

**Appendix A**  
**Initial Study/Notice of Preparation**  
**and Notice of Preparation Comments**

---



# Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

---

## 2810 EAST 1ST STREET PROJECT

---



LEAD AGENCY:

**City of Long Beach**

333 W. Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, CA 90802

**Contact: Steve Gerhardt, AICP**  
562.570.6288

PREPARED BY:

**RBF Consulting**

14725 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, California 92618

**Contacts: Glenn Lajoie, AICP**  
**Rita Garcia**  
949.472.3505

April 1, 2013

JN 133143



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Statutory Authority and Requirements .....	1
1.2	Consultation.....	2
1.3	Incorporation by Reference.....	2
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Project Description.....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	Project Location and Setting .....	5
2.2	Background and History.....	5
2.3	Project Characteristics .....	5
2.4	Project Phasing.....	10
2.5	Actions and Approvals .....	10
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Environmental Summary .....</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1	Background.....	11
3.2	Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	12
3.3	Lead Agency Determination.....	13
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environmental Analysis.....</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Aesthetics .....	17
4.2	Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	19
4.3	Air Quality .....	21
4.4	Biological Resources .....	25
4.5	Cultural Resources .....	27
4.6	Geology and Soils.....	29
4.7	Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	33
4.8	Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	37
4.9	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	41
4.10	Land Use and Planning.....	49
4.11	Mineral Resources .....	53
4.12	Noise .....	55
4.13	Population and Housing.....	61
4.14	Public Services .....	63
4.15	Recreation .....	67
4.16	Transportation/Traffic.....	69
4.17	Utilities and Service Systems.....	71
4.18	Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	75
<b>5.0</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>77</b>
5.1	Environmental Evaluation Personnel.....	77
5.2	Reference Documents .....	77



## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1	Regional Vicinity .....	7
Exhibit 2	Local Vicinity .....	8
Exhibit 3	Site Plan .....	9

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.12-1	Exterior Noise Limits .....	57
Table 4.12-2	Interior Noise Standards .....	58



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project (herein referenced as the “project”) is located north of Ocean Boulevard, between Temple Avenue and Orizaba Avenue, within the Bluff Park Historic District. The proposal involves re-construction of 1920’s residential and garage structures. Refer to Section 2.0, *Project Description*, for a detailed description.

Following preliminary review of the proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project, the City has determined that the Project is subject to the guidelines and regulations of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Initial Study addresses the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects associated with the Project.

### 1.1 STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND REQUIREMENTS

In accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 - 21178.1), this Initial Study has been prepared to analyze the Project in order to identify any potentially significant impacts upon the environment that would result from Project implementation. In accordance with Section 15063 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this Initial Study is a preliminary analysis prepared by the Lead Agency, the City of Long Beach, in consultation with other jurisdictional agencies, to determine whether a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required for the Project. The purpose of this Initial Study is to inform the City of Long Beach decision-makers, affected agencies, and the public of potential environmental impacts associated with Project construction and implementation.

Following completion of the Initial Study, the City will make a formal determination as to whether the Project may or may not have significant unmitigable environmental impacts. A determination that a project may have less than significant effects on the environment would result in the preparation of a Negative Declaration. A determination that a project may have significant impacts on the environment would require the preparation of an EIR to further evaluate issues identified in this Initial Study. Therefore, this Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) serve as part of the scoping process to determine the appropriate environmental documentation for the Project.

The City has determined, based upon the analysis of potential environmental effects within this Initial Study, that the Project may have a significant effect on the environment and that preparation of an EIR is required to further evaluate identified issues; refer to Section 3.3, *Lead Agency Determination*.

The Initial Study and NOP will undergo a 30-day public review period. During this review, comments by the public and responsible agencies on the Project relative to environmental issues are to be submitted to the City. The City will review and consider all comments as a part of the Project’s environmental analysis, as required in Section 15082 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended. The comments received with regard to this Initial Study and NOP will be included in the Project environmental document, for consideration by the City of Long Beach.



## 1.2 CONSULTATION

In accordance with Section 15063 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, as soon as the Lead Agency determines that an Initial Study is required for the Project, the Lead Agency is directed to consult informally with all Responsible Agencies and Trustee Agencies that are responsible for resources affected by the Project, in order to obtain the recommendations of those agencies on the environmental documentation to be prepared for the Project. Following receipt of any written comments from those agencies, the City will consider any recommendations of those agencies in the formulation of the preliminary findings. Following execution of this Initial Study, the City will initiate formal consultation with these and other governmental agencies, as required under CEQA and its implementing guidelines.

## 1.3 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

The following references were utilized during preparation of this Initial Study. These documents are available for review at the City of Long Beach Community Development Department, located at 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, California, 90802.

- *City of Long Beach General Plan*. The *City of Long Beach General Plan (General Plan)* is the long-range planning guide for growth and development for the City. The *General Plan* sets forth the goals, policies, and directions the City will take in managing its future. The *General Plan* is the citizens' blueprint for development; the guide to achieving the City's vision. It is a comprehensive document that addresses the following seven mandatory elements/issues in accordance with State law: Land Use; Housing; Circulation; Conservation; Open Space; Noise; and Safety. Other optional issues that affect the City, including Air Quality, Scenic Routes, Seismic Safety, and a Local Coastal Program, have also been addressed in the *General Plan*.

Each element of the *General Plan* was adopted as follows:

- Land Use Element (1989);
- Historic Preservation Element (2010);
- Transportation Element (1991);
- Open Space and Recreation Element (2002);
- Public Safety Element (1975);
- Housing Element (2009);
- Noise Element (1975);
- Seismic Safety Element (1988);
- Conservation Element (1973);
- Air Quality Element (1996);
- Scenic Routes Element (1975); and
- Local Coastal Program (1980).

The *General Plan* was utilized throughout this document as the fundamental planning document governing development on the Project site. Background and policy information from the *General Plan* are cited in several sections of this document.



- City of Long Beach Municipal Code (enacted August 17, 2010). The *City of Long Beach Municipal Code* (Municipal Code), enacted August 17, 2010, consists of the City's regulatory, penal, and administrative ordinances. It is the method the City uses to implement control of land uses, in accordance with *General Plan* goals and policies. The City's *Zoning Code* (Municipal Code Title 21) identifies land uses permitted and prohibited according to the zoning category of particular parcels. The *Buildings and Construction Code* (Municipal Code Title 18) specifies regulations for construction, alteration, and building or uses for human habitation.



This page intentionally left blank.



## **2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **2.1 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING**

The City of Long Beach (City) is located in the southern portion of Los Angeles County, overlooking the Pacific Ocean and San Pedro Bay (approximately 22 miles south of downtown Los Angeles); refer to Exhibit 1, *Regional Vicinity*. The proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project (herein referenced as the “Project”) is located north of Ocean Boulevard, between Temple Avenue and Orizaba Avenue, within Long Beach’s Bluff Park Historic District; refer to Exhibit 2, *Local Vicinity*.

The Project site consists of one approximately 0.16-acre parcel, Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 7264-017-003.<sup>1</sup> Regional access to the site is provided via Interstate 405 (I-405) and State Route 22 (SR-22), located approximately 3.0 and 2.5 miles north and northeast of the Project site, respectively, and I-710 located approximately 2.75 miles west of the Project site. Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) is located approximately 2.0 miles to the north and northeast. The primary local roadways providing access to the site are Ocean Boulevard, East Broadway, and Temple Avenue.

Land uses surrounding the Project site include various single- and multi-family residential uses to the north, a multi-family residential use to the east, and single-family residential uses to the south and west.

### **2.2 BACKGROUND AND HISTORY**

The residence located at 2810 East 1st Street was originally constructed in 1921. In 1982, the Bluff Park Historic District was designated with the 2810 East 1st Street residence identified as a contributing structure. On October 15, 2005, a Certificate of Appropriateness was approved allowing a 523-square foot addition and removal of the rough-textured stucco on the existing residential structure. In December 2005, permitted construction work was initiated. Upon removal of the rough-textured stucco, most of the lath detached from the framing, leaving the framing bare. Termite damage and dry rot in the framing were also discovered during the stucco removal. The former property owner notified the City and requested a Certificate of Appropriateness for demolition and new construction. Since 2005, the residence has remained in its current state.

### **2.3 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS**

The applicant proposes to restore the existing structure, using over 90 percent of the onsite materials; refer to Exhibit 3, *Site Plan*. The proposal involves the use of 100 percent of the existing foundation and over 80 percent of the existing framing. Missing doors and windows would be replaced with circa 1920s. The following summarizes the proposed restoration/reconstruction:

---

<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor, <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/mapping/viewer.asp>, Accessed January 22, 2013.



### **Structural**

- Foundation: Retain and reuse 100 percent of the existing foundation, and sister a new engineered foundation for structural support.
- Roof Framing: Frame roof as per original design and structural upgrades.
- Roofing: Reuse 90 percent of the existing onsite adobe circa 1920's roofing materials and replace the missing 10 percent adobe with imported circa 1920's roofing materials.
- Garage: Retain and maintain the existing garage.
- Garage Roof: Repair and terrain grade the existing garage roof to prevent water intrusion.
- Front Porch: Retain, restore, maintain, and reuse the front porch.
- Framing: Chemically treat all framing for wood destroying organisms using Vikane Gas Fumigant (Sulfuryl Fluoride).<sup>2</sup>
- Timbers and Wood: Remove the existing dry rotted wood, replace with new structural wood, and sister the existing timbers, per engineering standards.

### **Interior**

- Coved Ceiling: Retain interior coved ceiling in living room and dining area.
- Flooring: Install period correct oak flooring.
- Simple Living Home: The roof is designed to accommodate a rain water receptacle. The interior is designed to create heating, cooling zones, and low energy lighting throughout. The goal is to minimize costly off site energy and materials, use all available onsite materials, and take full advantage of economical passive energy systems.

### **Exterior**

- Exterior Doors: Exterior doors circa 1920's.
- Exterior Doors: Repair, restore, and reuse the existing exterior doors, and replace the missing doors with circa 1920s.
- Windows: Repair, restore, and reuse the existing windows, and replace the missing windows with circa 1920s.
- Garage Doors: Provide new garage doors circa 1920s.
- Front Metal Gates and Door Screen: Retain, repair and restore matching metal gates at front of property and front door screen.
- Architectural Detail: Restore architectural detail as per historical photos and onsite framing details.
- Exterior Colors: Use approved exterior colors and stucco.


### **Hardscape/Landscape/Fencing**

- Driveway and Walkways: Retain, maintain, and reuse the existing driveways and walkways; retain and grade the west side walkway.

---

<sup>2</sup> Fluoride Action Network Website, <http://www.fluoridealert.org/pesticides/sulfuryl.f.vikane.epa.htm>, Accessed January 22, 2013.





 - Project Boundary  
Source: Google Maps, 2012.


NOT TO SCALE



04/13 • JN 133143

CITY OF LONG BEACH  
2810 E FIRST STREET PROJECT  
INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST  
**Local Vicinity**

**Exhibit 2**



Source: Begovich + Haug Architects, September 26, 2012.

