

4 Environmental Impact Analysis

This section discusses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project for the specific environmental issue areas that were identified through the Initial Study process (or otherwise determined to be appropriate to include in this analysis) as having the potential to experience significant impacts.

“Significant effect” is defined by the State CEQA Guidelines §15382 as:

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

The assessment of each issue area begins with the setting and is followed by the impact analysis. Within the impact analysis, the first subsection identifies the methodologies used and the “significance thresholds,” which are those criteria adopted by the City of Long Beach (as the CEQA Lead Agency) or other public agencies, as determined appropriate. Other thresholds are generally recognized or have been developed specifically for this analysis. The next subsection describes each impact of the proposed project, feasible mitigation measures for significant impacts, and the level of significance after mitigation. Each effect under consideration for an issue area is separately listed in bold text, with the discussion of the effect and its significance following. Each bolded impact listing also contains a statement of the significance determination for the environmental impact as follows:

Significant and Unavoidable: An impact that cannot be reduced to below the significance threshold level with implementation of reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved per §15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Significant but Mitigable: An impact that can be reduced to below the significance threshold level with implementation of reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings to be made under §15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Less than Significant: An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the significance threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.

No Impact: No impact would occur.

Beneficial Impact: The project would result in a beneficial impact on the environment.

Following each environmental effect discussion is a listing of feasible mitigation measures (if required) and the residual effects or level of significance remaining after the implementation of the measures. In those cases where the mitigation measure for an impact could have a significant environmental impact in another issue area, this impact is discussed as a residual effect. The impact analysis concludes with a discussion of cumulative effects, which evaluates the impacts associated with the proposed project in conjunction with other past, present and probable future development in the area.

4.1 Cultural Resources

The information and analysis presented in this section is based on a Historic Resources Assessment prepared for the proposed project by Rincon Consultants, Inc. in January 2016, an Architectural Survey Report completed for the project by Cogstone in February 2016, and a Peer Review Historic Resources Assessment Report Completed by Architectural Resources Group (ARG) in April 2016, all of which are included as Appendix B of this EIR.

4.1.1 Setting

Historical Background

Prehistory

The project site is located in the southern coastal region of California. The prehistoric chronological sequence is generally divided into four periods: Early Man, Milling Stone, Intermediate, and Late Prehistoric. The Early Man Horizon (ca. 10000-6000 B.C.) is represented by numerous sites identified along the mainland coast and Channel Islands. Early Man Horizon sites are generally associated with a greater emphasis on hunting than later horizons, though recent data indicates that the economy was a diverse mixture of hunting and gathering, including a significant focus on aquatic resources. The Millingstone Period, (6000-3000 B.C.), is characterized by an ecological adaptation to collecting suggested by the appearance and abundance of well-made milling implements. A broad spectrum of food resources were consumed, including small and large terrestrial mammals, sea mammals, birds, shellfish, fishes, and other littoral and estuarine species, yucca, agave, seeds, and other plant products. The Intermediate Horizon (3000 B.C. – A.D. 500) is characterized by a shift toward a hunting and maritime subsistence strategy. A noticeable trend occurred toward greater adaptation to local resources including a broad variety of fish, land mammal, and sea mammal along the coast. Tool kits for hunting, fishing, and processing food and other resources reflect this increased diversity, with flake scrapers, drills, various projectile points, and shell fishhooks being manufactured. An increase in mortars and pestles became more common, indicating an increasing reliance on acorn. The Late Prehistoric Horizon (A.D. 500 - Historic Contact) saw further increase in the diversity of food resources. More classes of artifacts were observed during this period and high quality exotic lithic materials were used for small, finely worked projectile points associated with the bow and arrow.

Ethnography

The project lies within an area traditionally occupied by the Native American group known as the Gabrielino. The name Gabrielino was applied by the Spanish to those natives that were attached to Mission San Gabriel. Today, most contemporary Gabrielino prefer to identify themselves as Tongva. Tongva territory included the Los Angeles basin and southern Channel Islands as well as the coast from Aliso Creek in the south to Topanga Creek in the north. The Tongva language belongs to the Takic branch of the Uto-Aztecan language family, which can be traced to the Great Basin region.

