500 Hughes Way, Suite 400  
Long Beach, California 90810

Prepared by | Psomas  
3 Hutton Centre Drive, Suite 200  
Santa Ana, California 92707  
T: 714.751.7373

September 2016

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Section</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Previous California Environmental Quality Act Documentation</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR .....	2
Implementation of Terminal Area Improvements.....	3
<b>Environmental Evaluation</b> .....	<b>5</b>
CEQA Environmental Checklist Topics .....	6
Aesthetics .....	7
Agricultural and Forest Resources.....	9
Air Quality .....	10
Biological Resources .....	12
Cultural Resources.....	13
Geology and Soils.....	14
Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	15
Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	16
Hydrology and Water Quality.....	18
Land Use and Planning.....	20
Mineral Resources.....	21
Noise .....	21
Population and Housing .....	23
Public Services.....	24
Recreation .....	25
Transportation/Traffic .....	25
Utilities and Service Systems.....	27
CEQA Conclusion .....	28
NEPA Compliance Requirements.....	29
<b>References</b> .....	<b>30</b>

**TABLES**

<b><u>Table</u></b>		<b><u>Page</u></b>
1	Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvements Program Space Allocation .....	4

## **Introduction**

This Environmental Compliance Assessment is part of the larger Feasibility Study being prepared to assess the Federal Inspection Service (FIS) Facility at Long Beach Airport (LGB or the Airport). A FIS Facility is a single processing complex that evolved from the consolidation and integration of U.S. customs, immigration, and agriculture operations with offices and support functions.

A Feasibility Study is statutorily exempt per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Specifically, Section 15262, Feasibility and Planning Studies, of the State CEQA Guidelines states the following:

A project involving only feasibility or planning studies for possible future actions which the agency, board, or commission has not approved, adopted, or funded does not require the preparation of an EIR or Negative Declaration but does require consideration of environmental factors. This section does not apply to the adoption of a plan that will have a legally binding effect on later activities.

Therefore, as a Feasibility Study, the purpose of this evaluation is not to provide the City with a CEQA document; rather it is intended to give the City an understanding of the types of technical studies and environmental compliance documents that may be required should it decide to move forward with the subsequent project-level evaluation of the FIS Facility. However, to aid in the evaluation, the questions from the CEQA Environmental Checklist from Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Sections 15000, et seq.) are used as a baseline to assess potential environmental effects of the FIS Facility.

In conducting this evaluation, consideration was also given regarding whether the FIS Facility could be accommodated within the impact envelope that was evaluated in the 2006 Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project Final Environmental Impact Report No. 37-03 (State Clearinghouse No. 2003091112) (hereinafter referred to as “FEIR 37-03”) and approved by the Long Beach City Council on June 20, 2006, with the adoption of Resolution No. Res-06-0056.

At this conceptual level, three options have been identified—Option 1 would be located north of the terminal area and Options 2 and 3 would be located south of the terminal area. Section 3 of the Study provides a description of the improvements associated with each option. Figures 4 through 9 provide graphic depictions of the required for an FIS Facility. For comparison purposes, Option 1 would require approximately 35,051 square feet of new construction; Option 2 would require 30,672 square feet of new construction; and Option 3 would require 21,656 square feet of new construction and approximately 6,750 square feet of the Security Screening Checkpoint (SSCP) would be repurposed and would require the construction of a new SSCP. In addition, it should be noted, that Option 1 would require aircraft parking position 11 be reconstructed to be to be on the north side of the FIS Facility and a new parking position (position 12) would be constructed.

It should be noted that, at this phase of the process, only very general concepts are available. Therefore, this evaluation is not intended to provide consideration of specific design elements. It is assumed that, should the FIS Facility proceed to the subsequent phase of evaluation, all facilities would be designed in compliance with the Customs and Border Protection (CBP)

Airport Technical Design Standards (ATDS). As such, applicable Department of Homeland Security requirements would be complied with.

## **Previous California Environmental Quality Act Documentation**

### **Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR**

The Project evaluated in FEIR 37-03 consisted of improvements to the existing Airport Terminal Building and related facilities in order to accommodate increases in flight activity at LGB consistent with operational limitations of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and the 1995 Settlement Agreement. The 1995 Settlement Agreement included a “grandfather” provision under the Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA) that allowed for continued City of Long Beach enforcement of flight and noise restrictions. The Project included construction of, or alteration to, the 13 areas listed below:

- Holdrooms
- Concession Area
- Passenger Security Screening
- Baggage Security Screening
- Baggage Claim Devices
- Baggage Service Office
- Restrooms
- Office Space
- Ticketing Facilities
- Airline Gates
- Aircraft Parking Positions
- Vehicular Parking
- Traffic and Pedestrian Circulation

The study area for the Terminal Area Improvements included the area surrounding the existing Airport Terminal Building. The FEIR evaluated the construction of improvements between the Gulfstream building and the Million Air lease site on the Airport. Uses in this area include the Airport Terminal Building, a permanent holdroom, temporary holdrooms, security screening of passengers and baggage, a baggage claim area, a parking structure, and surface parking facilities. On the airfield side, uses include aircraft parking position for the commercial and commuter carriers and a general aviation tie-down area on the Million Air site.

Though the FEIR evaluated 102,850 square feet of terminal facilities and up to 14 aircraft parking positions, when certifying FEIR 37-03 on June 20, 2006, the City Council, through Resolution No. Res-06-0056, approved 97,545 square feet of terminal improvements with a maximum of 12 aircraft parking positions together with a 4,000-space parking structure (City of Long Beach 2006a, 2006c). The FEIR identified only one significant, unavoidable impact, for which the City Council adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations. The impact was associated short-term air quality impacts during construction, specifically, NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC emissions would exceed established standard. It should be noted that the reduction of

5,305 square feet of terminal area improvements was not required to reduce potential significant impacts, but instead was approved due to the intense public interest<sup>1</sup> in the proposed terminal improvements and related facilities.

## **Implementation of Terminal Area Improvements**

On April 17, 2007, a workshop was conducted with the City Council to review the results of a detailed space needs analysis completed by the City's architectural consultant for the Airport Terminal Improvement Project. Based on the direction provided at this workshop, staff reported back to the City Council on April 24, 2007 and received authorization to prepare final plans, specifications, cost estimates and a financing plan for the construction of a terminal improvement project of 89,995 square feet.

FEIR 37-03 identified that the Terminal Area Improvements would be phased based on service priorities and funding availability. To date, only the first phase of improvements have been implemented. Phase I included the construction of an additional parking structure with an adjoining surface lot; a new passenger concourse with consolidated passenger screening; and a new aircraft parking ramp. The concourse opened to the public on December 12, 2012. While additional improvements have been proposed, there is no timing on the implementation of any additional improvements.

Table 1 provides a summary of the improvements evaluated in FEIR 37-03; the improvement program approved by the City Council on April 24, 2007; the size of the terminal area facilities with the implementation of the Phase I improvements; and the amount of terminal area improvements allocated for future construction pursuant to the City Council direction. For informational purposes only, the amount of additional terminal area improvement that has approved CEQA documentation pursuant to FEIR 37-03 is also provided (i.e., the delta between what was environmentally cleared in FEIR 37-03 and what has been constructed). However, this allocation exceeds the April 24, 2007 directive, which reduced the size of the terminal area improvements from what was evaluated in FEIR 37-03 and the June 20, 2006 initial approvals.