NOT TO SCALE



04/13 • JN 131143

CITY OF LONG BEACH  
 2810 E FIRST STREET PROJECT  
 INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST  
**Site Plan**

**Exhibit 3**



- Fencing: Retain, maintain, repair, and reuse the existing fencing.
- Concrete Steps: Retain and repurpose for restoration the concrete steps located at south side of the house.
- Landscaping: Retain and maintain the orange tree and bougainvillea bushes.

#### **Utilities**

- Water and Sewer Lines: Retain, maintain, repair, and reuse the existing water and sewer lines.
- Gas Lines: Test, repair, and retain the existing gas lines.

## **2.4 PROJECT PHASING**

Construction of the Project is anticipated to occur in one phase, over a 12-month period. Construction would begin upon issuance of the Building Permit, which is anticipated to occur Summer 2013 and continue through issuance of the Occupancy Permit, which is anticipated to occur Summer 2014.

## **2.5 ACTIONS AND APPROVALS**

The applicable agency approvals required for Project implementation include the following:

#### **City of Long Beach**

- Certification of EIR by Planning Commission; and
- Approval of Certificate of Appropriateness by Cultural Heritage Commission (or Planning Commission, upon appeal).



## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

### 3.1 BACKGROUND

<b>1. Project Title:</b>	2810 East 1st Street Project
<b>2. Lead Agency Name and Address:</b>	City of Long Beach 333 West Ocean Boulevard Long Beach, California 90802
<b>3. Contact Person and Phone Number:</b>	Mr. Steve Gerhardt, AICP Senior Planner 562.570.6288
<b>4. Project Location:</b>	2810 East 1st Street (north of Ocean Boulevard, between Temple Avenue and Orizaba Avenue, within the Bluff Park Historic District), City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles; refer to <u>Exhibit 2, Site Vicinity</u> .
<b>5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b>	Mr. Alan Schwendener 11409 Carson Street Lakewood, California 90715
<b>6. General Plan Designation:</b>	Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District
<b>7. Zoning Designation:</b>	Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District
<b>8. Description of the Project:</b>	Refer to <u>Section 2.4, Project Characteristics</u> .
<b>9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b>	Refer to <u>Section 2.1, Project Location and Setting</u> .
<b>10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement):</b>	Refer to <u>Section 2.6, Agreements, Permits, and Approvals</u> .



### 3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the Project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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



### 3.3 LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposal COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposal could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section 4.0, *Inventory of Mitigation Measures*, have been added. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

X

I find that the proposal MAY have a significant effect(s) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature  
Steve Gerhardt, AICP, Senior Planner  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

City of Long Beach  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Agency  
April 1, 2013  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Sections 4.1 through 4.18 analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with the Project. The environmental issue areas that are evaluated in this Initial Study are:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forest Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, and used by the City of Long Beach in its environmental review process. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the development's impacts and to identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The development will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The development will have the potential to generate impacts, which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The development could have impacts, which may be considered significant, and therefore additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.1 AESTHETICS

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✓	
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓	

### 4.1.a. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

**No Impact.** According to the City's *General Plan*, the City has multiple aesthetic visual assets, including vistas of the ocean, port facilities, oil islands, Bixby Park, Bluff Park, and other vantage points. The Project site is located within the Bluff Park neighborhood, which is described by the *General Plan* as a scenic gateway to the City with ocean views that must be retained. However, the Project site and surrounding residential uses are not afforded views of Bluff Park or the ocean due to intervening development. These views are primarily available to residences fronting Ocean Boulevard. Additionally, public views from a scenic vista toward the Project site are not available due to the interior location of the Project site and surrounding development. Thus, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located along a designated State scenic highway.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

### 4.1.c. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Partial demolition of the existing residence, including the prior removal of the exterior walls, interior walls, and roof occurred in 2005, resulting in the exposure of bare framing and further physical deterioration of the remaining structure. Current views of the site consist of a chain link fence with construction screening and partial views of the remaining structure. The existing partially demolished structure would be reconstructed/restored and the chain link fencing would be removed, improving the existing visual character and quality of the site. The reconstructed/restored residence and garage must comply with the

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Transportation Website, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/), Accessed January 22, 2013.



residential development standards specified in Municipal Code Table 31-21A, which regulate factors of compatibility and aesthetics such as minimum building setbacks, maximum building height and maximum number of dwelling units per lot, among other development factors.

The Project site is located within the Bluff Park Historic District. Municipal Code Chapter 2.63, *Cultural Heritage Commission*, was adopted to protect, enhance, and perpetuate areas, districts, buildings, and other structures, which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past. According to Section 2.63.040.B, the Cultural Heritage Commission would review the proposed restoration/reconstruction and issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Certificate would be issued only if it is determined that the proposed change:

- Would not adversely affect any significant historical, cultural, architectural, or aesthetic feature of the concerned property or of the landmark district in which it is located and that issuance of the Certificate is consistent with the spirit and intent of Municipal Code Chapter 2.63;
- Is consistent with or compatible with the architectural period of the building; and
- Is compatible in architectural style with existing adjacent contributing structures in a historic landmark district;

Compliance with the residential development standards, which would be verified through the City's discretionary review process, and review by the Cultural Heritage Commission, would ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and the overall Bluff Park Historic District. Therefore, Project implementation would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are two primary sources of light: light emanating from building interiors that pass through windows and light from exterior sources (i.e., street lighting, parking lot lighting, building illumination, security lighting, and landscape lighting). The existing residence has been unoccupied for several years, thus, is not a contributing source of light in the area. Currently, light and glare in the Project vicinity is produced by vehicle headlights, street lighting, residential security lighting, and interior lighting associated with existing residential uses. Project implementation would introduce new sources of lighting that currently do not exist. However, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residential use that was a contributing source of light in the area. Moreover, the lighting that would be created by the Project would not be dissimilar or substantially greater than the existing residential uses in the area. Therefore, Project implementation would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.



## 4.2 AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

<p><i>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 Department 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:</i></p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact 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?				✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
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))?				✓
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				✓
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?				✓

**4.2.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project area is void of any agricultural uses. No areas of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the Project or converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is zoned Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District and not under Williamson Act Contract. No agricultural zoning applies to the site. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.



**4.2.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))?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is zoned Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District. No zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production applies to the Project site. In addition, the Project site does not contain any trees capable of supporting ten percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, or that allow for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

**4.2.d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.2.c.

**4.2.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?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Responses 4.2.a through 4.2.c, above. No other changes in the existing environment would occur that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.



### 4.3 AIR QUALITY

<i>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:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓	
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓	
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)?			✓	
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓	
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓	

#### 4.3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

**Less Than Significant Impact.** On December 7, 2012, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s (SCAQMD) Governing Board approved the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (2012 AQMP), which outlines the its strategies for meeting the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and ozone. The 2012 AQMP was then forwarded to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for inclusion into the California State Implementation Plan (SIP) in January 2013. Subsequently, the 2012 AQMP will be submitted to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as the 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> SIP addressing the 2006 PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS and as a limited update to the approved 8-hour ozone SIP. The 1-hour ozone attainment demonstration and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) emissions offset demonstration will also be submitted through CARB to the EPA. According to the SCAQMD’s 2012 AQMP, two main criteria must be addressed.

#### Criterion 1:

With respect to the first criterion, SCAQMD methodologies require that an air quality analysis for a project include forecasts of project emissions in relation to contributing to air quality violations and delay of attainment.

a) *Would the Project result in an increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations?*

Since the consistency criteria identified under the first criterion pertain to pollutant concentrations, rather than to total regional emissions, an analysis of the Project’s pollutant emissions relative to localized pollutant concentrations is used as the basis for evaluating Project consistency. As discussed in Response 4.3.d, below, localized concentrations of air pollutants would be less than significant. Therefore, the Project would not result in an



increase in the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations. Because reactive organic gases (ROGs) are not a criteria pollutant, there is no ambient standard or localized threshold for ROGs. Due to the role ROG plays in ozone formation, it is classified as a precursor pollutant and only a regional emissions threshold has been established.

b) *Would the Project cause or contribute to new air quality violations?*

As discussed in Response 4.3.b, the Project would not be capable of exceeding the SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the Project would not have the potential to cause or affect a violation of the ambient air quality standards.

c) *Would the Project delay timely attainment of air quality standards or the interim emissions reductions specified in the AQMP?*

The Project would result in less than significant impacts with regard to localized concentrations during Project construction and operations. As such, the Project would not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or 2012 AQMP emissions reductions.

**Criterion 2:**

With respect to the second criterion for determining consistency with SCAQMD and Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) air quality policies, it is important to recognize that air quality planning within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) focuses on attainment of ambient air quality standards at the earliest feasible date. Projections for achieving air quality goals are based on assumptions regarding population, housing, and growth trends. Thus, the SCAQMD's second criterion for determining Project consistency focuses on whether or not the Project exceeds the assumptions utilized in preparing the forecasts presented in the 2012 AQMP. Determining whether or not a project exceeds the assumptions reflected in the 2012 AQMP involves the evaluation of the three criteria outlined below. The following discussion provides an analysis of each of these criteria.

a) *Would the Project be consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections utilized in the preparation of the AQMP?*

In the case of the 2012 AQMP, three sources of data form the basis for the projections of air pollutant emissions: the City of Long Beach General Plan, SCAG's *Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP)*, and SCAG's *2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP)*. The RTP also provides socioeconomic forecast projections of regional population growth. The Project site is located within a residential neighborhood and is designated Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District by the City's General Plan. The Project proposes to restore an existing single-family residential structure; thus, it would not result in additional traffic trips not already considered in the General Plan, and would not result in additional growth in the City. Thus, the Project is consistent with the types, intensity, and patterns of land use envisioned in the RCP for the site vicinity. The population, housing, and employment forecasts, which are adopted by SCAG's Regional Council are based on the local plans and policies applicable to the City; these are used by SCAG in all phases of implementation and



review. Additionally, as the SCAQMD has incorporated these same projections into the 2012 AQMP, it can be concluded that the Project would be consistent with the projections.

*b) Would the Project implement all feasible air quality mitigation measures?*

The Project would result in less than significant air quality impacts. Compliance with emission reduction measures identified by the SCAQMD would be required. As such, the Project meets this AQMP consistency criterion.

*c) Would the Project be consistent with the land use planning strategies set forth in the AQMP?*

The Project would serve to implement various City of Long Beach and SCAG policies. The Project is located within a developed portion of the City, and is considered an infill development.

In conclusion, the determination of 2012 AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of a project on air quality in the Basin. The Project would not result in a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and Federal air quality standards. Also, the Project would be consistent with the 2012 AQMP goals and policies for control of fugitive dust. As discussed above, the Project's long-term influence would also be consistent with the SCAQMD and SCAG's goals and policies and is, therefore, considered consistent with the 2012 AQMP.