The Tongva established large permanent villages and smaller satellite camps throughout their territory. Society was organized along patrilineal non-localized clans, a common Takic pattern. Tongva subsistence was oriented around acorns supplemented by roots, leaves, seeds, and fruits of a wide variety of plants. Meat sources included large and small mammals, freshwater and saltwater fish, shellfish, birds, reptiles, and insects. Tongva employed a wide variety of tools and implements to gather and hunt food. The digging stick, the bow and arrow, traps, nets, blinds, throwing sticks and slings, spears, harpoons, and

hooks were common tools. Like the Chumash, the Tongva made oceangoing plank canoes (known as *ti'at*) capable of holding 6 to 14 people and used for fishing, travel, and trade between the mainland and the Channel Islands.

History

Spanish exploration of California began when Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo led the first European expedition into the region in 1542. For more than 200 years after his initial expedition, Spanish, Portuguese, British, and Russian explorers sailed the California coast and made limited inland expeditions, but they did not establish permanent settlements. On September 8, 1771, Fathers Pedro Cambón and Angel Somera established the Mission San Gabriel de Arcángel near the present-day city of Montebello. In addition to Mission San Gabriel, the Spanish also established a pueblo (town) in the Los Angeles Basin known as El Pueblo de la Reina de los Angeles de la Porciúncula in 1781. This pueblo was one of only three pueblos established in Alta California and eventually became the City of Los Angeles. It was also during this period that the Spanish crown began to deed ranchos to prominent citizens and soldiers. To manage and expand their herds of cattle on these large ranchos, colonists enlisted the labor of the surrounding Native American population. Native populations were also affected by the missions who were responsible for their administration as well as converting the population to Christianity. The increased European presence during this period led to the spread of disease which devastated the native populations.

The Mexican Period commenced when news of the success of the Mexican War of Independence (1810-1821) against the Spanish crown reached California in 1822. This period saw the federalization and distribution of mission lands in California with the passage of the Secularization Act of 1833. This Act federalized mission lands and enabled Mexican governors in California to distribute former mission lands to individuals in the form of land grants. Successive Mexican governors made more than 700 land grants between 1822 and 1846, putting most of the state's lands into private ownership for the first time. The land within which the project site is located was once part of Rancho Los Nietos, which was granted to Manuel Nieto in 1874. His rancho would be later divided among his heirs, a portion of which became Rancho Los Cerritos, which includes the project site.

The American Period officially began with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, in which the United States agreed to pay Mexico \$15 million for the conquered territory. This period saw many ranchos in California sold or otherwise acquired by Americans and the land subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns. Many ranchos in Los Angeles County were sold or otherwise acquired by Americans in the mid-1800s, and most were subdivided into agricultural parcels or towns. Nonetheless, ranching retained its importance and, by the late 1860s, Los Angeles was one of the top dairy production centers in the West. By 1876, the county had a population of 30,000. Ranching was supplanted by farming and urban professions during the late nineteenth century due to droughts and increased population growth.

Rancho Los Cerritos was sold by Manuel Nieto's heir to Jonathan Temple, who built a ranch house on the land approximately six miles from the current project site. Rancho Los Cerritos was then sold to Thomas and Benjamin Flint and Lewellyn Bixby, who began subdividing and selling the land in the 1870s. By 1884, the developing community had adopted the name of Long Beach. Expansion of transportation networks and further growth led to the incorporation of Long Beach in 1888. The City became a major oil producer beginning in the 1920s (Franks and Lambert 1985) and has continued to grow as a major transportation center, shipping industry hub, and tourist destination. Today, Long Beach is the busiest port on the West Coast and is one of the most populous cities in California, with an estimated 2015 population of 484,958 (California Department of Finance, May 2016).

