

14.0 Comments and Responses



14.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

14.1 CEQA REQUIREMENTS

Before approving a project, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the Lead Agency to prepare and certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

In accordance with Sections 15120 through 15132, and Section 15161 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Long Beach has prepared an EIR for the Shoreline Gateway Project (SCH #2005121066). The Response to Comments section, combined with the Draft EIR, comprise the Final EIR.

The following is an excerpt from the *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15132, Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report:

The Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) The draft EIR or a version of the draft.*
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.*
- (c) A list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR.*
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.*
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.*

This Comments and Responses section includes all of the above-required components and shall be attached to the Final EIR. As noted above, the Final EIR will be a revised document that incorporates all of the changes made to the Draft EIR following the public review period.

14.2 PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS – DRAFT EIR

The Draft EIR was circulated for review and comment to the public, agencies, and organizations. The Draft EIR was also circulated to State agencies for review through the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research. A notice of availability was placed in the Press Telegram. The 45-day public review period ran from June 30, 2006 to August 14, 2006. Comments received during the 45-day public review period have been incorporated into this section.

During the public review period, the public and local and State agencies submitted comments on the Draft EIR. During the public review period, 37 written comment letters on the Draft EIR were received.



14.3 FINAL EIR

The Final EIR allows the public and Lead Agency an opportunity to review revisions to the Draft EIR, the responses to comments, and other components of the EIR, such as the Mitigation Monitoring Program, prior to approval of the project. The Final EIR serves as the environmental document to support a decision on the proposed project.

After completing the Final EIR, and before approving the project, the Lead Agency must make the following three certifications as required by Section 15090 of the *CEQA Guidelines*:

- *The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA;*
- *The Final EIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency, and that the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information contained in the final EIR prior to approving the project; and*
- *That the final EIR reflects the lead agency's independent judgment and analysis.*

Additionally, pursuant to Section 15093(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, when a Lead Agency approves a project that would result in significant, unavoidable impacts that are disclosed in the Final EIR, the agency must submit in writing its reasons for supporting the approved action. This Statement of Overriding Considerations is supported by substantial information in the record, which includes the Final EIR. Since the proposed project would result in significant, unavoidable impacts, the Lead Agency would be required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations if it approves the proposed project.

These certifications, the Findings of Fact, and the Statement of Overriding Considerations are included in a separate Findings document. Both the Final EIR and the Findings will be submitted to the Lead Agency for consideration of the proposed project.

14.4 WRITTEN COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

Written comments on the Draft EIR were received from the following:

A. Citizens

1. Dennis Apodaca
2. Phil Appleby
3. Stacie Beal
4. Larry and Pat Bott
5. Patricia Brockman
6. William Fahey
7. Eric Gray
8. Tammy Holden
9. Tammy Holden



10. Robert Jackson
11. Joseph Landau
12. Heidi Maerker
13. Tom McCoy
14. Ana Maria McGuan
15. William McKinnon
16. Patricia Paris
17. Ricardo Pulido
18. Jeff Rossignol
19. Gary Shelton
20. Don Slider
21. Patrick Thorpe
22. John Torkelson
23. Tim Tran
24. Norman Wiener
25. Clive Williams
26. Rose Wray, et. al.
27. John Carl Brogdon

B. Private Organizations and Interested Parties

1. Stephen Breskin, Union Bank of California
2. Jess Johannsen, International Tower Owners Association
3. Neighbors on Ocean Boulevard
4. William Driscoll, Driscoll & Fox Lawyers
5. Kristen Autry, SaveLBCSkyline
6. John Thomas, Long Beach Heritage
7. Sander Wolff, East Village Arts District Board of Directors

C. Public Agencies

1. County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
2. California Public Utilities Commission
3. April Grayson, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)
4. County of Los Angeles Fire Department
5. Department of Toxic Substances Control
6. State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

D. Petition

1. Help Save the Long Beach Cafe

All correspondence from those agencies commenting on the Draft EIR is reproduced on the following pages. Where duplicate comment letters were received from the same commenter (i.e., via email and mail), only one copy of the comment letter was included. The individual comments on each letter have been consecutively numbered for ease of reference. Following each comment letter are responses to each numbered comment. A response is provided for each comment raising significant environmental issues. It should be noted that some comments provide information that does not directly challenge the Draft EIR or provide new



environmental information. Additionally, some comments may include opinions regarding approval or disapproval of the project, which are not within the purview of the EIR. The comments are noted and will be forwarded to decision makers for their review and consideration.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 06:00 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Shoreline Gateway EIR