**4.3.b. *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Short-Term Construction Emissions**

The Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure. The Project would not require extensive construction activities as it plans to utilize over 90 percent of the existing on-site materials. As described in Section 2.3, *Project Characteristics*, existing building features such as the foundation, driveway, walkways, garage, and front porch would be retained and reused, while features such as the roof, windows, utility lines, fencing, and doors would be repaired and reused. The Project would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing quantifiable fugitive dust or exhaust emissions. Therefore, the Project would not be capable of exceeding SCAQMD significance thresholds. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

**Long-Term (Operational) Emissions**

Development projects generally result in long-term air quality impacts from mobile source emissions from project-related traffic and from area and energy source-related emissions. As the Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure, the Project would not generate new vehicle trips or mobile source emissions. Additionally, the Project would not result in an increased amount of area and energy source emissions. As described in Section 2.3, *Project*



*Characteristics*, the Project would be designed to create heating and cooling zones, and low energy lighting. Therefore, long-term operational impacts would be less than significant.

**4.3.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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed previously, the Project would not result in short- or long-term air quality impacts. Therefore, cumulative construction and operational impacts associated with Project implementation would be less than significant. Also refer to Responses 4.3.a and 4.3.b, above.

**4.3.d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed above, the Project would involve reconstruction/restoration of a single-family residence, and would not result in construction activities or operations capable of producing emissions in excess of the SCAQMD thresholds. Due to extensive termite damage and dry rot in the existing framing, the structure would require fumigation using Vikane Gas Fumigant. During application, the building would be enclosed in a tight tent and filled with the gas for a period of time, usually at least 16 to 18 hours, sometimes as long as 72 hours. The building would then be ventilated, generally for at least six hours, before occupants can enter. Reentry to the home would be allowed when the concentration level is at or below five (5) parts per million (ppm). Therefore, the proposed fumigation activities would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**4.3.e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the SCAQMD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. The Project involves a residential use and does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. Construction activities associated with the Project would include the restoration of an existing structure which would not result in odor impacts. Therefore, Project implementation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.



## 4.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				✓
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?				✓

**4.4.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?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is located within an urbanized residential area and does not contain candidate, sensitive, or special status species or habitat that would support such species. The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

**4.4.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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No Impact.** The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures. No riparian habitats or sensitive natural communities are present on the



Project site. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

**4.4.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures, and no federally protected wetlands are present; refer to Responses 4.4.a and 4.4.b, above. Therefore, Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

**4.4.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?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.4(a) above. The Project area does not contain habitat to support any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The Project would not interfere with the movement of fish or wildlife.

**4.4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**No Impact.** No sensitive biological resources are located on the Project site. No policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources are applicable to the Project other than Municipal Code Chapter 14.28, *Trees and Shrubs*. Chapter 14.28 contains regulations on tree and shrub planting, removal, and maintenance, and the protection of trees located along a street, alley, court, or other public place during construction activities. Project implementation would not disturb City trees or shrub planting within areas of public right-of-way. Thus, Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

**4.4.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?**

**No Impact.** Project implementation would not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans, since no such plans apply to the Project area.



## 4.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?	✓			
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?			✓	
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			✓	
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			✓	

**4.5.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Potentially Significant Impact.** The Project site and associated residence is located within the Bluff Park Historic District. The residence was originally constructed in 1921 and was identified by the City as a contributing structure to the Bluff Park Historic District. The Project includes work that previously occurred and that resulted in the partial demolition of the existing residence, including the prior removal of the exterior walls, interior walls, and roof, which subsequently resulted in the physical deterioration of the remaining structure due to exposure to the elements. Further analysis will be conducted as part of the Project EIR to analyze the previous actions' impact upon the individual residence and Historic District, and the Project's potential impact on the Bluff Park Historic District. The EIR analysis will also determine whether the existing residence represents an important example of a major period of California history.

**4.5.b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** There are no known designated archaeological resources present on the Project site. Additionally, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residence and is surrounded by urban/developed land that has been permanently altered due to the construction of below and aboveground improvements (i.e., buildings, parking lots, hardscapes, and utilities, etc.). The Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and may contain artificial fill materials. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for ground-disturbing activities to impact an as yet unidentified archeological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.



**4.5.c. *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.5.b, above. No unique geologic feature is present on the Project site. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for ground-disturbing activities to impact an as yet unidentified paleontological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving its potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

**4.5.d. *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for Project implementation to disturb any human remains is remote. Additionally, no conditions exist that suggest human remains are likely to be found during Project construction activities. Nevertheless, if human remains were found, those remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws. Public Resources Code Section 5097, et seq., and Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5-7055 describe the general provisions regarding human remains, including the requirements if any human remains are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. The requirements and procedures set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 would be implemented if human remains are discovered, including notification of the County Coroner, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission, and consultation with the individual identified by the Native American Heritage Commission to be the “most likely descendant.” If human remains are found during excavation, excavation must stop in the vicinity of the find and any area that is reasonably suspected to overly adjacent remains until the County coroner investigates and the remains have been investigated and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Compliance with applicable law regarding human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would result in less than significant environmental impacts.



## 4.6 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1) 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.				✓
2) Strong seismic ground shaking?			✓	
3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				✓
4) Landslides?				✓
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			✓	
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?				✓
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property?			✓	
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?				✓

**4.6.a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

**4.6.a.1. 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.**

**No Impact.** Seismically induced ground rupture is defined as the physical displacement of surface deposits in response to an earthquake’s seismic waves. Ground rupture is most likely along active faults, and typically occurs during earthquakes of magnitude five or higher. Ground rupture only affects the area immediately adjacent to a fault.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Act’s main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act requires the State Geologist to establish regulatory zones, known as “Alquist Priolo (AP) Earthquake Fault Zones,” around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps. If an active fault is found, a structure for human occupancy cannot be placed over the trace of the fault and must be set back from the fault (typically 50 feet). The Project site is not



affected by a State-designated AP Earthquake Fault Zone.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

#### **4.6.a.2. Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Long Beach is located within a seismically active region that commonly experiences strong ground shaking from earthquakes along active faults. Regional faults that are significant to the City are outlined in the *General Plan Seismic Safety Element*, Table 3, *Characteristics and Estimated Maximum Earthquakes for Faults Considered for City of Long Beach SSE*, and illustrated in Plate 1, *Earthquake Epicenter and Fault Map of Southern California*. As indicated on *General Plan* Table 3 and Plate 1, the most significant fault in the City is the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, which includes the Cherry Hill Fault, the Northeast Flank Fault, and the Reservoir Hill Fault. The Palos Verdes Fault is another significant fault near the City. Thus, the Project site could experience strong seismic ground shaking from the Newport-Inglewood Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault or faults located elsewhere in the region. The intensity of ground shaking at the Project site would depend upon the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter and the geology of the area between the epicenter and the Project site.

The City has adopted the 2007 Edition of the California Building, Mechanical, Plumbing, and Electric Codes into the Long Beach Building Codes contained in Municipal Code Title 18, *Buildings and Construction*. Also adopted into Title 18 is Part 8 of the California Building Standards Code, which is commonly known as the State Historic Building Code. Special regulations for qualified historic buildings that provide alternate methods are included in this Code, in order to ensure that historic buildings comply with the intent of the Code, while retaining those aspects of the building integral to its historic character. The Project must adhere to standard engineering practices and design criteria relative to seismic and geologic hazards, in accordance with Municipal Code Title 18 and standard engineering practices. Compliance with Municipal Code Title 18 would be verified through the City's development review process, which would ensure that Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking.

#### **4.6.a.3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**No Impact.** Liquefaction is a seismically induced form of ground failure. Liquefaction takes place when granular materials that are saturated by water lose strength and transform from a solid to a liquid state. Liquefaction generally occurs during significant earthquake activity. Structures located on soils such as silt or sand may experience significant damage during an earthquake due to the instability of structural foundations and the moving earth. *General Plan Seismic Safety Element*, Plate 7, *Liquefaction Potential Areas*, illustrates the four potential liquefaction hazard zones in the City. As illustrated on Plate 7, the Project site is located within an area characterized as having a minimal potential for liquefaction. Further, according to the State of California Department of Conservation, the Project site is not located within an area

---

<sup>4</sup> State of California Website, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, *Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program - Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act*, [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/preliminary\\_maps.aspx](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/preliminary_maps.aspx), Accessed January 22, 2013.



susceptible to liquefaction.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

#### **4.6.a.4. Landslides?**

**No Impact.** Topography within the Project area is relatively flat and void of any features capable of producing a landslide. According to the *General Plan* Seismic Safety Element, Plate 9, *Slope Stability Study Areas*, the Project area is not located an area of relatively steep slopes. Since the Project area is relatively flat, the risk of landslides at the site is considered very low. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides.

#### **4.6.b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Due to the scope and nature of the Project and surrounding area, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Notwithstanding, as concluded in Response 4.9.a, the Project's construction activities must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements, which would further minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil.

#### **4.6.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 an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Responses 4.6.a.3 and 4.6.a.4. According to the General Plan, large scale subsidence, mostly related to petroleum production from the Wilmington Oil Field, has taken place in the Long Beach Harbor area. The Project site is not located within an area identified as being susceptible to subsidence. Lateral spreading involves the dislocation of the near surface soils generally along a near-surface liquefiable layer. In many cases, this phenomenon of shallow landsliding occurs on relatively flat or gently sloping ground adjacent to a "free face," such as a river embankment. The Project site is not located within an area susceptible to lateral spreading. Therefore, the Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable.

#### **4.6.d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Expansive soils are clay-rich soils that can undergo a significant increase in volume with increased water content and a significant decrease in volume with a decrease in water content. Significant changes in moisture content within moderately to highly expansive soil can produce cracking differential heave, and other adverse impacts to structures constructed on such soils. The City of Long Beach has been subdivided into four predominant soil profiles (*General Plan* Seismic Safety Element, Plate 3, *Soil Profiles*). As indicated on Plate 3, the Project site is located in an area designated as Profile D, which is described as containing "predominantly cohesionless, granular non-marine terrace deposits

---

<sup>5</sup> State of California Website, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, *State of California Seismic Hazard Zones*, Long Beach Quadrangle, Official Map, Released March 25, 1999.



overlying Pleistocene granular marine sediments at shallow depths; includes adjacent beach areas.” Therefore, the Project would not be located on expansive soil or create substantial risks to life or property in this regard.

**4.6.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?***

**No Impact.** Sewers are available for disposal of wastewater generated by the Project. Accordingly, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be required or permitted.



## 4.7 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			✓	
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			✓	

### 4.7.a. *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

#### Less Than Significant Impact.

#### Global Climate Change

California is a substantial contributor of global greenhouse gases (GHGs), emitting over 400 million tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) per year.<sup>6</sup> Climate studies indicate that California is likely to see an increase of three to four degrees Fahrenheit (°F) over the next century. Methane is also an important GHG that potentially contributes to global climate change. GHGs are global in their effect, which is to increase the earth's ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere. As primary GHGs have a long lifetime in the atmosphere, accumulate over time, and are generally well-mixed, their impact on the atmosphere is mostly independent of the point of emission.