Regulatory Setting

CEQA

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21084.1). A *historical resource* is a resource listed, or determined to be eligible for listing, in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); a resource included in a local register of historical resources; or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a][1-3]).

A resource shall be considered historically significant if it meets any of the following criteria:

- 1 Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;
- 2 Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
- 3 Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4 Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

According to CEQA, all buildings constructed over 50 years ago and that possess architectural or historical significance may be considered potential historic resources. Most resources must meet the 50-year threshold for historic significance; however, resources less than 50 years in age may be eligible for listing on the CRHR if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand their historical importance.

California Register of Historical Resources Criteria

The California Register criteria are modeled on the National Register of Historic Places criteria. For listing in the California Register, a property must be eligible under one or more of the following criteria and retain sufficient integrity to convey its significance:

- 1 It is associated with events or patterns of events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
- 2 It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
- 3 It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values.
- 4 It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, state or the nation.

City of Long Beach

Historical Context Statement

In July 2009, the City completed a citywide Historic Context Statement to provide a framework for the investigation of the City's historic resources; serve as a tool for preservation planning; and provide historic preservation specialists, planners, and the public with guidance in assessing the significance of Long Beach's built environment. The Historic Context Statement was also designed to assist City staff to

evaluate proposed projects that may have a significant impact on cultural resources as they relate to CEQA.

The Historic Context Statement uses the Multiple Property Submission (MPS) approach to historic survey and registration efforts developed by the National Park Service. The MPS approach facilitates the evaluation of individual properties by comparing them with resources that share similar physical characteristics and historical associations. By evaluating groups of related properties, the MPS approach streamlines the identification process and establishes a consistent framework for assessing potential historic resources.

The Historic Context Statement spans Long Beach history from prehistory through development of the modern city and concludes in 1965. The Historic Context Statement addresses six specific:

- Identification of significant themes in Long Beach history and architecture;
- Definition and description of property types that represent the contexts and provision of known examples of resources that illustrate and explain the property types;
- Description of architectural styles and character-defining features representative of development in Long Beach;
- Identification of architects and builders known to have influenced the physical character of Long Beach;
- Listing of known important buildings constructed in Long Beach;
- Establishment of registration requirements for Long Beach’s historic resources.

Historic Preservation Element

The City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Element was adopted by the City Council on June 22, 2010, to create a proactive, focused plan for use by residents, local preservation advocates, City staff, the Cultural Heritage Commission, Planning Commission, and City Council. The Historic Preservation Element outlines a vision for future historic preservation efforts and the actions that need to be taken to achieve them. Development of the Historic Preservation Element was coordinated with the City’s 2030 General Plan update.

To ensure that the rich history of Long Beach is preserved through the identification, protection, and celebration of historic resources highly valued for their role in the city’s environment, urban design, economic prosperity, and contributions to the quality of life in city neighborhoods, the Historic Preservation Element establishes five main goals, each with corresponding policies and implementation measures that affirm the City’s commitment to historic preservation:

- GOAL 1: Maintain and support a comprehensive, citywide historic preservation program to identify and protect Long Beach’s historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.
- GOAL 2: Protect historic resources from demolition and inappropriate alterations through the use of the City’s regulatory framework, technical assistance, and incentives.
- GOAL 3: Maintain and expand the inventory of historic resources in Long Beach.
- GOAL 4: Increase public awareness and appreciation of the city’s history and historic, cultural, and archaeological resources.
- GOAL 5: Integrate historic preservation policies into the city’s community development, economic development, and sustainable-city strategies.

Local Designation

Since 1988 the City of Long Beach has had an active program to recognize buildings and neighborhoods that have special architectural or historical value. Chapter 2.63.050 of the City of Long Beach Municipal Code established the procedures for the designation of individual landmarks and landmark districts, and designated historic landmarks are listed in Chapter 16.52 of the Municipal Code. As of January 2016, 130 landmarks and 17 historic districts have been designated.