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 06:00 PM -----



"Dennis Apodaca"
<lbdennis@hotmail.com>
08/14/2006 12:03 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway EIR

Angela:

As a resident of the East Village, I reviewed the EIR submitted for the Shoreline Gateway Project and have the following comments:

1. I read that there is a possibility that a variance on the parking could be issued to the project if the parking was not seen as adequate. This is ABSOLUTELY unacceptable! The project needs to be fully parked, no exceptions. As a condition to issuing approval on this project, the developer should also be required to provide parking to augment the parking that we will lose on the neighborhood streets. Even with this contribution, we will still be lacking in parking for the neighborhood due to the poor planning of recent projects.

A1.1

2. The Aqua project was a mistake and we are paying for it now; it has substantially changed the airflow and sunlight downtown. In addition, we were given a new front lawn for Victory Park park on Ocean. As we will have to share our park with this new development, shouldn't the developer be required to provide the residents of the East Village and Downtown area with additional park space. By this I mean real park space; not a pocket park, not a strip of grass, but a real usable park space. Please do not let them do this to us again, I've seen these developments compromise our quality of life downtown; do we not pay our taxes, don't we deserve better?

A1.2

3. The EIR says nothing about the frequent filming done in the East Village. When the City issues filming permits, which they do often, the production companies close the streets and good portion of the parking. They closed First and Linden recently without notifying the residents or providing us with an alternative. This is another issue I know, however, is the City prepared to cancel all permits for filming during the 24 - 28 months that this project will be in construction? We had the same problem when Aqua was built, it was extremely difficult to park and move freely on Ocean, Elm, Linden and First.

A1.3

4. I noticed that the parking or traffic studies made no mention of the Jehovah Witness convention that is an annual event at the convention center.

They are here for a very long period and they take a good portion of the street parking as well as increase the traffic on Ocean between the 710 Freeway and Alamitos. In addition, I see no mention of the Grand Prix? The Gay Parade and Festival? These events need to be considered seriously or else we will end up with gridlock; sensible planning now could resolve this future problem.

A1.4

5. When Aqua was in construction, we made daily calls to the AQMD to complain about the styrofoam which clogged our roof drains, air conditioning units, stuck to our cars...it was a toxic situation. We even saw abundant amounts of styrofoam in the water and on the beach adjacent to the project. The City and the AQMD did nothing! This cannot happen again...the fugitive dust and debris needs to be contained during construction, it's absolutely imperative that during construction this project will be draped at all times to contain their dust and debris.

A1.5

6. In closing, I have been a resident for 17 years in the East Village, I love Long Beach, it's my home. I am really saddened when I see developers (like Aqua) come to town to make their money and leave us holding the bag. Please do not let the developers do this to us....once they are gone they don't care.

A1.6

If you would, please respond to my email so I know that you've received it and my comments have been included.

Thanks.

Dennis Apodaca
lbdennis@hotmail.com
425 East Ocean 220
Long Beach, Ca 90802
T: 562 437.6058
C: 562 212.1370

Is your PC infected? Get a FREE online computer virus scan from McAfee® Security. <http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>



A1. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM DENNIS APODACA, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.

- A1.1 As indicated in Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, the City's Zoning Regulations determine the number of parking spaces required based on proposed uses. The parking analysis indicates that the amount of parking currently proposed would result in a parking deficit of 107 spaces without shared commercial/residential parking and 73 spaces with shared commercial/residential parking. This includes the provision of 70 replacement parking spaces for the Artaban and replacement of 18 on-street parking spaces. The project applicant would be required to complete a shared parking analysis to determine if the amount of parking proposed is sufficient. The analysis would require the approval of the City. If the shared parking analysis determines that the parking proposed for the project would be sufficient, the applicant would request a Standards Variance. However, if the shared parking analysis determines that parking would be insufficient, resulting in a significant impact, the project would be required to meet the parking requirements, in accordance with the City's Zoning Regulations.
- A1.2 As indicated in Section 5.8, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR, the project proposes recreational and leisure amenities for potential residents including a podium garden with a swimming pool, lawn, garden alcove and clubhouse. Additionally, the townhouse units fronting the terrace garden would have private yards. A workout room and gym would be situated on the first and second floors of the Gateway Tower and a lap pool and sun deck would be provided on the roof. Additionally, the project would incorporate passive open space areas, including an elliptical paseo and forecourt area. Provision of recreational amenities would reduce the demand on park and recreational facilities in the area. Although the project does not propose development of a park, the proposed project would be required to pay park impact fees, as established by the City, to compensate for the impacts of the proposed project on park and recreational facilities. Chapter 18.18 of the *Long Beach Municipal Code* requires payment of park fees for parkland acquisition and recreation improvements, prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy for residential developments, as defined in the *Municipal Code*. The park fee imposed on residential development projects reflects the specific project's share of the cost of providing parkland and improvements to meet the needs created by the residential development at established City service level standards.
- A1.3 The traffic impacts resulting from filming and special events occurring within the downtown are not within the purview of the EIR. The Parks, Recreation and Marine Department issue special event permits. The Public Works Department coordinates with the Parks, Recreation and Marine Department regarding traffic management during large events. During construction of the proposed project the Public Works Department would coordinate with the Parks, Recreation and Marine Department