The impact of human activities on global climate change is apparent in the observational record. Air trapped by ice has been extracted from core samples taken from polar ice sheets to determine the global atmospheric variation of CO<sub>2</sub>, methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) from before the start of industrialization (approximately 1750), to over 650,000 years ago. For that period, it was found that CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations ranged from 180 parts per million (ppm) to 300 ppm. For the period from approximately 1750 to the present, global CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations increased from a pre-industrialization period concentration of 280 ppm to 379 ppm in 2005, with the 2005 value far exceeding the upper end of the pre-industrial period range.

#### Regulations and Significance Criteria

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) constructed several emission trajectories of GHGs needed to stabilize global temperatures and climate change impacts. It concluded that a stabilization of GHGs at 400 to 450 ppm carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>eq)<sup>7</sup> concentration is required to keep global mean warming below 2 degrees Celsius (°C), which in turn is assumed to be necessary to avoid dangerous climate change.

<sup>6</sup> California Energy Commission, *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004*, 2006.

<sup>7</sup> Carbon Dioxide Equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>eq) – A metric measure used to compare the emissions from various greenhouse gases based upon their global warming potential.



Executive Order S-3-05 was issued in June 2005, which established the following GHG emission reduction targets:

- 2010: Reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- 2020: Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- 2050: Reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32 requires that the California Air Resources Board (CARB) determine what the statewide GHG emissions level was in 1990, and approve a statewide GHG emissions limit that is equivalent to that level, to be achieved by 2020. CARB has approved a 2020 emissions limit of 427 million metric tons (MMT) of CO<sub>2</sub>eq.

Due to the nature of global climate change, it is not anticipated that any single development project would have a substantial effect on global climate change. In actuality, GHG emissions from the Project would combine with emissions emitted across California, the United States, and the world to cumulatively contribute to global climate change.

In June 2008, the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) published a Technical Advisory, which provides informal guidance for public agencies as they address the issue of climate change in CEQA documents.<sup>8</sup> This is assessed by determining whether a proposed project is consistent with or obstructs the 39 Recommended Actions identified by CARB in its Climate Change Scoping Plan which includes nine Early Action Measures (qualitative approach). The Attorney General's Mitigation Measures identify areas where GHG emissions reductions can be achieved in order to achieve the goals of AB 32. As set forth in the OPR Technical Advisory and in the proposed amendments to the *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.4, this analysis examines whether the Project's GHG emissions are significant based on a qualitative and performance based standard (Proposed *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15064.4(a)(1) and (2)).

It is noted that at this time, the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) does not have an adopted threshold of significance for residential projects or construction GHG emissions.

### ***Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases***

Project-related GHG emissions generally include emissions from direct and indirect sources. Direct GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities and mobile sources, while indirect sources include emissions from electricity consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation.

The Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure. The Project would not require extensive construction activities as it plans to utilize over 90 percent of the existing on-site materials. The Project would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing quantifiable GHG emissions. Additionally, the restoration Project would not result in additional operational vehicle trips or mobile source emissions or an increased amount of indirect emissions. As described in Section 2.3, *Project Characteristics*, the Project would be

---

<sup>8</sup> Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, 2008.



designed to create heating and cooling zones, and low energy lighting, which would in turn reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that could adversely affect the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

**4.7.b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions apply to the Project area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHGs. Also, the Project would result not in substantial construction-related or operational GHG emissions. The Project would not hinder the State's GHG reduction goals established by AB 32; therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.8 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			✓	
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?			✓	
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
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?				✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓
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?				✓

**4.8.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Further, the Project would not involve handling hazardous materials or the generation of hazardous emissions. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment in this regard.

**4.8.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project involves reconstruction of a residence that is entirely surrounded by other residential uses. Given the historic and present uses of the site, as well as the surrounding land uses, Project implementation would not 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. Refer to Response 4.3.d for a discussion of potential impacts involving the use of Vikane Gas Fumigant.

**4.8.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** The Project involves reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Moreover, the Project site is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. The nearest school to the Project site is the Horace Mann Childhood Development Center and Mann Elementary School, located approximately 0.3-mile northeast of the Project site. Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

**4.8.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

**4.8.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?**

**No Impact.** In compliance with legislative requirements, the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) prepared the Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) (Revised December 1, 2004). The ALUP provides for the orderly expansion of Los Angeles County's public use airports and the areas surrounding them. It is also intended to provide for the adoption of land use measures that will minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards. In formulating the ALUP, the Los Angeles County ALUC established provisions for safety, noise insulation, and the regulation of building height within areas adjacent to each of the County's public airports.

The ALUC adopted planning boundaries for each of the public use airports in Los Angeles County. The planning boundaries delineate areas subject to noise impacts and safety hazards (height restriction areas and approach surface and runway protection zones [RPZ]). Within these boundaries, certain proposed local actions must be submitted to the ALUC for review. The airport influence area maps illustrate the planning boundaries, RPZs, and 65 and 70 CNEL noise contours.

The nearest public airport (Long Beach Municipal Airport) is located approximately 2.5-mile north of the Project area. According to the *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*,<sup>9</sup> the Project site is situated outside of the Long Beach Airport Planning Area Boundary/Airport

---

<sup>9</sup> County of Los Angeles Website, Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-long-beach.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-long-beach.pdf), Accessed January 22, 2013.



Influence Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working at the Project site.

**4.8.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or related facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in an airstrip-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area?

**4.8.g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**No Impact.** The City's *Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan* (October 2004) includes resources and information to assist residents and others interested in participating in planning for natural hazards. The plan provides a list of activities that may assist the City in reducing risk and preventing loss from future natural hazard events. The plan addresses multi-hazard issues, earthquakes, flooding, earth movement, windstorms, and tsunamis. The Project is not anticipated to result in any roadway closures or interfere with emergency response or evacuation to and from the area. Additionally, all proposed improvements would occur within the limits of the Project site.

**4.8.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is located within an urban area and not adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.9 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			✓	
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)?			✓	
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			✓	
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?			✓	
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			✓	
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			✓	
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?				✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
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?			✓	
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓

### 4.9.a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Impacts related to water quality range over three different periods:

- During the earthwork and construction phase, when the potential for erosion, siltation, and sedimentation would be the greatest;
- Following construction, before the establishment of ground cover, when the erosion potential may remain relatively high; and
- Following completion of the Project, when impacts related to sedimentation would decrease markedly, but those associated with urban runoff would increase.



A reduction of permeable surfaces would be considered a water quality impact, as permeable surfaces allow for rain and runoff to infiltrate into the ground. Infiltration both reduces the amount of flow that is capable of washing off additional pollutants and filter water removing potential pollutants. These changes have the potential to affect long-term water quality.

The Project proposes to reconstruct a single-family residence and garage. The Project involves land-disturbing activity on an already developed site that results in the replacement of approximately 5,156 square feet of impervious surface area, which would have a footprint identical to that of previous lot improvements. Project implementation would not result in a reduction of permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Thus, the water quality issues of concern would involve stormwater and nuisance water runoff associated with construction and operation of the single-family residence.

### **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System**

As part of Clean Water Act § 402, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) promulgated regulations under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges for construction activities disturbing one acre or more of land. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, which include construction activities. The SWRCB works in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) to preserve, protect, enhance, and restore water quality. The City is within the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles RWQCB (LARWQCB).

### **Short-Term Construction**

NPDES. Dischargers whose projects disturb one or more acres of soil or whose projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity Construction General Permit Order 2009-0009-DWQ.<sup>10</sup> The Project would disturb less than projects disturb one acre of soil, thus, is not subject to compliance with the General Construction Permit requirements.

Municipal Code Requirements. The purpose of Municipal Code Chapter 18.61, *NPDES and SUSMP Regulations*, is to provide regulations and give legal effect to certain requirements of the NPDES permit issued to the City of Long Beach, and the subsequent requirements of the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), mandated by the LARWQCB. The intent of these regulations is to effectively prohibit nonstorm water discharges into the storm drain systems or watercourses and to require controls to reduce the discharge of pollutants into the storm water to the maximum extent practicable.

According to Municipal Code Section 18.61.050, *Development Construction*, prior to issuance of any building or grading permit for any project, the construction plans shall include features meeting the construction activities BMPs (CA-10 through CA-12, CA-20, CA-21 and CA-23, and CA-30 through CA-32) and the applicable provisions of the erosion and sediment control BMPs

---

<sup>10</sup> State of California Water Quality Control Board Website, [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml), Accessed January 22, 2013.



(ESC-1 through ESC-56) published in the “California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks (Construction Activity) (1993),” and BMP (CD-4(2)) of the “Caltrans Storm Water Quality Handbooks, Construction Contractor’s Guide and Specifications (1997),” to ensure that every construction site meets the requirement of these regulations during the time of construction. The project’s construction activities must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements, which would reduce the Project’s construction-related impacts to water quality to less than significant.

### **Long-Term Operations**

NPDES. The Municipal Storm Water Permitting Program regulates storm water discharges from municipal separate storm sewer (drain) systems (MS4s). These permits are issued to a group of co-permittees encompassing an entire metropolitan area or to a single permittee (such as the City of Long Beach). The MS4 permits require the discharger to develop and implement a Storm Water Management Plan/Program with the goal of reducing the discharge of pollutants to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MEP is the performance standard specified in Clean Water Act Section 402(p). The management programs specify what BMPs must be used to address certain program areas. The program areas include public education and outreach; illicit discharge detection and elimination; construction and post-construction; and good housekeeping for municipal operations.

The City of Long Beach (or Permittee) discharges or contributes to discharges of storm water and urban runoff from municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), also called storm drain systems, into receiving waters of the Los Angeles Basin. On March 22, 1999, the Permittee submitted a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) as an application for issuance of waste discharge requirements and a NPDES Permit. Municipal storm water discharges from the Permittee’s storm drain systems are regulated under waste discharge requirements contained in Order No. 99-060<sup>11</sup> (NPDES Permit No. CAS004003 (CI 8052), *Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Storm Water and Urban Runoff Discharges Within City of Long Beach*), which was adopted June 30, 1999. The MS4 Permit Order provides the waste discharge requirements for MS4 discharges within the City’s watershed.

The ROWD includes the Long Beach Storm Water Management Program (LBSWMP) (among other components). The LBSWMP consists of several distinct elements, including the Program Management element and Development Planning/Construction Program element, among others. The MS4 Permit Order requires that the LBSWMP be implemented to reduce the discharges of pollutants in storm water to the MEP. The MS4 Permit Order also specifies that the Permittee (City) must require that Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMP) be prepared for various types of projects including home subdivisions of 10 to 99 units or greater. The Project involves one residential unit, thus, would not require preparation of a SUSMP.

Municipal Code Requirements. The Project is subject to compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74, *Low Impact Development Standards*, which addresses water quality by requiring the use of low impact development (LID) standards in the planning and construction of development projects. LID standards improve the quality of receiving waters, protect the Los

---

<sup>11</sup> City of Long Beach Website, <http://www.longbeach.gov/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=27766>, Accessed January 23, 2013.