---

<sup>1</sup> An extensive public outreach program was conducted in conjunction with the preparation of FEIR 37-03. There were two public scoping meetings in 2003 as part of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, with 100 and 200 people in attendance. The City received 251 responses to the NOP. Fifteen meetings, which were open to the public, were conducted with the Airport Advisory Commission to determine the scope of the EIR. The City Council considered the scope recommendations at two council meetings in 2005. An updated NOP was circulated in 2005, and two additional public meetings were conducted. The EIR was circulated for an 84-day public review period. A series of public meetings were held during the public review period and included an overview of the findings of the Draft EIR; there was also a joint workshop with the Long Beach Planning Commission and the Long Beach Cultural Heritage Commission. During the public review period, a total of 215 written comments were received (a combination of letters, comment cards, and emails) on the Draft EIR.

**TABLE 1  
LONG BEACH AIRPORT  
TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENTS PROGRAM SPACE ALLOCATION**

<b>Function</b>	<b>Terminal Improvements Facilities Evaluated in FEIR 37-03</b>	<b>Terminal Improvements Program Approved by City Council April 24, 2007</b>	<b>Terminal Improvements Post Phase I Improvements<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Terminal Improvements Future Construction per April 24,2007 Authorization</b>	<b>Remaining Terminal Improvements Under FEIR 37-03</b>
Total Square Footage <sup>b</sup>	102,850 sf	89,995 sf	73,769 sf <sup>c</sup>	24,826 sf <sup>d</sup>	37,681 sf <sup>e</sup>
Airline Gates	11	11	11	0	0
Aircraft Parking Positions	12 to 14	12	11	0	1
Total Parking Spaces	6,286	5,586 <sup>f</sup>	3,836	1,750 <sup>e</sup>	2,450
lf=linear feet sf= square feet  NOTES: a. Phase I Constructed Areas listed provided by Architect of Record D. Holloway from HOK on February 11, 2014. b. Exterior covered space or terminal support functions such as mechanical, electrical, kitchen equipment and food prep, janitorial and maintenance are exempt from Total Area. c. Total reflects the demolition of 23,850 square feet resulting in a net of 73,769 square feet of terminal area. d. Assumes the removal of 3,600 square feet of existing TSA space and 5,000 square feet of existing baggage security screening areas that have been identified for renovation. Additionally, the 1,975 square feet of improvements that have been identified but not constructed are provided for in this total. e. Reliance on FEIR 37-03 for construction up to 102,850 square feet would require action by the City Council, which restricted terminal area improvements to 89,995 square feet. However, from a CEQA compliance perspective, the FEIR addressed the impacts associated with 102,850. This would allow up to an additional 12,855 square feet of terminal area improvements beyond what was authorized on April 24, 2007. f. Rental Car Parking relocated from Lot A or Lot B Parking Structures to Million Air Leasehold during 5/06/2008 City Council Site Plan Review Approval.					

## Environmental Evaluation

It should be noted that this evaluation is not intended to serve as a CEQA compliance document. At this phase of the process, only very general concepts are available; therefore, consideration of specific design elements is not possible. It is assumed that, should the FIS Facility proceed to the subsequent phase of evaluation, all facilities would be designed in compliance with the CBP Airport Technical Design Standards (ATDS). As such, applicable Department of Homeland Security requirements would be complied with.

As described above, the purpose of this environmental evaluation is to provide a baseline assessment of the potential environmental effects that could occur with implementation of the FIS Facility. The purpose is to provide the City with an understanding of potential issues and possible future studies that may be needed to comply with CEQA.<sup>2</sup>

An assumption of the analysis is that there would be no modifications to the City's Airport Noise Ordinance, which was enacted as Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code.<sup>3</sup> The Noise Ordinance contains reasonable and non-arbitrary provisions for the number of daily air carrier operations (minimum of 41 plus 9 supplemental flight slots)<sup>4</sup>, commuter carrier flight slots (minimum of 25), as well as cumulative noise budgets and maximum Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) limits for Charter, Industrial and General Aviation (GA) operations. Under the Noise Ordinance, if the cumulative noise budgets for the air carrier and commuter operators are below the cumulative noise limits established for these categories as determined during the baseline year 1989-1990, the number of flight slots available to air carrier and commuter operators must be increased. As a result, LGB must determine annually as specified in Chapter 16.43 of the Municipal Code, whether additional flights must be allocated based on the cumulative noise generated by air carrier and commuter operations during the prior 12 month period.

---

<sup>2</sup> If implemented, the FIS Facility would require modifications to the airfield side of LGB, which would require Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval. Therefore, environmental compliance pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) would also be required.

<sup>3</sup> At the public meetings held for the FIS Facility, some members of the community raised a concern about whether introducing international flights would lead to a repeal of the City's Airport Noise Ordinance. However, the FIS Facility would not introduce any components that would jeopardize or nullify the City's Airport Noise Ordinance. In 1990, while the litigation between the City and the carriers was pending, Congress passed the *Airport Noise and Capacity Act* (ANCA), which limited an Airport operator's right to control Stage 3 aircraft. Included within the ANCA legislation is a "grandfather" provision which permits Long Beach Airport to continue to enforce the flight and noise restrictions that are contained in the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance (Chapter 16.43). In May 2003, when the Terminal Area Improvements Project was being processed, the FAA reaffirmed the "grandfather" status of the Ordinance under ANCA.

<sup>4</sup> For commercial aircraft, the Airport Noise Ordinance had provisions for a minimum of 41 flights per day. In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines had to adjust their flight operations to reduce the noise footprint. This was done through the use of quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late night operations. This was achieved and, in late 2015, additional flights were allocated. The flights were initiated in 2016. It should be noted that, if the noise budgets are exceeded, the number of flights would be reduced to ensure compliance with the City's Airport Noise Ordinance.

The assessment also assumes that international flights would use the current fleet mix operating at LGB.<sup>5</sup> As a result, the noise characteristic and passenger levels served at the Airport would not be substantially changed from what is currently provided for with the current flight allocations. When assessing the impact on the environment, the origin or destination of the flight does not substantially change the effect of the flight. However, it does change the type of facilities required to service the flights in order to meet CBP requirements. For the most part, this involves internal design requirements (e.g., providing the necessary sterile corridors to ensure all incoming international travelers proceed through CBP checkpoints). Consideration was also given regarding whether the FIS Facility could be accommodated within the impact envelope that was evaluated in FEIR 37-03. The State CEQA Guidelines encourage public agencies to reduce delay and paperwork through a variety of strategies. Using a previous EIR when it adequately addresses a proposed project is one of these strategies. When there is phased implementation of a project, if the agency finds that no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR and no new environmental document would be required. Therefore, the discussion below provides a preliminary assessment of the adequacy of FEIR 37-03 for addressing the FIS Facility should further evaluation be recommended.