A resource must meet one or more of the following criteria of significance to be designated as a City of Long Beach landmark or landmark district:

- Criterion A: It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the City's history; or
- Criterion B: It is associated with the lives of persons significant in the City's past; or
- Criterion C: It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction, or it represents the work of a master or it possesses high artistic values; or
- Criterion D: It has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

A group of cultural resources qualify for designation as a Landmark District if they retain integrity as a whole and meets the following criteria:

- Criterion A: The grouping represents a significant and distinguishable entity that is significant within a historic context.
- Criterion B: A minimum of sixty percent (60%) of the properties within the boundaries of the proposed landmark district qualify as a contributing property.

Site History

According to the Peer Review: Historic Resources Assessment Report, prepared for the project (Appendix B), the church is a drive-in church that was designed by Charles Beck. The church began as the El Dorado Park Community Church in 1957. The church's first services were held at the Los Altos Drive-In Theater in March of 1957. While outdoor church services had been established as early as the late 1930s, drive-in churches became a popular institutional typology during the mid-20th century; as seen in mid-century property types like drive-in restaurants, the car had an increasingly strong influence on the built environment and the culture of California at this time. The construction of Reformed Church in America, drive-in chapels at the Valley Community Church and the El Dorado Park Community Church followed.

In 1961, the El Dorado Park Community Church acquired the parcel at 3655 N. Norwalk Boulevard for the construction of a drive-in church building. Construction began in late spring of 1963 and was reported to include a chapel with a drive-in section (original chapel no longer extant), an administration building, a social hall and a school. The architect for this first phase of construction was Charles Beck of Costa Mesa. A Long Beach Independent article from 1965 stated that Charles Laughlin of Anaheim served as landscape architect while Ralph Davis of Lloyd's, Long Beach completed the building's interiors. The property's buildings from this era were unified by an aesthetic that blurred the line between interior and exterior spaces and integrated natural materials, a reflection of the primary tenets of the Mid-Century Modern style, a postwar iteration of the International Style that included a clear expression of structural elements and building materials, simple geometric volumes, and expanses of glass. The church experienced immediate and continued success in the years between its first service in 1964 and its expansion in the late 1960s. During this time, the church was acknowledged as the first drive-in church in Long Beach specifically designed to accommodate automobiles. Though its eastern neighbor Garden

Grove Community Church was arguably the most recognizable drive-in church in the country, El Dorado Park Community Church became a notable landmark within the community. The original chapel seated 400 people, while the adjacent drive-in facilities (consisting of open space with a sound system and curving lanes to direct cars into rows) accommodated approximately 300 cars. However, the congregation had long anticipated the construction of a larger church serving 1,000 worshippers that would effectively replace the smaller chapel as part of the church's master plan. Although the completion of the project's first phase was reported (and future phases conceptualized) in a Long Beach Independent Press-Telegram article in 1965, an official design for the new sanctuary was not publicized until 1967. The building's design most notably included expanses of glass and a continuous pulpit extending from the chapel's interior to a projecting balcony from which the ministry could give their sermons and better include the drive-in congregation. The design was to continue the natural Modern aesthetic established by Charles Beck. A 1968 article reported that the campus master plan also called for "a large multi-story educational unit to supplement existing classrooms, office and fellowship hall," as well as a second story addition to the existing classroom building that was nearing completion.

The new sanctuary building was designed by architect Benno Fischer. Ground was broken in 1968 and construction was completed by 1971. A reflecting pool and fountains, originally located along the base of the cross structure and east façade of the sanctuary, were completed the same year. Fischer also designed a second story for the complex's administration building, the construction of which was completed in 1972. In 1972 it was estimated that services attracted up to 2,000 people who came from communities outside of Long Beach in the Southern California region. Between 1971 and 1981 the church even had its own nationally televised weekly service, "Sunday Celebration." It appears to have ceased holding drive-in services sometime in the late 1970s but continued to hold services in the sanctuary building. In 2011, the El Dorado Park Community Church merged with the nearby Revolution Church (which had itself originally split off from El Dorado Park Community Church in 2003) under the overarching name of Park Church.