Angeles and San Gabriel River watersheds, maintain natural drainage paths, and protect potable water supplies within the City. The LID objective of controlling and maintaining flow rate is addressed through land development and storm water management techniques that imitate the natural hydrology (or movement of water) found on the site. Using site design and best management practices that allow for storage and retention, infiltration, filtering, and flowrate adjustments achieve the goals of LID, advances sustainability and reduces the overall cost of storm water management. The use of engineered systems, structural devices, and vegetated natural designs distributes storm water and urban runoff across a development site maximizing the effectiveness of LID.

The provisions of Municipal Code Section 18.74.030, *LID Requirements and Applicability*, set forth the requirements for and apply to all new Development and Redevelopment projects in the City. Section 18.74.030.B, *LID Requirements for New Development or Redevelopment Projects*, specifies the following regarding residential developments of four units or less:

*For new development less than 1 acre, or if redevelopment alters at least fifty percent (50%) or more of the impervious surfaces of an existing developed site, comply with the standards and requirements of this Chapter and implement at least two (2) adequately sized LID BMP alternatives from the LID Best Management Practices Manual.*

Compliance with the LID standards of Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 shall be demonstrated through a LID plan review. The Permit Applicant is required to submit an LID plan for review to the Department of Development Services. The LID plan shall demonstrate how the Project will meet the standards and requirements of Chapter 18.74 and of the LID Best Management Practices Manual; refer to Municipal Code Section 18.74.040, *LID Plan Review*.

Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual.<sup>12</sup> According to the LID BMP Design Manual, small scale residential development projects (4 units and less) include all projects that add or replace impervious area by 500 square feet or more. The majority of these projects are not required to complete formal hydrologic analysis. According to the Design Manual, redevelopment less than 1.0 acre is required to implement adequately-sized LID BMP alternatives. The following LID BMPs have been established as prescriptive LID improvement features to be employed on a qualifying small-scale project. Applicants may choose from two or more of the prescriptive BMPs to comply with the ordinance. Any remaining runoff that cannot feasibly be managed onsite must be mitigated by paying an offsite runoff mitigation fee in the manner and amount set forth in the schedule of fees and charges established by City Council resolution pursuant to Municipal Code Section 18.74.050.B. The prescriptive small scale BMPs are:

1. Rain Barrels & Small Cisterns;
2. Permeable Pavements (or Porous Pavement Systems);
3. Planter Boxes;
4. Rain Gardens;
5. Dry Wells; and
6. Tree Planting.

---

<sup>12</sup> City of Long Beach Website, Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual, <http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3855>, Accessed March 20, 2013.



Overall, the Project must meet the requirements of the MS4 Permit Order issued by the LARWQCB for the City of Long Beach, LBSWMP, and Municipal Code Chapter 18.74, which includes the LID BMP Design Manual requirements. Compliance with this established regulatory framework would reduce the Project's long-term impacts to water quality to less than significant levels.

**4.9.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)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As concluded in Response 4.17.b, Project implementation would generate a nominal increase in water demand. Therefore, Project implementation would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. Additionally, the Project would not interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, since it is not located within a groundwater recharge area. Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving groundwater supplies.

**4.9.c. *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Project implementation would not reduce the onsite permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Additionally, compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements that specify BMPs, would minimize erosion/siltation and ensure less than significant impacts to water quality; refer also to Response 4.9.a above. Therefore, Project implementation would not substantially alter the site's drainage pattern, or the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

**4.9.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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City's storm water collection system includes catch basins, drainage basins, pumping stations, and force mains. The drainage areas where the Project site is located are collected by the City's drainage systems that connect to local pump stations.

As concluded in Response 4.9.a above, Project implementation would not reduce the permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Moreover, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residential use that was a contributing source of storm water in the area. Thus, Project implementation would not create or contribute runoff water which would result in flooding on- or off-site or exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.



- 4.9.e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 4.9.a and 4.9.d.

- 4.9.f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.9.a.

- 4.9.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?**

**No Impact.** Flood hazard areas identified on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) are identified as a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). A Special Flood Hazard Area is defined as the area that will be inundated by the flood event having a one (1) percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. The one-percent annual chance flood is also referred to as the base flood or 100-year flood.

The Project site is located in Zone X (unshaded), according to the City of Long Beach Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Zones Map (September 26, 2008).<sup>13</sup> Zone X (unshaded) is an area of minimal flood hazard. It includes the areas located outside the Special Flood Hazard Area and higher than the elevation of the 0.2-percent-annual-chance (or 500-year) flood. The Project site is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not place housing or other structures within a Special Flood Hazard Area.

- 4.9.h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.9.g.

- 4.9.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is not located within the inundation area of a levee or dam, or the City's coastal areas that are subject to coastal storm surges. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding associated with the failure of a levee or dam.

---

<sup>13</sup> City of Long Beach Website, <http://www.longbeach.gov/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=23152>, Accessed January 23, 2013.



**4.9.j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**No Impact.** A seiche is an earthquake or slide-induced wave that can be generated in an enclosed body of water of any size from swimming pool, to a harbor, or lake. There is no enclosed body of water that is located in the vicinity of the Project site.

A tsunami is a sea wave generated by an earthquake, landslide, volcanic eruption, or even by a large meteor hitting the ocean. An event such as an earthquake creates a large displacement of water resulting in a rise or mounding at the ocean surface that moves away from this center as a sea wave. Tsunamis generally affect coastal communities and low-lying (low-elevation) river valleys in the vicinity of the coast. Buildings closest to the ocean and near sea level are most at jeopardy. According to the California Geological Survey Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps,<sup>14</sup> the Project site is not located within a tsunami inundation area.

Potential risk from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) does not exist within the Project area, as steep slopes are not located on or in proximity to the Project site.

Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential hazards from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

---

<sup>14</sup> State of California, Department of Conservation, Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps, [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami_maps.htm), Accessed January 23, 2013.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.10 LAND USE AND PLANNING

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
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?			✓	
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓

### 4.10.a. *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** Due to the built-out nature of the surrounding area, and since all proposed improvements would occur within the property limits, Project implementation would not physically divide an established community.

### 4.10.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?*

#### **Less Than Significant Impact.**

#### **Long Beach General Plan**

The Project site is designated Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District. The General Plan Land Use Element (April 1997) describes this district as follows:

*This land use district recognizes that there are large areas of the City with a mixture of low density housing types, such as single-family homes, duplexes.....*

*The purpose of this district, then, is to maintain the present situation, not to attempt to convert the areas to a single-family density, or to permit the areas to advance in density to that of the densest housing prevalent in the districts.....*

The Project proposes restoration/reconstruction of the partially demolished single-family residence that exists on the property. The Project would “maintain the present situation” and existing density, thus, would comply with the General Plan’s intended use for the LUD 2, Mixed Style Homes District.



The Project site is also located within the Bluff Park Neighborhood, which is defined largely by the Historic District it encompasses (Bluff Park Historic District). The relevant neighborhood policies are summarized below.

- Land Use: This distinct Historic District should retain its single-family home profile.
- Design Controls/Architectural Compatibility: Architectural controls are necessary and must be retained. This will be assured by the Cultural Heritage Commission, which has design approval authority in this district.

The Project proposes restoration/reconstruction of the partially demolished single-family residence that exists on the property, thereby retaining the District's single-family home profile. Additionally, as discussed in the Municipal Code Chapter 2.63, *Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance Section*, which follows, the Cultural Heritage Commission would review the design of the proposed restoration/reconstruction. Review by the Cultural Heritage Commission would ensure for architectural compatibility with the District. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the relevant Bluff Park Neighborhood policies and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

### **Long Beach Municipal Code**

Municipal Code Chapter 2.63, *Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance*. The Cultural Heritage Commission Ordinance is the primary tool used to protect historic resources in Long Beach. The Ordinance was adopted to protect, enhance, and perpetuate areas, districts, buildings, and other structures, which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past. In general, the Cultural Heritage Ordinance provides for the establishment of a Cultural Heritage Commission and establishes procedures for reviewing proposed work on designated landmarks or properties within landmark districts (Certificate of Appropriateness).

The Project site is located within the Bluff Park Historic District, one of Long Beach's 17 designated historic districts. According to Municipal Code Section 2.63.070, no person owning, renting or occupying property which is situated in a designated landmark district, shall make any environmental change to such property unless a certificate of appropriateness has been issued authorizing such environmental change. The Cultural Heritage Commission is responsible for considering and issuing the Certificates of Appropriateness. The Cultural Heritage Commission would review the proposed restoration/reconstruction and issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Certificate would be issued only if it is determined that the proposed change (Municipal Code Section 2.63.040.B):

- Will not adversely affect any significant historical, cultural, architectural or aesthetic feature of the concerned property or of the landmark district in which it is located and that issuance of the Certificate is consistent with the spirit and intent of Chapter 2.63;
- The proposed change is consistent with or compatible with the architectural period of the building; and
- The proposed change is compatible in architectural style with existing adjacent contributing structures in a historic landmark district.



Municipal Code Chapter 21.31, Residential Districts. The Project site is zoned Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District. According to Municipal Code Section 21.31.020.J, the R-2-L District is a two-family residential district with large lots. Municipal Code Table 31-1 indicates all uses permitted within the R-2-L District and indicates the proposed single-family residence is a permitted use. Additionally, Municipal Code Table 31-2A outlines the R-2-L District residential development standards, which regulate land use compatibility factors pertaining to the following:

- Units Per Lot;
- Lot Area Per Unit;
- Minimum Lot Area;
- Minimum Lot Width;
- Minimum Yard Setbacks;
- Maximum Height;
- Maximum Lot Coverage; and
- Minimum Usable Open Space.

The Project must comply with the development standards established for the R-2-L District and any other relevant standards for residential uses.

Municipal Code Chapter 16.52, Public Facilities and Historic Landmarks. The City's designated historic landmarks are listed in this Chapter; the residence that exists on the Project site, and the Bluff Park Historic District where the site is located, are not designated landmarks.

Compliance with the residential development standards, which will be verified through the City's discretionary review process, and review by the Cultural Heritage Commission, would ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and the overall Bluff Park Historic District. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the Municipal Code and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**4.10.c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within the jurisdiction of a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan; refer also to Response 4.4.f. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.11 MINERAL RESOURCES

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				✓
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?				✓

**4.11.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?**

**No Impact.** No known mineral resources occur in the Project area. According to the City's *General Plan*, although oil extraction operations occur in the City, no such facilities exist near the Project area. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value.

**4.11.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?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.11.a.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.12 NOISE

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			✓	
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			✓	
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?				✓
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?				✓

### REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Noise is generally defined as unwanted or excessive sound, which can vary in intensity by over one million times within the range of human hearing; therefore, a logarithmic scale, known as the decibel scale (dB), is used to quantify sound intensity. Noise can be generated by a number of sources, including mobile sources such as automobiles, trucks, and airplanes, and stationary sources such as construction sites, machinery, and industrial operations.