As indicated above, the FEIR evaluated larger terminal area improvements than were ultimately authorized. Should the City Council elect to do so, if it is determined that the FEIR fully addresses the impacts associated with the FIS Facility, the full 102,850 square feet of terminal area improvements and up to 14 aircraft parking positions addressed in the FEIR could be implemented without further documentation. It should be noted that the Program FEIR and approving resolutions identified the interior square footage for the buildings (i.e., net square feet). The concept plans used for this Feasibility Study identifies outside footprint of the building (i.e., gross square feet) because these values are being used to estimate cost of the facilities. As such, the square footage of the FIS Facility being assessed in this study and the square footage of the facilities evaluated in FEIR 37-03 represent slightly different things; however, they provide a basis for general comparison at this level of evaluation. If the FIS Facility is recommended for further evaluation, a more precise comparison of actual conceptual design plans would be evaluated to make definitive recommendations on the type of CEQA documentation that would be required.

## **CEQA Environmental Checklist Topics**

Though the FIS Facility is being considered as part of a feasibility study, the intent is to provide the City with a preliminary assessment of the environmental considerations that may be associated with implementation of the facility. As indicated above, to aid in the evaluation, the questions from the CEQA Environmental Checklist are being used. The CEQA Environmental Checklist has been developed as part of the State CEQA Guidelines as a tool for assessing areas of potential environmental impacts. The checklist addresses 17 different topical areas and

---

<sup>5</sup> Over the upcoming years, it is reasonable to assume the fleet mix at the Airport may change as Stage 4 aircraft are in more wide spread used. However, this transition in fleet mix would not be in response to the FIS Facility and it would be speculative to estimate what a future fleet mix would be. The Stage 4 aircraft are quieter and reduce air emissions compared to the current fleet mix. Therefore, the impacts associated with introduction of new aircraft is expected to reduce environmental impacts.

includes 86 questions. The CEQA Environmental Checklist is generally used when preparing an Initial Study to determine the type of environmental document for a project or as the basis for a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration.<sup>6</sup> The following discussion does not provide the level of detail generally associated with an Initial Study because of the preliminary nature of the design plans. While all the CEQA checklist questions are provided, the evaluation is provided at a topical level rather than a question-by-question assessment. For each topical area the following sections are provided:

- **CEQA Checklist Questions.** This section lists the questions from the CEQA Environmental Checklist included in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, only modified to focus on the FIS Facility, rather than state “the project” (as a feasibility study, the FIS Facility does not represent a “project” under CEQA).
- **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility.** This section provides a preliminary assessment of the nature of the environmental impacts for the topical issue. This assessment is based on the very conceptual plans used for this Feasibility Study (see Section 3).
- **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03.** As indicated above, a comprehensive EIR was prepared that assessed the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the terminal area improvements. The improvements were identified as being phased. The full square footage of the improvements evaluated in FEIR 37-03 have not been completed. Therefore, there is an assessment to determine whether the design of the FIS Facility is able to fit within the parameters of the improvements evaluated in FEIR 37-03 and whether the FIS Facility is anticipated to create new or more severe impacts or other changes in conditions that would require the certified EIR to be updated.
- **Recommended Further Evaluation.** This section identifies recommended further studies or evaluations that would be required if the FIS Facility is recommended for further evaluation and is subject to CEQA evaluation. The section states whether further analysis is required even if FEIR 37-03 is being relied upon as the CEQA compliance document or if the studies are only required if it is determined that an additional CEQA document is required.

## **Aesthetics**

### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
- b) Would the FIS Facility substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
- c) Would the FIS Facility substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

---

<sup>6</sup> A Negative Declaration is prepared for projects where there would not be a significant effect on the environment. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared for a project when the a potentially significant effects on the environment has been identified but measures have been incorporated prior to releasing the Initial Study for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where no significant effect on the environment would occur. An EIR is the most involved CEQA document and is prepared when significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant have been identified.

- d) Would the FIS Facility create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

At this time, only very conceptual building size and placement information is known about the FIS Facility (see Exhibits 1 through 3). Under all three Options, the buildings would be located in the area adjacent to the existing commercial terminal and airfield (i.e., international commercial passenger facilities would not be expanded to any other portion of the Airport). Based on preliminary information available, the placement and size of the buildings would serve to minimize aesthetic impacts because the overall visual character and visual quality of the site would not be substantially altered. Presuming the design of the buildings are consistent with the architectural character of the surrounding uses, the FIS Facility would become part of a visually cohesive terminal area. Neither the southern nor northern options offer any visual features that contribute to the aesthetic character of Airport.

The Airport is not located in the viewshed of a designated scenic vista or state scenic highway. Views of the FIS Facility would be limited to the area surrounding the existing Airport terminal and would have minimal effect outside the immediate area. This portion of the Airport site does not have trees or rock outcroppings that would be affected by the FIS Facility. Though not located along a State scenic highway, the terminal building is a notable local historic landmark to the residents of the City of Long Beach. Protection of the views of the terminal building was a point of concern during the preparation of FEIR 37-03. As part of the design considerations of the expanded terminal improvements, views of the historic terminal building were preserved on Donald Douglas Drive. With both the southern and northern options, views of the historic terminal building would not be impeded. (Historic resources is further discussed below under Cultural Resources.)

The FIS Facility would result in a greater amount of light emanating from the buildings; however, facilities would be located in the terminal area, which has been developed with similar uses. Design would be required to comply with applicable regulations associated with light and glare, as set forth in the zoning ordinance and FAA regulations. Lighting from the facilities would not extend beyond the terminal area.

Based on a review of the other CEQA Environmental Checklist questions, no significant impacts would be anticipated. However, before a definitive determination can be made, a review of the design plans would be required as part of the design phase.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

FEIR 37-03 identified that the Terminal Area Improvements Project would (1) alter views of the project site during construction activities, potentially resulting in short-term aesthetic impacts and (2) result in light and glare impacts associated with security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements. However, impacts would be reduced to a level considered less than significant with implementation of the Mitigation Program identified in the FEIR.

The Mitigation Program in FEIR 37-03 included a Project Design Feature (PDF) and three Standard Conditions and Requirements associated with the preservation of the historic

character of the original terminal building. Additionally, four Mitigation Measures were adopted that dealt with lighting and building design requirements (City of Long Beach 2006b).

Assuming the size and scale of the buildings are found to be consistent with the assessment provided in FEIR 37-03 and that the Mitigation Program is implemented, the FEIR would adequately address the aesthetic impacts associated with the FIS Facility.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

As part of the CEQA review process, the design of the FIS Facility would need to be evaluated for compatibility with the design of both the original terminal building and recent terminal area improvements to ensure the visual elements are compatible. If it is determined that FEIR 37-03 addresses the impacts of the FIS Facility, the design would have to incorporate the measures pertaining to aesthetics in the Mitigation Program adopted by the City Council. However, most of the measures were directed at a terminal expansion design concept that would be connected to the original historic terminal building, as well as construction associated with Parcel O located at the southwest portion of the Airport. These measures would not be applicable to the FIS Facility. There would be measures pertaining to lighting and amounts of reflective glass used in the building design that would apply. As discussed below under Cultural Resources, the design concepts would also be presented to the Cultural Heritage Commission.