Existing Conditions

The El Dorado Park Community Church (Park Church) complex currently occupies the project site. The church complex comprises five buildings: the sanctuary (chapel) building, a classroom building, an administration building, a preschool building, and Fellowship Hall. The church complex's buildings are unified by a Mid-Century Modern aesthetic, though the sanctuary building is the most highly articulated of the grouping and also exhibits elements of New Formalism. Architectural elements seen throughout include rectangular plans, flat roofs with wide eaves, exposed structural systems, expanses of glass, and cladding of stucco or rough cut stone veneer. The buildings are arranged around a series of hardscaped courts, and are physically joined by a network of covered walkways, with the exception of the sanctuary building, which stands alone. A paved court shared by the adjoined buildings is sheltered by fabric canopies, as is a playground at the northwest corner of the site; some ancillary wooden structures stand along its southwestern edge. The complex is raised above grade along the west façade and features a retaining wall of split-face concrete block. The site is landscaped with stretches of unmaintained grass, foundation plantings, hedges, flowering shrubs, mature shade trees, and meandering pathways.

Figure 5 Site Photographs



Photograph 1. Chapel and grounds where automobiles would park for drive-in services



Photograph 2. Chapel – outdoor balcony connected to interior preaching pulpit

Three historical reports were completed for the project. The first was completed by Rincon Consultants in January 2016. The second was completed by Cogstone in February 2016. The third was completed by Architectural Resource Group in April 2016. The Rincon Consultants report found that the chapel individually eligible for listing as a City of Long Beach Landmark under Criterion A, as the first drive-in church of Long Beach and one of the earliest examples of a chapel designed to accommodate the drive-in church concept. The chapel also appears eligible under Criterion C as it is a representative example of Midcentury Modern style. The building is dominated by the eastern façade, which features vertical glass panels separated by steel beams, a projecting roof, stone veneer and a unique balcony which extended into the interior pulpit. Although the chapel appears eligible for listing as a City of Long Beach Landmark, there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the chapel is eligible for listing in the CRHR at this time. The school, hall and office buildings were also found ineligible for listing in the CRHR and as City of Long Beach landmarks as both the school and office buildings have undergone alterations with additions of second stories in 1967 and 1972, respectively.

The report prepared by Cogstone found that one newly-recorded resource – the El Dorado Park Community Church Fellowship Hall – was identified as an historic-age built environment resource within the Project Area. The determination of eligibility finds that this building is not eligible for CRHR listing under any of the four CRHR criteria. The building retains some of its integrity, but it is recommended as not eligible for CRHR listing. The remaining buildings on the property are not old enough to be considered for historic designation and there is no evidence to support a finding of “exceptional importance”.

The ARG report was commissioned to review the two reports and come to an independent conclusion regarding the eligibility of the structures on the site. In this report ARG concurred with Rincon’s evaluation that found the sanctuary (chapel) building eligible for designation as a City of Long Beach Landmark under Criterion C, as an intact example of a rare building type (a drive-in church) and as an excellent example of Mid-Century Modern architecture. ARG further found that the building is also eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3 as an intact example of a rare building type (a drive-in church) and as an excellent example of Mid-Century Modern architecture. Additionally, ARG found that the sanctuary building, including its associated landscape features, is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and for designation as a City of Long Beach Landmark under Criteria 1/A, for its association with automobile-centric development patterns in California during the post-World War II period.

4.1.2 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds.

Significance Thresholds

According to Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, impacts related to cultural resources from the proposed project would be significant if the project would:

- 1 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5;
- 2 Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5;
- 3 Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature of paleontological or cultural value;

4 Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries

Historical resources are “significantly” affected if there is demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its surroundings. Generally, impacts to historical resources can be mitigated to below a level of significance by following the Secretary of the Interior’s Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings [13 PRC 15064.6 (b)]. In some circumstances, documentation of an historical resource by way of historic narrative photographs or architectural drawings will not mitigate the impact of demolition below the level of significance [13 PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)]. Preservation in place is the preferred form of mitigation for a “historical resource of an archaeological nature” as it retains the relationship between artifact and context, and may avoid conflicts with groups associated with the site [PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)(A)]. Historic resources of an archaeological nature and “unique archaeological resources” can be mitigated to below a level of significance by:

- Relocating construction areas such that the site is avoided;
- Incorporation of sites within parks, greenspace, or other open space;
- “Capping” or covering the site with a layer of chemically stable soil before building; or
- Deeding the site into a permanent conservation easement. [PRC 15126.4 (b)(3)(B)].