Two of the primary factors that reduce levels of environmental sounds are increasing the distance between the sound source to the receiver and having intervening obstacles such as walls, buildings, or terrain features between the sound source and the receiver. Factors that act to increase the loudness of environmental sounds include moving the sound source closer to the receiver, sound enhancements caused by reflections, and focusing caused by various meteorological conditions.

#### State of California

The State Office of Planning and Research *Noise Element Guidelines* include recommended exterior and interior noise level standards for local jurisdictions to identify and prevent the creation of incompatible land uses due to noise. The *Noise Element Guidelines* contain a land use compatibility table that describes the compatibility of various land uses with a range of environmental noise levels in terms of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). A noise environment of 50 CNEL to 60 CNEL is considered to be of “normally acceptable” for residential uses. The Office of Planning and Research recommendations also note that, under certain conditions, more restrictive standards than the maximum levels cited may be appropriate. As



an example, the standards for quiet suburban and rural communities may be reduced by 5 dBA CNEL to 10 dBA CNEL to reflect their lower existing outdoor noise levels in comparison with urban environments.

### City of Long Beach

Municipal Code Chapter 8.80, *Noise*, sets forth all noise regulations controlling unnecessary, excessive, and annoying noise and vibration in the City. As outlined in Municipal Code Chapter 8.80.150 and as indicated in Table 4.12-1, *Exterior Noise Limits*, maximum exterior noise levels are based on land use districts. Municipal Code Chapter 8.80 states the following:

- A. *The noise standards for the various land use districts identified by the noise control office as presented in Table A in Section 8.80.160 (Table 4.12-1) shall, unless otherwise specifically indicated, apply to all such property within a designated district.*
- B. *No person shall operate or cause to be operated any source of sound at any location within the incorporated limits of the city or allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied, or otherwise controlled by such person, which causes the noise level when measured from any other property, either incorporated or unincorporated, to exceed:*
  - 1. *The noise standard for that land use district as specified in Table A in Section 8.80.160 (Table 4.12-1) for a cumulative period of more than thirty minutes in any hour; or*
  - 2. *The noise standard plus five decibels for a cumulative period of more than fifteen minutes in any hour; or*
  - 3. *The noise standard plus ten decibels for a cumulative period of more than five minutes in any hour; or*
  - 4. *The noise standard plus fifteen decibels for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or*
  - 5. *The noise standard plus twenty decibels or the maximum measured ambient, for any period of time.*
- C. *If the measured ambient level exceeds that permissible within any of the first four noise limit categories in subsection B of this section, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased in five decibels increments in each category as appropriate to encompass or reflect the ambient noise level. In the event the ambient noise level exceeds the fifth noise limit category in subsection B of this section, the maximum allowable noise level under said category shall be increased to reflect the maximum ambient noise level.*



**Table 4.12-1  
Exterior Noise Standards**

Receiving Land Use District	Noise Level	Time Period
1 – Residential	50 db(A)	7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
	45 db(A)	10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.
2 – Commercial Properties	60 db(A)	7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
	55 db(A)	10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.
3 – Industrial Properties	65 db(A)	Any time
4 – Industrial Properties	70 db(A)	Any time
Source: City of Long Beach, <i>Municipal Code Chapter 8.80, Noise</i> , April 2009.		

Additionally, Municipal Code Chapter 8.80.170 states the following regarding interior noise standards:

- A. *The interior noise standards for various land use districts as presented in table C (Table 4.12-2, Interior Noise Standards) shall apply, unless otherwise specifically indicated, within structures located in designated zones with windows in their normal seasonal configuration.*
- B. *No person shall operate, or cause to be operated, any source of sound indoors at any location within the incorporated limits of the city or allow the creation of any indoor noise which causes the noise level when measured inside the receiving dwelling unit to exceed:*
  1. *The noise standard for that land use district as specified in table C (Table 4.12-2) for a cumulative period of more than five (5) minutes in any hour; or*
  2. *The noise standard plus five decibels (5 dB) for a cumulative period of more than one minute in any hour; or*
  2. *The noise standard plus ten decibels (10 dB) or the maximum measured ambient, for any period of time.*
- C. *If the measured indoor ambient level exceeds that permissible within any of the first two (2) noise limit categories in this section, the allowable noise exposure standard shall be increased in five decibel (5 dB) increments in each category as appropriate to reflect the indoor ambient noise level. In the event the indoor ambient noise level exceeds the third noise limit category, the maximum allowable indoor noise level under said category shall be increased to reflect the maximum indoor ambient noise level.*



**Table 4.12-2  
Interior Noise Standards**

Land Use District	Noise Level	Time Period
All – residential	45 db(A)	7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
	35 db(A)	10:00 p.m. – 7:00 a.m.
All – school	45 db(A)	7:00 a.m. – 10:00 p.m.
Hospital, designated quiet zones, and noise sensitive areas	40 db(A)	Any time
Source: City of Long Beach, <i>Municipal Code Chapter 8.80, Noise</i> , April 2009.		

In addition, the City provides exemptions of the noise standards for domestic power tools, air conditioning or air refrigerating equipment, and refuse collection vehicles, among other sources.

**4.12.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

**Short-Term Noise Impacts**

The Project proposes restoration/reconstruction of the existing residential structure. The Project would not require extensive construction activities as it plans to utilize over 90 percent of the existing on-site materials. As described in Section 2.3, Project Characteristics, existing building features such as the foundation, driveway, walkways, garage, and front porch would be retained and reused, while features such as the roof, windows, utility lines, fencing, and doors would be repaired and reused. The proposed restoration/reconstruction would take place during daytime hours, and would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing excessive noise. Therefore, Project construction would not exceed the City's noise standards as established in Municipal Code Chapter 8.80. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

**Long-Term Stationary Noise Impacts**

The Project would not involve any sources of substantial mobile or stationary noise (i.e., pumps, generators, etc.), as the Project would restore an existing residential structure. Upon Project completion, noise in the Project area would be similar to existing conditions. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

**4.12.b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction can generate varying degrees of groundborne vibration, depending on the construction procedure and the construction equipment used. The Project would not require the use of heavy equipment capable of producing groundborne vibration. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.



**4.12.c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.12.a.

**4.12.d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.12.a.

**4.12.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?**

**No Impact.** As concluded in Response 4.8.e, Long Beach Municipal Airport is located approximately 2.5-mile north of the Project area. According to the *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, the Project site is situated outside of the Long Beach Airport Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

**4.12.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or related facilities. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airstrip-related noise levels.



This page intentionally left blank.



### 4.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?			✓	
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓

**4.13.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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** A project could induce population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure). The Project involves reconstruction of one single-family residence. Based on an average household size of 2.786,<sup>15</sup> Project implementation could result in a population increase of approximately three (3) persons. The potential population growth would be nominal, representing less than one-tenth of one percent increase over the City’s existing 2012 population of 464,662 persons.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, Project implementation would not induce substantial population growth in the City.

**4.13.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The Project involves reconstruction of one partially demolished single-family residence. The Project would not displace existing housing, thus, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

**4.13.c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The existing residence is partially demolished, thus, is vacant. Therefore, the Project would not displace persons or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

<sup>15</sup> State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011 and 2012, with 2010 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2012.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.14 PUBLIC SERVICES

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
1) Fire protection?			✓	
2) Police protection?			✓	
3) Schools?			✓	
4) Parks?			✓	
5) Other public facilities?			✓	

**4.14.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:***

**4.14.a.1. *Fire protection?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Long Beach Fire Department (LBFD) provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the City. The nearest fire station to the Project site is Fire Station 2 located at 1645 East 3rd Street, approximately one mile northwest of the Project site.

The Project does not propose new or physically altered fire protection facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for fire protection services. Additionally, because the Project proposes infill redevelopment that is similar to the existing uses, the Project would not increase LBFD response times to the Project site or surroundings, or require construction of new or physically altered fire protection facilities. The Project's design must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.48, *Fire Code*, which would further minimize potential impacts involving fire protection. The Project would result in a less than significant impact involving fire protection services. It is noted, alterations or expansion of an existing residential building where no additional dwelling units are created and where the use is not changed, such as are proposed by the Project, are exempted from payment of the City's Fire Facilities Impact Fee; refer to Municipal Code Section 18.23.110.



#### **4.14.a.2. Police protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Long Beach Police Department (LBPD) provides police protection services to the City from their headquarters located at 400 West Broadway, approximately three miles west of the Project site. The Project does not propose new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for police protection services. Additionally, because the Project proposes infill redevelopment that is similar to the existing uses, the Project would not increase LBPD response times to the Project site or surroundings, or require construction of new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project would result in a less than significant impact involving fire protection services. It is noted, alterations or expansion of an existing residential building where no additional dwelling units are created and where the use is not changed, such as are proposed by the Project, are exempted from payment of the City's Police Facilities Impact Fee; refer to Municipal Code Section 18.22.110.

#### **4.14.a.3. Schools?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is situated within the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD) (grades K thru 12). The Project site is located in the Mann Elementary School, Jefferson Middle School, and Wilson High School service areas.<sup>17</sup>

The Project does not propose new or physically altered school facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in LBUSD's student population. As a result, it is anticipated that the LBUSD schools would have the capacity to accommodate these students and construction of new or physically altered school facilities would not be required.

Assembly Bill 2926 (AB 2926) passed in 1986 allows school districts to collect impact fees from developers of new residential and commercial/industrial building space. Senate Bill 50 (SB 50) and Proposition 1A, both of which passed in 1998, provided a comprehensive school facilities financing and reform program. The provisions of SB 50 prohibit local agencies from denying either legislative or adjudicative land use approvals on the basis that school facilities are inadequate, and reinstates the school facility fee cap for legislative actions (e.g., General Plan amendments, specific plan adoption, zoning plan amendments). According to Government Code Section 65996, the development fees authorized by SB 50 are deemed to be "full and complete school facilities mitigation."

The LBUSD collects from developers \$3.20 per square foot of residential additions 500 square feet or greater.<sup>18</sup> However, the Project proposes reconstruction/renovation of a single-family residence, thus, would be exempt from payment of this development fee. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact to LBUSD school facilities.

---

<sup>17</sup> Long Beach Unified School District Website, School Locator, <http://www2.lbusd.k12.ca.us/scripts/streets.idc>, Accessed January 25, 2013.

<sup>18</sup> Long Beach Unified School District Website, Business Services, [http://www.lbschools.net/Main\\_Offices/Business\\_Services/facility\\_developer\\_fees.cfm](http://www.lbschools.net/Main_Offices/Business_Services/facility_developer_fees.cfm), Accessed January 25, 2013.



#### **4.14.a.4. Parks?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not propose new or physically altered park or recreational facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for parkland and usage of existing parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur regarding parkland demand, and usage of existing parks and recreational facilities.

It is noted, replacement of an existing legal dwelling unit on the same lot, such as is proposed by the Project, is exempt from payment of the City's Park and Recreation Facilities Fee; refer to Municipal Code Section 18.18.120.