### **Agricultural and Forest Resources**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- b) Would the FIS Facility conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- c) Would the FIS Facility 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])?
- d) Would the FIS Facility result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
- e) Would the FIS Facility involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

#### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would not result in any impacts to farmlands listed as “Prime”, “Unique”, or of “Statewide Importance” based on the 2014 Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map prepared by the Department of Conservation. Due to lack of resources, none of the Airport is

under a Williamson Act Contract. Additionally, there are no forestland or timberland resources in the vicinity of the Airport; therefore, there would be no direct or indirect (i.e., pressure for conversion) impacts on these resources.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

Impacts to agricultural resources were focused out of FEIR 37-03 based on the 2002 Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map prepared by the Department of Conservation. The study area was generally designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land”. Additionally, there would be no conflict with Williamson Act Contracts, and implementing the Terminal Area Improvements Project would not create pressure to convert farmland to other uses. At the time FEIR 37-03 was prepared, Forest Resources were not an issue requiring evaluation. The FIS Facility would be located in the terminal area and would not conflict with these findings.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation of agricultural and forest resources is required.

### **Air Quality**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
- b) Would the FIS Facility violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
- c) Would the FIS Facility result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
- d) Would the FIS Facility expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
- e) Would the FIS Facility create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The introduction of commercial international flights would not alter the type of aircraft or operational procedures at LGB. Therefore, commercial aircraft emissions would not be expected to change. The introduction of CBP facilities would have the potential to incrementally reduce regional air emissions as it relates to general aviation operations. Currently, general aviation and charter aircraft traveling to LGB from international destination are required to be cleared at an airport with CBP facilities.<sup>7</sup> As a result, for these aircraft an additional stop is required. The additional take-off and landing would result in incrementally greater emissions. Though this would not change the local emissions at LGB, the additional flights do contribute to the regional emissions. Counterbalancing this, there is the potential that some general aviation and charter aircraft will utilize LGB as a stopping point for CBP services

---

<sup>7</sup> The Airport Noise Ordinance defines general aviation as aviation activity other than operations by Air Carriers, Commuter Carriers, Industrial operators, Charter operators, and public aircraft.

though Long Beach is not the final destination. On a regional scale these additional take off and lands would not have an effect on regional air quality. It should be noted, based on the Market Analysis (Appendix A), expected increases in general aviation would be nominal and would not have a substantial increase on the localized air quality.<sup>8</sup>

There would be four areas that may contribute to incremental increases in air emissions: (1) construction activities; (2) utility usage associated with expanded facilities (i.e., heating and cooling requirements); (3) additional employees that would be serving the Airport (i.e., CBP employees); and (4) special handling of international trash from the flights. Due to the differences in the amount of new building space being provided in each Option, the construction emissions would vary depending on the Option selected. However, the amount of additional space by any of the Options is not substantial. Similarly, the additional air emissions associated with operational activities (items 2 through 4 listed above) are also expected to be nominal and below the thresholds of significance established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Because the flights would not increase and the operational procedures would be the same, the introduction of the FIS Facility would not require any modifications to the Air Quality Management Plan for the South Coast Air Basin, nor would it result in the creation of objectionable odors. Though there are sensitive receptors living near the Airport, the incremental increase in the overall level of air emissions would not result in an increase of substantial pollutant concentrations.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

FEIR 37-03 identified that the Terminal Area Improvements Project would result in a significant short-term construction-related air quality impact for nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) and volatile organic compounds (VOC). The Mitigation Program in FEIR 37-03 would reduce the impact; however, the impact would remain significant even after implementation of the Mitigation Program. If the FIS Facility is evaluated as a standalone project, the construction impacts would reasonably be less than significant because of the small scale of the facility.

Provided an Option is selected that can be accommodated within the size parameters of the facilities evaluated in FEIR 37-03, the air quality evaluation prepared for the FEIR would reasonably address the impacts associated with the FIS Facility. As noted above, the introduction of international flights would not alter the type of aircraft or operational procedures at LGB; therefore, the flight characteristics would be consistent with the existing conditions and the assumptions of the FEIR. In terms of an incremental increase in air emissions associated with utility usage, these impacts would have been accounted for in the previous air quality study because the analysis was based on the size of the facilities. Similarly, construction emissions would have been included in the overall impacts associated with construction of the terminal improvements.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

If it is determined that the FIS Facility is within the parameters of the improvements addressed in FEIR 37-03, the design would have to incorporate the applicable measures pertaining to air

---

<sup>8</sup> The Market Analysis cites the most recent addition of CBP clearance procedures for general aviation operations within the Southern California market was the opening of the FIS facility at Van Nuys Airport (VNY) on May 23, 2015, which has increased general aviation flight activity by approximately 33 flights per month or roughly 1 flight per day.

quality, as listed in the Mitigation Program adopted by the City Council. Several of these provisions pertain to design requirements (e.g., lighting requirements, buildings that are certified by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design [LEED]). Additionally, Standard Conditions to reduce construction emissions would be applicable.

If the FIS Facility is beyond the parameters of the provisions of FEIR 37-03, an air quality analysis would need to be prepared. However, because the magnitude of the improvements is limited, rather than a full standalone technical report, the evaluation could be directly incorporated into the CEQA document with just the modeling results included in the appendices. Impacts would be expected to be below SCAQMD significance thresholds.

## **Biological Resources**

### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility have a substantial adverse effect, 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?
- b) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- c) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- d) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- e) Would the FIS Facility conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinances?
- f) Would the FIS Facility conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

All options for the FIS Facility are located on portions of the Airport that are paved. They do not support sensitive habitat or impact any sensitive species. No impacts are anticipated.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

Impacts to biological resources were focused out of FEIR 37-03 because the portion of the Airport evaluated for improvements was developed/paved to support airport-associated activities. The improvements would not have any direct impact on biological resources because it would not result in the removal of any sensitive habitat or impact any sensitive species. The terminal area improvements would not change the type of operations or operational

procedures at the Airport; therefore, the project addressed in FEIR 37-03 would not result in substantial interference with the movement of wildlife or migration of birds.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further analysis would be required.

### **Cultural Resources**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?
- b) Would the FIS Facility cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?
- c) Would the FIS Facility directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
- d) Would the FIS Facility disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

#### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

None of the Options for the FIS Facility would directly impact the historic terminal building because there would be no direct connection to the historic building. Based on placement of the buildings, it would be unlikely that any of the FIS Facility Options would have an indirect impact because of the physical separation of the facility from the historic terminal. The degree of separation and intervening non-historic buildings and features would not substantially change the setting or context of the historic terminal building. Any improvements would need to abide by the May 7, 1990 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council pertaining to new construction adjacent to or attached to the Terminal Building that recommends the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Standards be followed. Impacts to historic terminal building would not occur with compliance with these standards. If the FIS Facility is recommended for further study, design plans would need to be evaluated by an architectural historian and the plans reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

Based on the disturbed nature of the site and the limited grading that would be expected for the FIS Facility, further evaluation of archaeological and paleontological resources is not anticipated.

#### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

FEIR 37-03 identified that the Terminal Area Improvements Project would result in alterations to the original terminal building, a designated historical landmark. This was identified as a significant impact; however, implementation of the Mitigation Program would reduce the potentially significant impacts to a level considered less than significant. It should be noted that, as part of the design, the building concept for the Terminal Area Improvements was modified to avoid direct impacts on the historic terminal building. As indicated above, it is

unlikely that any of the Options for the FIS Facility would have a direct or indirect impact on the historic terminal building. However, this would need to be verified by a qualified architectural historian at the time design plans are prepared.