If an archaeological resource does not meet either the historic resource or the more specific “unique archaeological resource” definition, impacts do not need to be mitigated [13 PRC 15064.5 (e)]. Where the significance of a site is unknown, it is presumed to be significant for the purpose of the EIR investigation.

The CEQA thresholds were analyzed in the Initial Study prepared for the project, which found that impacts related to thresholds 2 through 4 would be less than significant with mitigation and did not need further discussion. Therefore these thresholds will not be further discussed in this EIR. See Appendix A for the Initial Study/NOP.

b. Impact Analysis

THRESHOLD 1 - CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE CHANGE IN THE SIGNIFICANCE OF A HISTORICAL RESOURCE AS DEFINED IN §15064.5?

Impact Cult-1	Construction of the project would involve the demolition of a drive-in church that is over 45 years of age and has been identified as a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Demolition of the drive-in church would result in a significant and unavoidable impact.
---------------	---

The project site is developed with a church and preschool. The Peer Review Historic Resources Assessment completed for the project (Appendix C) concurred with the report prepared by Rincon Consultants and found the church to be eligible for designation as a City of Long Beach Landmark under Criterion C and additionally, found the chapel to be eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 3, as an intact example of a rare building type (a drive-in church) and as an excellent example of Mid-Century Modern architecture. As stated above in Existing Conditions, the sanctuary building, including its associated landscape features, is eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and for designation as a City of Long Beach Landmark under Criteria 1/A, for its association with automobile-centric development patterns in California during the post-World War II period.

The other four buildings on the property, the administration building, classroom building, preschool building, and Fellowship Hall, do not appear to be individually eligible for listing under either local or

state criteria. The three 1960s buildings were designed, constructed, and added to as part of a master plan, share a unified Mid-Century Modern style, and are indirectly associated with patterns of events significant in local and state history. However, they are modest examples of the architectural style and have always been intended to serve a secondary, support role to the main drive-in sanctuary building. They are not distinguishable from the types of secondary buildings found on conventional church campuses, and do not exhibit any of the distinctive characteristics of the drive-in church typology. For these reasons, they are found not eligible for listing in the California Register or as City of Long Beach Landmarks. The fifth building in the complex is a prefabricated building added in 1975; it is a later addition that was not part of the master plan and it does not have a distinguishable architectural style. It is also ineligible against eligibility criteria.

The property as a whole is not eligible for listing as a historic district under either local or state criteria. While the grouping of buildings does represent a distinguishable entity, there is not enough evidence to confirm that the campus as a whole is significant against eligibility criteria.

Based on the above, the drive-in church is considered a historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. The project would result in the demolition of this building and would therefore have a significant direct impact to cultural resources insofar as it entails a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources. Impacts to the drive-in church would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

CR-3 Building Documentation. Archival documentation of as-built and as-found condition shall be collected for the chapel. Prior to issuance of the first demolition permit for the project, the lead agency shall ensure that documentation of the building is completed in accordance with the general guidelines of Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation, a historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to repositories that will make it available for current and future generations. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department, the downtown branch of the Long Beach Public Library, and the Historical Society of Long Beach where it would be available to local researchers.