#### **4.14.a.5. Other public facilities?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not propose new or physically altered public facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for the City's public facilities.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.15 RECREATION

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	
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?			✓	

**4.15.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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.14.a.4.

**4.15.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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.14.a.4.



This page intentionally left blank.



## 4.16 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			✓	
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?			✓	
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?				✓
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				✓
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
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.				✓

**4.16.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in nominal increases in traffic volumes and usage of alternative modes of transportation (mass transit, bicycle, and pedestrian). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the City’s General Plan regarding the circulation system and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**4.16.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires evaluation of projects generating 50 or more AM or PM weekday peak hour trips



at a CMP-monitored intersection. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in traffic volumes, thus, would not add 50 or more trips, during either the AM or PM peak hour, at any CMP-monitored intersection. Therefore, no further CMP traffic analysis is warranted and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**4.16.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?**

**No Impact.** The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which due to its nature and scope, would not Result in a change in air traffic patterns.

**4.16.d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No Impact.** No roadway or intersection improvements are proposed. The Project proposes to reconstruct a partially demolished single-family residence within a fully developed residential neighborhood. Therefore, Project implementation would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.

**4.16.e. Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**No Impact.** Refer to Response 4.8.g.

**4.16.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.16.a.



## 4.17 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			✓	
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?			✓	
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?			✓	
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			✓	
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?			✓	
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			✓	
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			✓	

### **4.17.a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As concluded in Response 4.17.b below, the Project would nominally increase the site's wastewater generation, with a resultant increase in the demand for wastewater treatment. The Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation. General Plans are used by the RWQCB when issuing NPDES permits. Therefore, it is not anticipated that Project implementation would cause an exceedance of the wastewater treatment requirements.

### **4.17.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.**

#### **Water**

**Water Demand.** The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in water demand. The increase in water demand is not considered substantial, since the Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for evaluating a service area's future water demands.



Water Treatment. As concluded above, the Project would result in a negligible increase in water demand, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing water treatment facilities. Therefore, Project implementation would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Water Conveyance. The Project would result in a negligible increase in water demand, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing water conveyance facilities. The Applicant would be responsible for construction of all water conveyance facilities pursuant to current Uniform Codes, City Ordinances, and Public Works standards. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of new water conveyance facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

## **Wastewater**

Wastewater Generation. Project implementation would result in a negligible increase in wastewater generation, which would place an incremental increase in the demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities. The Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for issuance of the County Sanitation's NPDES wastewater discharge permits; refer also to the *Wastewater Treatment* Section below.

Wastewater Conveyance. The Project would result in a negligible increase in wastewater generation, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing wastewater conveyance facilities. The Applicant would be responsible for construction of all wastewater conveyance facilities pursuant to current Uniform Codes, City Ordinances, and Public Works standards. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of new wastewater conveyance facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Wastewater Treatment. The Project's increase in wastewater generation is not considered substantial, since the Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for issuance of the NPDES wastewater discharge permits. Project implementation would not cause the treatment plant's operating capacities to be exceeded. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**4.17.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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Responses 4.9.c and 4.9.e.

**4.17.d. *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not satisfy the criteria pursuant to Senate Bills 610 or 221 for preparation of a Water Supply Assessment. Moreover, as concluded above, the Project would result in a negligible increase in the demand for water, as concluded in



Response 4.17.b above. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements are not needed.

**4.17.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?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Response 4.17.b.

**4.17.f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project would result in a negligible increase in solid waste generation, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on landfills' capacity. The Project's solid waste disposal needs would be accommodated within permitted capacities.

**4.17.g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Participation in the City's recycling programs would ensure that the Project would not conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard. Refer also to Response 4.17.f.



This page intentionally left blank.



### 4.18 MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<i>Would the Project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	✓			
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)?			✓	
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		✓		

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

**Potentially Significant Impact.** As concluded in Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*, the Project site and its surroundings are fully developed and there are no biological resources present in the area. Therefore, the Project does not 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.

As concluded in Response 4.5.a, further analysis will be conducted as part of the Project EIR to analyze the previous actions' impact upon the individual residence and Historic District, and the Project's potential impact on the Historic District. The EIR analysis will also determine whether the existing residence represents an important example of a major period of California history.

As concluded in Response 4.5.b, the Project site is developed with a single-family residence and has already been subject to extensive disruption. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for Project implementation to impact an as yet unidentified archeological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory.



**4.18.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)?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** For the environmental issue areas analyzed in this Initial Study, there would be no impact that would be individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** As concluded in the previous discussions, the Project would result in less than significant environmental impacts. Therefore, the Project would cause less than significant adverse effects on human beings.



## 5.0 REFERENCES

### 5.1 ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION PERSONNEL

#### LEAD AGENCY/PROJECT SPONSOR:

**City of Long Beach**  
333 West Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, CA 90802

#### Contacts:

*Ms. Jill Griffiths, AICP, Planning Officer*  
*Mr. Steve Gerhardt, AICP, Senior Planner*  
*Mr. Mark Hungerford, Planner III*

#### CONSULTANT:

**RBF Consulting**  
14725 Alton Parkway  
Irvine, CA 92618

*Mr. Glenn Lajoie, AICP, Vice President of Environmental Services*  
*Ms. Rita Garcia, Senior Project Manager*  
*Ms. Linda Bo, Document Preparation/Graphic Artist*

#### **Galvin Preservation Associates**

231 California Street  
El Segundo, CA 90245

*Ms. Andrea Galvin, President, Architectural Historian*  
*Mr. Matt Weintraub, Architectural Historian*

### 5.2 REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, *CEQA and Climate Change*, January 2008.

California Energy Commission, *Inventory of California Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990 to 2004*, 2006.

California Department of Transportation Website, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/), Accessed January 22, 2013.

City of Long Beach, *City of Long Beach General Plan*, 1973-2009.

City of Long Beach, *City of Long Beach Municipal Code and Development Code*, enacted April 20, 2010.



City of Long Beach Website, <http://www.longbeach.gov/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=27766>, Accessed January 23, 2013.

City of Long Beach Website, Low Impact Development (LID) Best Management Practices (BMP) Design Manual, <http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=3855>, Accessed March 20, 2013.

County of Los Angeles Website, Department of Regional Planning, Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission, *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc\\_airport-long-beach.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/project/aluc_airport-long-beach.pdf), Accessed January 22, 2013.

Fluoride Action Network Website, <http://www.fluoridealert.org/pesticides/sulfuryl.f.vikane.epa.htm>, Accessed January 22, 2013.

Governor's Office of Planning and Research, *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*, 2008.

Los Angeles County Office of the Assessor, <http://maps.assessor.lacounty.gov/mapping/viewer.asp>, Accessed January 22, 2013.

State of California, Department of Conservation, Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps, [http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami\\_maps.htm](http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/tsunami/tsunami_maps.htm), Accessed January 23, 2013.

State of California, Department of Finance, *E-5 Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State, 2011 and 2012, with 2010 Benchmark*. Sacramento, California, May 2012.

State of California Water Quality Control Board Website, [http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml](http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/stormwater/construction.shtml), Accessed January 22, 2013.

State of California Website, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, *Regional Geologic & Hazards Mapping Program - Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act*, [http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/preliminary\\_maps.aspx](http://www.consrv.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/preliminary_maps.aspx), Accessed January 22, 2013.

State of California Website, Department of Conservation California Geological Survey, *State of California Seismic Hazard Zones*, Long Beach Quadrangle, Official Map, Released March 25, 1999.





EDMUND G. BROWN JR.  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE of PLANNING AND RESEARCH  
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



KEN ALEX  
DIRECTOR

Notice of Preparation

April 2, 2013

To: Reviewing Agencies  
Re: 2810 East 1st Street Project  
SCH# 2013041004

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the 2810 East 1st Street Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Steve Gerhardt  
City of Long Beach  
333 W. Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, CA 92802

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan  
Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments  
cc: Lead Agency

**Document Details Report  
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

**SCH#** 2013041004  
**Project Title** 2810 East 1st Street Project  
**Lead Agency** Long Beach, City of

---

**Type** NOP Notice of Preparation  
**Description** The Applicant proposes to restore the existing structure, using over 90 percent of the onsite materials. The proposal involves the use of 100 percent of the existing foundation and over 80 percent of the existing framing. Missing doors and windows would be replaced with circa 1920s. The project proposes various structural, interior, exterior, hardscape/landscape/fencing, driveway/walkways, and utility improvements to the property. Project construction would occur in one phase over a 12-month period, beginning Summer 2013 and ending Summer 2014. The Applicant requests approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Cultural Heritage Commission (or Planning Commission, upon appeal).

---

**Lead Agency Contact**

**Name** Steve Gerhardt  
**Agency** City of Long Beach  
**Phone** 562 570 6288 **Fax**  
**email**  
**Address** 333 W. Ocean Boulevard  
**City** Long Beach **State** CA **Zip** 92802

---

**Project Location**

**County** Los Angeles  
**City** Long Beach  
**Region**  
**Cross Streets** 1st Street between Temple and Orizaba Avenues  
**Lat / Long** 33° 45' 48.2472" N / 118° 9' 32.4684" W  
**Parcel No.** 7264-017-003  
**Township** 5S **Range** 12W **Section** 5 **Base** SBB&M

---

**Proximity to:**

**Highways** I-710  
**Airports**  
**Railways**  
**Waterways** Pacific Ocean  
**Schools** Multi (Long Beach USD)  
**Land Use** PLU: Single Family Residence (partially demolished)  
GPD: Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District  
Z: Two-Family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District

---

**Project Issues** Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Economics/Jobs; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Other Issues