The results of the record search indicate that there are no previously recorded archeological sites within a one-mile radius of the project site. The potential for archaeological resources or human remains to be present on the project site is very low because of the disturbed nature of the site. Similarly, based on the literature and records search conducted by the Vertebrate Paleontology Section of the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, there are no recorded vertebrate fossil localities within the Terminal Area Improvements Project's boundaries. The study area is situated on younger Quaternary alluvium, which would probably not yield fossils in the uppermost layers of soil.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

Regardless of the whether the FIS Facility relies on FEIR 37-03 as the appropriate CEQA documentation or if additional CEQA documentation is prepared, design plans would need to be evaluated by an architectural historian and the plans reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission.

If FEIR 37-03 is relied on as the appropriate CEQA documentation, the Mitigation Program would apply. However, it should be noted that a number of the mitigation measures were identified because the analysis in the FEIR assumed a direct connection of the Terminal Area Improvements with the historic terminal building. Since the FIS Facility would not have this direct connection, some of the measures would not be applicable (e.g., the measure pertaining to the replicating the original style of fenestration if window replacement for the historic terminal building is required).

### **Geology and Soils**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility expose people or structures to 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.
  - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
  - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
  - iv) Landslides?
- b) Would the FIS Facility result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Would the FIS Facility be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the FIS Facility, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- d) Would the FIS Facility be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Would the FIS Facility have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The area being evaluated for the FIS Facility is relatively flat covered by an impervious surface. Construction activities would expose the underlying soils; however, the overall area exposed would be limited and would be covered once the improvements were implemented. The FIS Facility site would not be prone to geotechnical constraints such as slope instability or landslides because the site is relatively flat. Though all of Southern California is exposed to seismic hazards, the Long Beach Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan indicates the site would have a low potential for liquefaction. Additionally, a geotechnical survey conducted by the City of Long Beach for the parking structure at the Airport concluded that the potential for the site to be significantly impacted by earthquakes, seismic ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, substantial soil erosion, or unstable or expansive soil is limited (City of Long Beach 2006a). Implementation of Standard Conditions and Requirements, such as compliance with the 2016 California Building Code, would reduce the risks to a level considered less than significant. Septic tanks would not be required to serve the FIS Facility.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

The evaluation of Geology and Soils was focused out of FEIR 37-03 for the reasons stated above. It was determined compliance with existing regulations would provide a sufficient safeguard to public safety and avoid or minimize environmental impacts.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation of Geology and Soils should be required. The lack of constraints and compliance with existing building regulations would sufficiently avoid or minimize impacts on the environment.

### **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- b) Would the FIS Facility conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

For small projects, the SCAQMD has identified a screening value or bright line value for the evaluation of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. For industrial projects, the SCAQMD has adopted a threshold of 10,000 metric tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) equivalent per year (MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/yr). Since there is not a threshold or draft threshold specific to airport use, it is

anticipated that the industrial threshold would apply. Given the small scale of the FIS Facility, it is reasonable to assume that the GHG emissions would be below this bright line threshold and no impacts would be anticipated.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

GHG emissions were not addressed in FEIR 37-03. It should be noted, however, that the courts have found that GHG emissions and global climate change is not “new information” since these effects have been generally known for quite some time. Therefore, reliance on a previous document that did not evaluate GHG emissions would not be an issue. GHG emissions would not be considered new information under Section 21166 of CEQA.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

If FEIR 37-03 is the CEQA compliance document for the FIS Facility, no further evaluation is required. Should documentation be required, the GHG emissions associated with the FIS Facility should be quantified to demonstrate that the emissions associated with the improvements are below the bright line threshold established by the SCAQMD.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- c) Would the FIS Facility emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- e) Would the FIS Facility result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in an area 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?
- f) Would the FIS Facility result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in an area that is within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
- g) Would the FIS Facility impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Would the FIS Facility expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

Given the industrial nature of the Airport and the ongoing use and storage of hazardous materials at the site, there is the potential that sites considered for the FIS Facility may have been exposed to past hazardous materials. To the extent that the FIS Facility would disturb the soil, there could be a potential limited risk during construction. However, this is a relatively low risk given that both the northern and southern locations are completely impervious and have been covered for well over a decade.

The southern options would integrate the south Security Check Point into the overall design of the FIS Facility. This structure was constructed as part of the Terminal Area Improvements and, based on when the southern security checkpoint was constructed, lead based paint or asbestos-containing materials would not have been used.

Standard construction practices would sufficiently address the handling of hazardous materials required for construction. Permits and licenses from health and regulatory agencies to operate and properly manifest all hazardous or California regulated materials are standard conditions for contractors transporting or handling hazardous materials and/or wastes.

The FIS Facility would not result in a significant hazard from the transport of hazardous materials. Materials used for construction that are classified as “hazardous” would be handled consistent with federal, State, and LGB practices regarding the handling of hazardous materials. The FIS Facility would not alter the Airport’s fueling or other maintenance or operational procedures.

The FIS Facility would not change the number of flights, the flight patterns, or the operational procedures at the Airport in a manner that would result in increased safety hazards on site or off site. Flight operations would be under the purview of the FAA and would be required to abide by applicable safety regulations. The FIS Facility would be required to comply with the Department of Homeland Security/CBP requirements. Transportation Security Administration (TSA) safety screening would be applied to all outgoing international flights.

The FIS Facility would not alter or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Access to the Airport is off Lakewood Boulevard, which is not designated as an evacuation route. The Airport is not within ¼ mile of any existing schools; therefore, there would be no risk associated with emitting hazardous emissions or handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste near a school.

The Airport site is not located in an area subject to wildland fires. The area surrounding the Airport is urbanized and the conditions for wildland fires do not exist in close proximity.

Based on overall site conditions, existing regulations, and nature of the FIS Facility, no safety impacts or constraints associated with hazardous materials are anticipated.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

FEIR 37-03 identified potential risks associated with modification of the historic terminal building, predominantly from lead based paint and asbestos. These impacts would not be applicable to the FIS Facility because no demolition or modification to older buildings would be necessary.

FEIR 37-03 also identified risks associated with aerially deposited lead from Interstate (I) 405 and possible trace amounts of dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT) being released into the environment during soil removal and disturbance on Parcel O. This impact would not be applicable to the FIS Facility, which would not utilize Parcel O. As indicated above, sites being considered for the FIS Facility are completely paved over and are not in close proximity to I-405 or grassy infield areas.

The FEIR also evaluated potential risks associated with the use of hazardous materials during construction. Implementation of standard regulations and conditions controlling these substances would reduce the risk to a level considered less than significant. These standard regulations and conditions include the applicable State and federal regulations on the handling and storage of these materials and the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the Airport's existing Industrial Permit and for future Construction Activity Permits. This evaluation and associated conditions would be applicable to the FIS Facility and no further impacts would be anticipated.

The evaluation of impacts associated with transport of hazardous materials, releases in proximity to schools, and wildland fires were focused out of FEIR 37-03 for the reasons cited above.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

If further evaluation of the FIS Facility is recommended, an updated search of federal, State, and local databases is recommended to clearly identify any outstanding hazardous materials constraints in the terminal area vicinity. Based on the results of the database search, additional actions such as coring for soil samples may be recommended; however, this would likely not be done until final design.