Significance after Mitigation

Implementation of mitigation measure CR-1 would ensure that the building is documented prior to demolition. This would reduce the cultural resource impact to the degree feasible. Nevertheless, the impact related to demolition of the structure would remain significant and unavoidable. Section 6, Alternatives, considers alternatives that would avoid this impact by preserving the church building.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

In terms of historical resources, the analysis of cumulative impacts relates to whether impacts of the project and future related projects, considered together, might substantially impact and/or diminish the number of similar historic resources, in terms of context or property type. While the project would result in significant impacts to historic resources, significant cumulative adverse impacts to historic resources are not anticipated since the proposed project is the only project in the vicinity that involves the demolition of a historic building. Any future projects would need to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis

pursuant to CEQA, with a determination made for each project on the significance of indirect impacts to historic resources, as well as any future historic resources that are identified in the vicinity.

4.2 Traffic

This section analyzes the potential for the proposed project to cause significant impacts to the existing traffic and transportation facilities in the City of Long Beach. The analysis in this section is based on a Trip Generation Study (Study) prepared for the proposed project by RK Engineering Group, Inc. in January 2015 (Appendix C).

4.2.1 Setting

a. Existing Street Network

Primary regional access to the project site is provided by the San Gabriel River Freeway (I-605). I-605 runs in the north/south direction west of the project site. Local access to the project site is provided 226th Street, N Norwalk Boulevard, and E Wardlow Road. These roadways are classified in the City's General Plan and described in detail below.

- **Interstate 605** transverses the city in a generally north/south direction through the central portion of the Plan Area. To the south it links with the 405 Freeway and into southern Los Angeles area. Average daily traffic volumes in 2014 on I-605 were 198,000.
- **226th Street** is a two lane roadway that runs east/west through the eastern portion of the city.
- **N Norwalk Boulevard** is designated as a Major Avenue by the City of Long Beach General Plan Mobility Element. It is a four lane roadway that runs north/south through the eastern portion of the City.
- **E Wardlow Road** is designated as a Minor Avenue by the City of Long Beach General Plan Mobility Element. It is a four lane roadway that runs east/west through the southern portion of the city.

b. Regulatory Setting

Congestion Management Program

In Los Angeles County (County), the CMP uses ICU intersection analysis methodology to analyze its operations. In June 1990, the passage of the Proposition 111 gas tax increase required urbanized areas in the State with a population of 50,000 or more to adopt a CMP. Metro is the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for the County. Metro has been charged with the development, monitoring, and biennial updating of Los Angeles County's CMP. The Los Angeles County CMP is intended to address the impact of local growth on the regional transportation system. The CMP Highway System includes specific roadways, including State highways, and CMP arterial monitoring locations/intersections. The CMP is also the vehicle for proposing transportation projects that are eligible to compete for the State gas tax funds.

Long Beach General Plan

It is the stated goal of the City to maintain or improve the current ability to move people and goods to and from activity centers while reinforcing the quality of life in their neighborhoods. This goal is supported by the objectives to: (1) maintain traffic and transportation LOS at LOS D, (2) accommodate reasonable, balanced growth, and (3) maintain or enhance our quality of life. The following specific Mobility of People (MOP) policies are included in the Mobility Element of the General Plan.

- MOP Policy 1-1 To improve the performance and visual appearance of Long Beach’s streets, design streets holistically using the “complete streets approach” which considers walking, those with mobility constraints, bicyclists, public transit users, and various other modes of mobility in parallel.
- MOP Policy 1-9 Increase mode shift of transit, pedestrians, and bicycles.
- MOP Policy 1-18 Focus development densities for residential and nonresidential uses around the eight Metro Blue Line stations within City boundaries.
- MOP Policy 4-1 Consider effects on overall mobility and various travel modes when evaluating transportation impacts of new developments or infrastructure projects.
- MOP Policy 15-3 Consider pickup and delivery activities associated with various land uses when approving new development, implementing projects, and improving highways, streets, and bridges.

4.2.2 Impact Analysis and Mitigation Measures

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds

Project Traffic Generation

Traffic generation is expressed in vehicle trip ends, defined as one-way vehicular movements, either entering or exiting the generating land use. Generation equations and/or rates used in the traffic forecasting procedure are found in the Ninth Edition of *Trip Generation*, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE).