---

**Reviewing Agencies** Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4

---

**Date Received** 04/02/2013 **Start of Review** 04/02/2013 **End of Review** 05/01/2013

Resources Agency

Resources Agency  
Nadell Gayou

Dept. of Boating & Waterways  
Nicole Wong

California Coastal Commission  
Elizabeth A. Fuchs

Colorado River Board  
Gerald R. Zimmerman

Dept. of Conservation  
Elizabeth Carpenter

California Energy Commission  
Eric Knight

Cal Fire  
Dan Foster

Central Valley Flood Protection Board  
James Herola

Office of Historic Preservation  
Ron Parsons

Dept of Parks & Recreation Environmental Stewardship Section

California Department of Resources, Recycling & Recovery  
Sue O'Leary

S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm.  
Steve McAdam

Dept. of Water Resources Agency  
Nadell Gayou

Fish and Game

Dept. of Fish & Wildlife  
Scott Flint

Environmental Services Division  
Donald Koch

Fish & Wildlife Region 1  
Donald Koch

Fish & Wildlife Region 1E  
Lauree Harrisberger

Fish & Wildlife Region 2  
Jeff Drongenes

Fish & Wildlife Region 3  
Charles Amior

Fish & Wildlife Region 4  
Julie Vance

Fish & Wildlife Region 5  
Leslie Newton-Reed

Fish & Wildlife Region 6  
Gabrina Gatchel

Habitat Conservation Program  
Brad Henderson

Fish & Wildlife Region 6 I/M Inyo/Mono. Habitat Conservation Program

Dept. of Fish & Wildlife M  
George Isaac  
Marine Region

Other Departments

Food & Agriculture  
Sandra Schubert  
Dept. of Food and Agriculture

Depart. of General Services  
Public School Construction

Dept. of General Services  
Anna Garbeff  
Environmental Services Section

Dept. of Public Health  
Jeffery Worth  
Dept. of Health/Drinking Water

Delta Stewardship Council  
Kevan Samsam

Independent Commissions, Boards

Delta Protection Commission  
Michael Machado

Cal EMA (Emergency Management Agency)  
Dennis Castrillo

Native American Heritage Comm.  
Debbie Treadway

Public Utilities Commission  
Leo Wong

Santa Monica Bay Restoration  
Guangyu Wang

State Lands Commission  
Jemifer Deleong

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)  
Cherry Jacques

Business, Trans & Housing

Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics  
Phillip Crimmins

Caltrans - Planning  
Terri Pencovic

California Highway Patrol  
Suzann Ikeuchi  
Office of Special Projects

Housing & Community Development  
CEQA Coordinator  
Housing Policy Division

Dept. of Transportation

Caltrans, District 1  
Rex Jackman

Caltrans, District 2  
Marcelino Gonzalez

Caltrans, District 3  
Gary Arnold

Caltrans, District 4  
Erik Alin

Caltrans, District 5  
David Murray

Caltrans, District 6  
Michael Navarro

Caltrans, District 7  
Dianna Watson

Caltrans, District 8  
Dan Kopulsky

Caltrans, District 9  
Gayle Rosander

Caltrans, District 10  
Tom Dumas

Caltrans, District 11  
Jacob Armsstrong

Caltrans, District 12  
Marlon Regtsford

Cal EPA

Air Resources Board  
Airport/Energy Projects  
Jim Lerner

Transportation Projects  
Douglas Ito

Industrial Projects  
Mike Tollstrup

State Water Resources Control Board  
Regional Programs Unit  
Division of Financial Assistance

State Water Resources Control Board  
Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit  
Division of Water Quality

State Water Resources Control Board  
Phil Crader  
Division of Water Rights

Dept. of Toxic Substances Control  
CEQA Tracking Center

Department of Pesticide Regulation  
CEQA Coordinator

RWQCB 1  
Caitleen Hudson  
North Coast Region (1)

RWQCB 2  
Environmental Document Coordinator  
San Francisco Bay Region (2)

RWQCB 3  
Central Coast Region (3)

RWQCB 4  
Teresa Rodgers  
Los Angeles Region (4)

RWQCB 5S  
Central Valley Region (5)

RWQCB 5F  
Central Valley Region (5)  
Fresno Branch Office

RWQCB 5R  
Central Valley Region (5)  
Redding Branch Office

RWQCB 6  
Lahontan Region (6)

RWQCB 6V  
Lahontan Region (6)  
Victorville Branch Office

RWQCB 7  
Colorado River Basin Region (7)

RWQCB 8  
Santa Ana Region (8)

RWQCB 9  
San Diego Region (9)

Other

Conservancy

# Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Hand Delivery/Street Address: State Clearinghouse, 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 445-0613

2013 APR 4 1004

Project Title: 2810 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street Project  
 Lead Agency: City of Long Beach  
 Street Address: 333 West Ocean Boulevard  
 City: Long Beach

Contact Person: Steve Gerhardt, AICP  
 Phone: 562.570.6288  
 County: Los Angeles

Zip: 90802

## Project Location: 2810 East 1<sup>st</sup> Street

County: Los Angeles City/Nearest Community: Long Beach  
 Cross Streets: 1<sup>st</sup> Street between Temple and Orizaba Avenues Zip Code: 90803 Total Acres: 0.16  
 Lat. / Long. 33° 45' 48.2472" N / 118° 9' 32.4684" W  
 APN: 7264-017-003 Section: 5 Twp: 5S Range: 12W Base: SBBM  
 Within 2 Miles: State Hwy. #: I-710 Waterways: Pacific Ocean  
 Airports: Railways: Schools: Multi (Long Beach USD)

## Document Type: (Check one)

- |                                         |                                                    |                                    |                                           |  |  |              |  |  |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--|--|--------------|--|--|
| <u>CEQA</u>                             |                                                    |                                    | <u>NEPA</u>                               |  |  | <u>OTHER</u> |  |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NOP | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR                 | <input type="checkbox"/> NOI       | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document   |  |  |              |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons     | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR | <input type="checkbox"/> EA        | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Document   |  |  |              |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec        | <input type="checkbox"/> (Prior SCH No.)           | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: CEQA-Plus |  |  |              |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mit Neg Dec    | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:                    | <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI     |                                           |  |  |              |  |  |

## Local Action Type: (Check all that apply)

- |                                               |                                            |                                                            |                                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update  | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan     | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezone                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amend.  | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan       | <input type="checkbox"/> Prezone                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element | <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Dev. | <input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit                        | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan       | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan         | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Cert. of Appropriateness |

## Development Type: (Check all that apply)

- |                                                 |             |       |           |                                           |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------|-----------|-------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Residential | Units/Sq Ft | Acres | Employees | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office                 | 1 DU        | 0.16  |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial             |             |       |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining           |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial             |             |       |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Power            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational            |             |       |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational           |             |       |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste  |
|                                                 |             |       |           | <input type="checkbox"/> Other:           |

RECEIVED

Mineral: APR 02 2013  
 Watts

STATE CLEARING HOUSE

## Project Issues Discussed in Document: (Check all that apply)

- |                                                          |                                                                |                                                             |                                                                     |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics/Visual    | <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation/Parks        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Vegetation                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Plain/Flooding       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Schools/Universities    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forest Land/Fire Hazard    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Septic Systems          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Supply/Ground Water       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeo/ Historical  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geologic/Seismic           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sewer Capacity          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland/Riparian                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minerals                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soil Erosion/Compaction | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coastal Zone         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducement               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Drainage Absorption  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Toxic/Hazardous         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic/Jobs        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Traffic/Circulation     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects              |
|                                                          |                                                                |                                                             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Greenhouse Gas Emissions |

## Present Land Use/General Plan Designation/Zoning:

Present Land Use: Single-Family Residence (partially demolished) / General Plan Designation: Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District / Zoning: Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District

## Project Description:

The Applicant proposes to restore the existing structure, using over 90 percent of the onsite materials. The proposal involves the use of 100 percent of the existing foundation and over 80 percent of the existing framing. Missing doors and windows would be replaced with circa 1920s. The Project proposes various structural, interior, exterior, hardscape/landscape/fencing, driveway/walkways, and utility improvements to the property. Project construction would occur in one phase over a 12-month period, beginning Summer 2013 and ending Summer 2014. The Applicant requests approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Cultural Heritage Commission (or Planning Commission, upon appeal).

**NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION**

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
(916) 653-6251  
(916) 657-5390 - FAX

April 4, 2013

Mr. Steve Gerhardt, AICP, Planner

**City of Long Beach**

333 Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, CA 92802

RE: SCH# 2013041004 CEQA Notice of Completion; draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the **2810 1<sup>st</sup> Street Project**; located in the the City of Long Beach; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Mr. Gerhardt:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the CEQA Notice regarding the above referenced project. In the 1985 Appellate Court decision (170 Cal App 3<sup>rd</sup> 604), the court held that the NAHC has jurisdiction and special expertise, as a state agency, over affected Native American resources impacted by proposed projects, including archaeological places of religious significance to Native Americans, and to Native American burial sites.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resources, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA guidelines 15064(b)). To adequately comply with this provision and mitigate project-related impacts on archaeological resources, the Commission recommends the following actions be required:

Contact the appropriate Information Center for a record search to determine :If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources, which we know that it has. The NAHC recommends that known cultural resources recorded on or adjacent to the APE be listed in the draft Environmental Impact Report.

If an additional archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey. We suggest that this be coordinated with the NAHC, if possible. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measurers should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure pursuant to California Government Code Section 6254.10. Contact has been made to the Native American Heritage Commission for :a Sacred Lands File Check. A list of appropriate Native American Contacts for consultation concerning the project site has been provided and is attached to this letter to determine


if the proposed active might impinge on any cultural resources. Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.

Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.

Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.

Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely,

  
Dave Singleton  
Program Analyst  
(916) 653-6251

CC: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contacts list

**Native American Contacts  
Los Angeles County  
April 4, 2013**

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm  
Ron Andrade, Director  
3175 West 6th St, Rm. 403  
Los Angeles , CA 90020  
randrade@css.lacounty.gov  
(213) 351-5324  
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Gabrielino Tongva Nation  
Sam Dunlap, Cultural Resources Director  
P.O. Box 86908  
Los Angeles , CA 90086  
samdunlap@earthlink.net  
(909) 262-9351 - cell

Ti'At Society/Inter-Tribal Council of Pimu  
Cindi M. Alvitre, Chairwoman-Manisar  
3094 Mace Avenue, Apt. B Gabrielino  
Costa Mesa, , CA 92626  
calvitre@yahoo.com  
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council  
Robert F. Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources  
P.O. Box 490  
Bellflower , CA 90707  
gtongva@verizon.net  
562-761-6417 - voice  
562-761-6417- fax

Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation  
John Tommy Rosas, Tribal Admin.  
Private Address Gabrielino Tongva  
  
tattnlaw@gmail.com  
310-570-6567

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
Bernie Acuna, Co-Chairperson  
P.O. Box 180  
Bonsall , CA 92003  
(619) 294-6660-work  
(310) 428-5690 - cell  
(760) 636-0854- FAX  
bacuna1@gabrieinotribe.org

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission  
Anthony Morales, Chairperson  
PO Box 693  
San Gabriel , CA 91778  
GTTribalcouncil@aol.com  
(626) 286-1632  
(626) 286-1758 - Home  
(626) 286-1262 -FAX

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
Linda Candelaria, Co-Chairperson  
P.O. Box 180  
Bonsall , CA 92003  
palmsprings9@yahoo.com  
626-676-1184- cell  
(760) 636-0854 - FAX

**This list is current only as of the date of this document.**

**Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.**

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2013041004; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2810 East 1st Street Project; located in the City of Long Beach; Los Angeles County, California.

**Native American Contacts  
Los Angeles County  
April 4, 2013**

Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians  
Andrew Salas, Chairperson  
P.O. Box 393                      Gabrielino  
Covina                      , CA 91723  
(626) 926-4131  
gabrielenoindians@yahoo.  
com

---

Gabrielino-Tongva Tribe  
Conrad Acuna,  
P.O. Box 180                      Gabrielino  
Bonsall                      , CA 92003

760-636-0854 - FAX

**This list is current only as of the date of this document.**

**Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.**

**This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2013041004; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the 2810 East 1st Street Project; located in the City of Long Beach; Los Angeles County, California.**