regarding special events. The Downtown Traffic and Parking Management Organization (PTMO) is a panel consisting of downtown businesses, organizations, property owners, property managers and other stakeholders, as well as City staff, which meets once a month to discuss issues such as special events and filming, which may impact traffic circulation and parking in the downtown area. Efforts would be made to minimize the impacts of traffic circulation and parking in the downtown area during construction of the proposed project through the PTMO.

- A1.4 Refer to Response to Comment A1.3.
- A1.5 As indicated in Section 5.4, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR, the proposed project would be required to comply with all mitigation measures, which specify compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations, as well as proper consultation with the City prior to grading activities. Implementation of the recommended mitigation regarding dust control techniques (e.g., daily watering), limitations on construction hours and adherence to SCAQMD Rules 402 and 403 (which require watering of inactive and perimeter areas, track out requirements, etc.) would reduce impacts of PM₁₀ fugitive dust. If the project is approved, a mitigation monitoring program would be adopted to ensure compliance with mitigation measures during project implementation.
- A1.6 Comment noted. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
08/08/2006 10:24 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Re: Shoreline

"Phil Appleby" <pappleby@applebyre.com>



"Phil Appleby"
<pappleby@applebyre.com>
08/08/2006 09:50 AM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Shoreline

Angela:

I am strong supporter of the Shoreline Gateway Project. The developer is quality and qualified; the project is attractive and well thought out with lots of open space; it is in keeping with the EV Guide for Development.

As a City we need to move from a good city to A GREAT CITY.

Please help in moving this very important project forward.

Thank you,

Phil Appleby

A2.1



A2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PHIL APPLEBY, DATED AUGUST 8, 2006.

- A2.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
08/14/2006 07:28 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Re: Construction at Ocean and Alamitos

"Stacie Beal" <beal.stacie@gmail.com>



"Stacie Beal"
<beal.stacie@gmail.com>
m>
08/10/2006 05:11 PM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Construction at Ocean and Alamitos

Hello,

I live at the intersection of E. First and Bonito which is two blocks from the proposed construction site of Ocean and Alamitos in downtown Long Beach, CA 90802. I not opposed to the plan of a 300 plus unit condominium building going in, but I would like to be assured there will be ample parking, and something done to improve the traffic flow in the area. I also work in Shoreline Village and know the area very well. We are already burdened with traffic and parking issues that could be improved by additional planning. Please let me know what I can do or where I can go to voice my concerns. Thank you

A3.1

Regards,
Stacie Beal

Office: 562-285-0151
Mobile: 916-730-0412
Fax: 562-285-0201
www.allstarloanteam.com

IMPORTANT/CONFIDENTIAL: This transmission is intended only for the use of the recipient(s) listed. It contains information that may be privileged, confidential and/or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient of this transmission, you are hereby notified that the copying, use, or distribution of any information or materials transmitted herewith is strictly prohibited. If you have received this transmission by mistake, please contact sender immediately.



A3. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM STACIE BEAL, DATED AUGUST 10, 2006.

A3.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR, analyzes the project's impacts on traffic and parking within the study area.

City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 06:10 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: EIR on Shoreline Gateway

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 06:10 PM -----



Patricia Bott
<patbottdesign@earthlink.net>
08/12/2006 12:05 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: EIR on Shoreline Gateway

Dear Angela,

Pat and I strongly support the Shoreline Gateway Project. It follows the goals of the East Village Arts District Guide for Development. The project is well thought out and would be a real boost to the redevelopment of downtown.