If FEIR 37-03 is relied upon as the CEQA compliance document, the Mitigation Program would apply. As indicated above, some of the measures would not be applicable because no modifications to the historic terminal building would be required. However, the Mitigation Program would require the FIS Facility to be constructed as a LEED-certified building. No other outstanding issues have been identified.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?
- b) Would the FIS Facility substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?
- c) Would the FIS Facility substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- d) Would the FIS Facility substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?
- e) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- f) Would the FIS Facility otherwise substantially degrade water quality?
- g) Would the FIS Facility place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?
- h) Would the FIS Facility place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?
- i) Would the FIS Facility expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

For all Options, the area being evaluated for the FIS Facility is currently paved. As a result, the facility would not result in an increase in impervious soil or result in increased runoff. This facility would not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or affect the quality or quantity of the groundwater table.

The FIS Facility would be required to comply with the Municipal Storm Water permit issued to the City of Long Beach, as well as the City-developed Long Beach Storm Water Management Program.

The FIS Facility would not be located within a 100-year flood hazard area, nor would it alter the flood zone. Therefore, it would not place housing or any structures that would impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

For the reasons stated above, Hydrology and Water Quality was focused out of FEIR 37-03.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation is required. If the FIS Facility is recommended for further evaluation, the design would be required to comply with the Municipal Storm Water permit and Long Beach Storm Water Management Program.

## **Land Use and Planning**

### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility physically divide an established community?
- b) Would the FIS Facility conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?
- c) Would the FIS Facility conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would be limited to improvements on the Airport property and would not be expected to have direct or indirect impacts on the surrounding land uses. It would not physically divide an established community. The potential for indirect impact associated with noise is addressed below under Noise. The Airport is not located in a habitat conservation plan area.

The FIS Facility Options would require new construction at the Airport; however, substantial land use impacts are not anticipated. The improvements associated with the Proposed Project would be consistent with the City's General Plan Land Use Districts and Zoning Districts. The FIS Facility would not conflict with land use planning programs because it would not change the nature of the uses at the Airport. These land use policies do not specify the specific uses allowed in the terminal area. The FIS Facility Options are not designated on the Airport Layout Plan.<sup>9</sup> As discussed below, two of the options would displace existing uses; however, there are opportunities to replace the uses without significant land use impacts. If implemented, the FIS Facility would require a modification to the Airport Layout Plan. However, this action is not part of the CEQA or NEPA process.

Two of the Options would require modification to existing land uses at the Airport. Option 1 (North FIS Facility) would require the relocation of aircraft parking position 11 from its current location to serve the FIS Facility. Option 3 would integrate the South Security Checkpoint into the FIS Facility, which would require replacement. However, as shown in Exhibit 3, there is physical space available to construct a new security checkpoint without resulting in land use impacts on the Airport. Both the southern FIS options (Options 2 and 3) would use the area currently utilized as parking for airport service vehicles; however, this area is not specifically designated for this use. Relocation options are available at the Airport. .

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

FEIR 37-03 evaluated the impacts of 102,850 square feet of terminal area facilities. The impacts associated with this amount of development in the terminal area would be consistent with the potential impacts associated with the FIS Facility. As discussed above, the FIS Facility is not

---

<sup>9</sup> An Airport Layout Plan, which serves as a planning tool, typically shows both existing facilities and planned development for an airport.

expected to result in direct or indirect impacts on surrounding land uses. No new impacts are anticipated.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation is required. If the FIS Facility is ultimately recommended for implementation, the Airport Layout Plan would need to be revised to show the changes to the Airport.

### **Mineral Resources**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- b) Would the FIS Facility 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?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The California Division of Mines and Geology (CDMG) is the State agency with the responsibility to oversee the management of mineral resources in California. The CDMG considers a site to be significant in regard to mineral commodities if it can be mined commercially and there must be enough of the resource to be economically viable. There are no such resources on site.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

Mineral Resources was focused out of FEIR 37-03 for the reason stated above.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No evaluation of this topical area is required.

### **Noise**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?
- b) Would the FIS Facility expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?
- c) Would the FIS Facility cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without it?
- d) Would the FIS Facility cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity above levels existing without it?

- e) Would the FIS Facility expose people residing or working 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 to excessive noise levels?
- f) Would the FIS Facility expose people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip to excessive noise levels?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The City's Airport Noise Ordinance is the controlling mechanism for aircraft noise. The FIS Facility would not change the number of flights at the Airport. What would change is the destination of a portion of the flights. As shown in the Market Analysis prepared for this Feasibility Study (Appendix A), the international cities that would likely be served are Vancouver, Canada and multiple cities in Mexico and Central America. These international destinations would be substituted for domestic destinations because the cap of an average of 50 average daily commercial carrier flights would not be modified unless the overall noise levels associated with the commercial carrier flights is reduced to less than noise budget allocated for commercial carriers per the Airport Noise Ordinance. There is the potential that the international flights would travel greater distances than the domestic flights they are replacing. In these instances, it is reasonably assumed the aircraft would have to carry additional fuel and luggage weight could be greater. As a heavier aircraft, the noise characteristics of the international flights may be slightly greater than if the same type of aircraft travels to a closer locale. It is speculative as to whether this incremental noise increase would be sufficient to influence the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contours. However, the City's Airport Noise Ordinance would address this issue because if the CNEL contours were to increase beyond what is allowed in the Airport Noise Ordinance, then the total number of flights would be reduced accordingly. Similarly, if the FIS Facility is available at LGB there could be an incremental increase in general aviation and charter aircraft utilizing the Airport. Currently, aircraft with international origins are required to stop at an airfield with CBP facilities, such as Brown Field in San Diego County, before proceeding to their ultimate destination. As previously indicated, based on the Market Analysis, increases in general aviation activity is projected to be minimal. However, if the increase in general aviation and charter activity were enough to result substantial noise increases that exceeds the noise budget for their respective categories, the provisions of the Airport Noise Ordinance apply and the corrective actions would be implemented. Section 16.43.060A of the Airport Noise Ordinance specifically pertains to general aviation compliance with the noise budgets and Section 16.43.060C pertains to charter operations. The operation of the FIS Facility would not increase the number of sensitive receptors exposed to noise levels in excess of State or federal standards. Therefore, the operation of the FIS Facility would not result in any long-term noise impacts.

During construction of the FIS Facility there would be construction noise. The closest sensitive receptor to the FIS Facility locations would be the homes west of Clark Avenue. These homes are more than 3,500 feet from either the northern or southern locations. As a result, the construction noise levels would be less than significant. Once constructed, the noise levels associated with use of the FIS Facility would not be substantially different from the existing conditions in the terminal area.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

The analysis presented in FEIR 37-03 is consistent with the analysis presented above. FEIR 37-03 did not identify any significant noise impacts associated with 102,850 square feet of terminal area facilities. Similarly, the construction noise impacts associated with improvements in the terminal area were quantified and found to be less than significant. The impacts associated the FIS Facility would be consistent with the findings of FEIR 37-03.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further noise analysis would be required because the FIS Facility would not require or result in any modifications to the City's Airport Noise Ordinance, which is the controlling mechanism for aircraft noise.