Significance Thresholds

Impacts related to transportation and circulation would be potentially significant if development facilitated by the proposed project would:

- 1 Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing a measure of effectiveness for the performance of a circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and nonmotorized 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
- 2 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
- 3 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
- 4 Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- 5 Result in inadequate emergency access
- 6 Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bikeways, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise substantially decrease the performance or safety of such facilities

In addition, according the City of Long Beach:

- *Impacts to intersections are considered significant if:*
 - *An unacceptable peak hour Level of Service (LOS) (i.e. LOS E or F) at any of the intersections is projected. The City of Long Beach considers LOS D (ICU = 0.801 - 0.900) to be the minimum*

acceptable LOS for all intersections. For the City of Long Beach, the current LOS, if worse than LOS D (i.e. LOS E or F), should also be maintained; and

- *The project increases traffic demand at the study intersection by 2% of capacity (ICU increase ≥ 0.020), causing or worsening LOS E or F (ICU > 0.901). At unsignalized intersections, a “significant” adverse traffic impact is defined as a project that: adds 2% or more traffic delay (seconds per vehicle) at an intersection operating LOS E or F.*
- *Impacts to roadway segments are considered significant if:*
 - *An unacceptable LOS (i.e. LOS E or F) at any of the study roadway segments is projected.*

All the thresholds listed above were analyzed in the Initial Study in Appendix A. The analysis found that impacts related to thresholds 3 through 6 would be less than significant and did not need further discussion. Therefore these thresholds are not further discussed in this EIR.

b. Impact Analysis

THRESHOLD 1 - CONFLICT WITH AN APPLICABLE PLAN, ORDINANCE OR POLICY ESTABLISHING MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE CIRCULATION SYSTEM

THRESHOLD 2 - 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

Impact T-1	Construction and operation of the proposed project would decrease traffic on the surrounding street network, and therefore would not cause any intersection to exceed the City’s LOS standard. Impacts associated with construction and operation of the proposed project would be less than significant.
------------	---

Construction of the project would generate temporary construction-related traffic such as deliveries of equipment and materials to the project site and construction worker traffic. Construction traffic would be limited and temporary, and would not be substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.

The project includes an internal road that would connect to Norwalk Boulevard. Norwalk Boulevard is designated as a Major Avenue by the Long Beach General Plan Mobility Element. Major Avenues are primarily used for travel between cities and neighborhoods. Adjacent to the project site, Norwalk Boulevard is a four-lane road with a dedicated center left turn lane.

The project would also generate traffic during its operation. A Trip Generation Study was completed for the proposed project by RK Engineering Group, January 2015 (see Appendix C). The project would reduce the number of trips to and from the site. The net decrease is shown in Table 5. The total daily decrease would be 521 daily trips, with a 101-trip reduction occurring during the AM peak hour and a 93-trip reduction during the PM peak hour.

Table 5 Trip Generation

Use	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	Daily Total
Proposed			
Single Family Residences	31	40	381
Existing			
Church	10	10	161
Daycare Center	122	123	741
Total Existing	132	133	902
Net Change (Proposed – Existing)	(101)	(93)	(521)

() – indicates a negative number

Source: Trip Generation Study, RK Engineering Group, January 2015 (Appendix C)

The traffic pattern caused by these trips would be different than the pattern caused by the existing uses. The existing church and daycare center would result in trips from the general vicinity, but would not attract trips from elsewhere in the region. This is due to the fact that people tend to attend church and find daycare in the area where they live. Therefore regional trips would not result from the existing uses. The proposed residences would result in trips that could be more regional in nature. However, due to the overall reduction in traffic generation, the project would not regional intersections or freeways to exceed service standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Significance after Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant.

c. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative development within the project area would cause increases in traffic on area roadways. The development listed in Table 3 would create more traffic on the roadway system and could lead to congestion that exceeds level of service standards. However, the proposed project would reduce trips to and from the site and would incrementally reduce traffic in the surrounding area. Therefore the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact.

This page left intentionally blank.