### **Population and Housing**

- a) Would the FIS Facility 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)?
- b) Would the FIS Facility displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Would the FIS Facility displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would not result in substantial growth-inducing impacts or result in changes in population projections for the City of Long Beach or the vicinity of the Airport. The FIS Facility would not result in increased flight levels or displace existing housing. Therefore, there would be no need for construction of replacement housing. Additionally, the project would not change the noise budget for LGB resulting in potential displacement of housing to achieve noise/land use compatibility. There are no indications that FIS Facility would have any effect on the "grandfather" status of LGB as it pertains to ANCA.<sup>10</sup> The FIS Facility would result in an incremental increase of employees at the Airport because CBP staff would serve the facility. However, the overall number of employees would be nominal, especially when considered in light of the metropolitan setting. This small increase in employees would not result in the demand for additional housing beyond the current and planned housing stock, nor would it result in a substantial change in the population of the region.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

Population and Housing was focused out of FEIR 37-03 for the reason stated above.

---

<sup>10</sup> As part of process for FEIR 37-03, the City coordinated with FAA as it pertains to noise and flight restrictions. Mr. James W. Whitlow, Deputy Chief Counsel for the FAA, confirmed in a letter dated April 30, 2003 to Mr. Chris Kunze, the Airport Manager, that FAA acknowledges the "grandfather" status of LGB. This was reconfirmed in a letter from Ms. Patricia A. McNall, Deputy Chief Counsel for the FAA, to Robert C. Land, Senior Vice President JetBlue Airways, dated May 27, 2015.

## **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation of Population and Housing would be required for the FIS Facility.

## **Public Services**

### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

a) Would the FIS Facility 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:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would result in an incremental increase in the square footage of terminal improvements. The public services potentially affected would be fire and police protection. However, the incremental increase in the building square footage would not result in the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. The Airport has dedicated services located at the Airport that would provide the necessary response. The FIS Facility would result in the need for CBP staff to be at the Airport to serve international flights. The size of the FIS Facility addresses this need. No environmental impacts beyond the construction of these facilities would be expected.

As shown in Exhibits 1 through 3, all the design options are located either to the north or the south of the terminal area. Therefore, there would be minimal interference due to construction activities. Additionally, during construction, the Airport's construction safety plan, titled *Safety and Security Requirements During Construction*, defines standards and procedures for meeting Federal Aviation Regulations requirements (as stated in the *Code of Federal Regulations* [CFR], Title 14, Part 139) and local rules and regulations governing operational safety on airports during construction. With implementation of these provisions, there would not be substantial impacts on emergency responders due to construction activities.

No impact on parks, schools, or library services would result from the FIS Facilities because it would not generate new population that would create the need for these services.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

The purpose of the proposed terminal area improvements evaluated in FEIR 37-03 was to implement facilities improvements to better serve the passengers who currently use the Airport. Since staffing levels are generally based on the number of passengers and flights at the

Airport, based on input from the fire and police departments, the new facilities would not result in a substantial increase in demand for fire or police service at Long Beach Airport. The FIS Facility would be consistent with the nature of the improvements evaluated in FEIR 37-03. The Standard Conditions and Regulations outlined in the Mitigation Program incorporated requirements that would reduce potential conflict during construction. These requirements would be applicable to the FIS Facilities.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

Once concept designs are available, coordination with the fire and police departments should be conducted to verify that the design meets the applicable requirements. However, based on the threshold of whether new or physically altered governmental facilities could cause significant environmental impacts, it is anticipated that there would be either no impacts or less than significant impacts on public services.

### **Recreation**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility 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?
- b) Does the FIS Facility include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

#### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would not generate any increase in population or provide development that would result in increased usage of existing neighborhood and regional parks. There would not be any physical deterioration to existing recreational facilities due to the FIS Facility.

#### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

Recreation was focused out of FEIR 37-03 for the reason stated above.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further evaluation of recreation would be required for the FIS Facility.

### **Transportation/Traffic**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

- b) Would the FIS Facility conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Would the FIS Facility result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Would the FIS Facility substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Would the FIS Facility result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Would the FIS Facility conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

As discussed above, the City's Airport Noise Ordinance controls the number of commercial carrier flights that are allocated to the airlines. If the FIS Facility is implemented, international flights would be substituted for domestic flights because the cap of an average of 50 average daily commercial carrier flights would not be modified. As a result, the number of trips associated with the commercial carriers would be the same with or without the FIS Facility. There would be an incremental increase in vehicle trips associated with the CBP staff and possibly an increase in TSA staff serving the Airport. However, the overall number of trips would be limited and would not be expected to substantially alter the overall trip generation rate used for the Airport. The potential impact on the surrounding circulation network would be dependent on the time of the international flights because that would influence if the additional employee trips would occur at peak hour.

The FIS Facility would not alter the alternative modes of transportation currently serving the Airport (e.g., shuttles and transit). There would be no element of the FIS Facility that would result in hazardous design features or incompatible use. The public circulation system at the Airport would not be altered and internal (airfield side) circulation would be regulated by applicable FAA and Airport requirements.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

The additional square footage of terminal area improvements associated with the FIS Facility would be consistent with the facility assumptions in FEIR 37-03. The traffic generation factor used for the traffic assessment in the FEIR evaluated passenger trips and factored in employee trips and delivery trips serving the Airport. The FEIR considered the trips associated with the commercial carriers, as well as an assumption of 25 commuter flights, which is minimum levels provided by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. This overstates the historical and current traffic generated by the Airport because the full 25 commuter flights have never been allocated due to lack of demand.

The construction traffic associated with the FIS Facility would either be comparable to or less than the levels evaluated in FEIR 37-03 because the FEIR evaluated the traffic generated for the construction of the full 102,850 square feet of terminal improvements and the estimated 4,000

space parking garage. This equated to approximately 50 peak hour trips during the most active construction period. Given the limited scale of the FIS Facility, this number of trips would overstate the construction related impacts.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

No further analysis pertaining to traffic would be required for the FIS Facility.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

#### **CEQA Checklist Questions**

- a) Would the FIS Facility exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Would the FIS Facility require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Would the FIS Facility require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Would the FIS Facility have sufficient water supplies available from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Would the FIS Facility result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve it that it has adequate capacity to serve the FIS Facility's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Would the FIS Facility be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate its solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Would the FIS Facility comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

### **Conceptual Assessment of the FIS Facility**

The FIS Facility would not create substantial demand on water, wastewater, or solid waste disposal. Water and wastewater service is provided by the Long Beach Water Department. Though there would be an incremental increase in water demand because there would be additional facilities, including new restroom facilities, at the Airport. However, the total number of passengers served would not increase because that is a factor of the number of flights, which would not change due to the FIS Facility. The FIS Facility may result in slightly increased peak flow rates, though the overall increase would not be substantial enough to require expansion of existing facilities. The FIS Facility would not require a water supply assessment pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 610 because the size of the improvements is well below the thresholds used in SB 610 or the State Water Code.

The total amount of solid waste generated at the FIS Facility would be comparable to the quantity associated with domestic flights. However, international generated garbage may be handled differently than garbage generated on domestic flights, if it is defined as "regulated garbage". Not all garbage generated onboard is defined as "regulated garbage". Regulated

garbage generally includes food scraps, table refuse, galley refuse, food wrappers or packaging materials, and other waste material from stores and food preparation areas. However, pursuant to 7 CFR 330.400 and 9 CFR 94.5 there are exemptions for aircraft provided certain conditions are met. These requirements pertain to the air carriers conducting the international flights rather than the FIS Facility. The air carriers would be responsible for entering into Agricultural Compliance Agreement (ACA) for handling international garbage.

### **Consistency Assessment with FEIR 37-03**

The discussion of utilities was focused out of FEIR 37-03 because it was determined that the incremental increased demand on water, wastewater, and solid waste would not result in any impacts on services or exceed capacity of the existing systems. The demand associated with the 102,850 square feet of terminal area facilities would address the incremental increased demand associated with the FIS Facility. The one element of the FIS Facility that is unique as it pertains to utilities, is the solid waste disposal from international flights. As indicated above, the air carriers are responsible for entering into an Agricultural Compliance Agreement for handling international garbage.

### **Recommended Further Evaluation**

From a CEQA perspective, no further evaluation of utilities would be required for the FIS Facility.

### **CEQA Conclusion**

The preliminary evaluation of the FIS Facility does not identify any significant impacts that were not previously addressed in FEIR 37-03. This analysis has been conducted without the benefit of detailed concept plans. Based on the preliminary assessment, it would appear the FIS Facility would be consistent with the Terminal Area Improvements Project evaluated in FEIR 37-03. The scale of the facility appears to be within the parameters of the facilities addressed in the FEIR. As previously indicated, FEIR 37-03 and approving resolutions identified the interior square footage for the buildings (i.e., net square feet), whereas this Feasibility Study identifies outside footprint of the building (i.e., gross square feet). As such, the square footage of the FIS Facility being assessed in this study and the square footage of the facilities evaluated in FEIR 37-03 are presented slightly differently. The more detailed conceptual plan would be required prior to making a complete CEQA determination.

Once conceptual plans (with net square footage) are available, it is possible that size of the FIS Facility would be consistent with the April 2007 City Council direction pertaining to the size of the terminal area improvements and number of aircraft parking positions (i.e., 12 parking positions). However, as indicated above, the FEIR fully addresses the impacts associated with 102,850 square feet terminal area improvements and 14 parking positions. Therefore, should the City Council elect to do so, if it is determined that FIS Facility fits within the parameters of the 102,850 square feet addressed in the FEIR, it could be implemented without further documentation because the type of facilities proposed for the FIS Facility are generally consistent with the project description in FEIR 37-03.

CEQA is required to address environmental impacts of proposed actions. The environmental impacts associated with the construction of the FIS Facility would not be substantially different

from the impacts associated with the construction of terminal facilities to accommodate domestic flights. Pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration is only required when:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative;
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Notwithstanding the reliance on FEIR 37-03, the design of the FIS Facility would need to be reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission for compatibility with the historic terminal building. Additionally, FEIR 37-03 assumed the Terminal Area Improvements would be designed consistent with LEED requirements. Though no reduction in impacts was assumed based on LEED consistency, this provision was identified as a Project Design Feature and should be incorporated into the design of the FIS Facility.

Provided the FIS Facility can be accommodated within the square footage allocation addressed in FEIR 37-03 and no new significant impacts are identified, it would be reasonable to rely on the previous EIR as the CEQA documentation for the FIS Facility.

## **NEPA Compliance Requirements**

NEPA compliance would be required for any federal actions or approvals. The FIS Facility may require federal approvals by both the CBP and FAA. All three options would require approval by CBP. CBP follows guidance provided by the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ's) for

the implementation of NEPA. A provision of the *Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act* allows for the processing of a Categorical exclusion for “actions which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment. . .” (40 CFR 1508.4). Given the context of the FIS Facility (i.e., development a limited amount of additional new terminal area in a disturbed area of the Airport, which would not directly influence the number of allowed commercial carrier flights), it is reasonable to assume a Categorical Exclusion would be appropriate documentation pursuant to NEPA. Coordination with CBP on the type of NEPA documentation would be required as part of the project development process.

As indicated above, FAA approval would also be required for the FIS. For Option 1 (the northern location) FAA approval of the airfield would require modifications to the airfield due to the relocation of one aircraft parking position and the addition of a new aircraft parking position. Coordination with the FAA would be required to determine the type of environmental document that would be required. However, given the limited improvements/modifications to the airfield, a Categorical Exclusion would be anticipated. It should be noted that these improvements would also require a modified Airport Layout Plan, which is identified in FAA Order 1050.1E CHG 1 as an action where a Categorical Exclusion is frequently processed. If the FIS Facility would be funded with the use of a Passenger Facility Charge, FAA approval would also be required.

## References

- California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). 2014. Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2014. Sacramento, CA: FMMP.
- Council on Environmental Quality, Executive Office of the President. 2005. *Regulations For Implementing The Procedural Provisions Of The National Environmental Policy Act* (40 CRF Parts 1500-1508). Washington D.C.: CEQ.
- Federal Aviation Administration. 2006 (March). Order 1050.1E CHG 1 (Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures). Washington D.C.: FAA.
- . 2003 (April). Correspondence from Mr. James W. Whitlow, Deputy Chief Counsel for the FAA, to Mr. Chris Kunze, Manager, Long Beach Airport.
- . 2015 (May). Correspondence from Ms. Patricia A. McNall, Deputy Chief Counsel for the FAA, to Robert C. Land, Senior Vice President JetBlue Airways.
- Long Beach, City of. 2016 (July, last update). *Long Beach Municipal Code*. Tallahassee, FL: Municode Corporation for the City.
- . 2006a (June). *Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project Final Environmental Impact Report No. 37-03 (SCH No. 200309112)*. Long Beach, CA: the City.
- . 2006b (June). Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project. Long Beach, CA: the City.
- . 2006c (June 20). Resolution No. RES-06-0056. Long Beach, CA: the City.

- . 2005 (May). *Long Beach Airport Safety and Security Regulations during Construction*. Long Beach, CA: the City.
- . 2012 (June). *Long Beach Airport Layout Plan*. Long Beach, CA: the City.

### APPENDIX G: ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

NOTE: The following is a sample form and may be tailored to satisfy individual agencies' needs and project circumstances. It may be used to meet the requirements for an initial study when the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines have been met. Substantial evidence of potential impacts that are not listed on this form must also be considered. The sample questions in this form are intended to encourage thoughtful assessment of impacts, and do not necessarily represent thresholds of significance.

1. Project title: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Lead agency name and address:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Contact person and phone number: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Project location: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Project sponsor's name and address:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. General plan designation: \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Zoning: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses 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 Incorporated” 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 Analyses,” 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. 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 effects 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 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

SAMPLE QUESTION

Issues:

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>III. AIR QUALITY.</b> Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:**

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>			

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iv) Landslides?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.**

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b><u>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u></b>				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</b> Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the project:

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**XII. NOISE** -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Less Than Significant</b>			
	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.**

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the 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: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Fire protection?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Police protection?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Schools?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Parks?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Other public facilities?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**XV. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</u> Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Less Than Significant</b>			
	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XVIII. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21083, 21083.05, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21095, and 21151, Public Resources Code; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, (1988) 202 Cal.App.3d 296; *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 1337; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

Revised 2009

**THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**