Thanks,

Larry and Pat Bott

A4.1



A4. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM LARRY AND PAT BOTT, DATED AUGUST 12, 2006.

- A4.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
07/27/2006 07:55 AM

To: gal@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Comment ILetter

I think this is regarding Shoreline Gateway.

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 07/26/2006 11:06 AM -----



pjbrockwoman@aol.co
m
07/26/2006 10:48 AM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Ocean Blvd.

I have lived in Long Beach since 1975 and used to love to drive down Ocean Blvd and actually see the ocean. With all the construction that has happen in the downtown area of Ocean Blvd all you now see is buildings. I think we are ruining the aesthetic look of Long Beach, but what really alarms me is the congestion of people and cars. At any given time there could be hundreds of thousand cars dumping onto Ocean Blvd. Would this be safe? Even with 3 lanes of traffic each way, this street would be very stressed.

A5.1

Ocean Blvd is a main route for Metro transportation. I ride the Passport twice weekly to the Catalina Landing station and am concerned how all this traffic will affect the timeliness of such transportation.

A5.2

I think the city should consider aesthetics and safety above saturation of buildings along Ocean Blvd. I think Ocean Blvd is going to quickly become a big parking lot! If people can't get around on Ocean they will start spilling onto the streets nearby, one of which is mine.

A5.3

Thanks for your time,
Patricia Brockman
955 E. 3rd St #303
Long Beach, CA 90802

Check out AOL.com today. Breaking news, video search, pictures, email and IM. All on demand. Always Free.



A5. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PATRICIA BROCKMAN, DATED JULY 26, 2006.

A5.1 Comment noted. The comment is an observation of existing aesthetic and traffic conditions by the comment's author and does not raise new environmental information or challenge information presented in the DEIR. The City of Long Beach will consider all comments on the proposed project during the decision-making process for the project. Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the aesthetic character of the area. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the local traffic system in the project vicinity.

A5.2 A traffic impact study was completed to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the local traffic system in the project vicinity. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the technical traffic analysis. The efficiency of traffic operations at a location is measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a description of traffic performance at intersections. It is based on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio. Levels range from A to F with A representing excellent (free-flow) conditions and F representing extreme congestion. The level of traffic during the peak hours at an intersection (volume) is compared to the amount of traffic that the intersection is able to carry (capacity). Intersections with vehicular volumes that are at or near capacity ($V/C \cong 1.0$) experience greater congestion and longer vehicle delays.

The traffic analysis conducted for this project analyzed nine intersections on Ocean Boulevard (refer to Table 5.3-3 of the Draft EIR). The traffic analysis indicates that the intersection of Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E) for existing conditions. For forecast year 2015, four intersections on Ocean Boulevard are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F) without project conditions (refer to Table 5.3-7 of the Draft EIR). With the addition of project-generated trips, these four intersections are forecast to continue to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F) for forecast year 2015 with project conditions (refer to Table 5.3-8). With the exception of the intersection of Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard, project related traffic would not contribute a V/C of 0.020 or more to critical movements, resulting in a less than significant impact at these intersections.

Project related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.02 to critical movements at the intersection of Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard during the AM peak hour, resulting in greater congestion and longer vehicle delays at the intersection. Because the Long Beach Passport utilizes the same roadways as other vehicular traffic on Ocean Boulevard, it is possible that the Passport could experience similar delays at this intersection.



The traffic impact analysis indicates that there are no feasible physical measures that would mitigate the project's impact to the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

A5.3 Comment noted. Refer to Response to Comment A5.1.



Craig Chalfant
07/27/2006 07:57 AM

To: gal@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Re: Ocean Blvd Project

We've received your comment...thanks

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
"Bill Fahey" <wfahey562@charter.net>



"Bill Fahey"
<wfahey562@charter.net>
07/26/2006 09:38 AM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Ocean Blvd Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

Re: Ocean/Alamitos project,

My main concern is the traffic congestion created. Have you ever driven down Wilshire Blvd. "High-Rise Corridor" between Westwood and Beverly Hills during rush hour? Quite a feat.

A6.1

I've lived on Ocean Blvd. (Harborplace Tower) since 1997 and have noticed since the Aqua Towers started move-ins recently that traffic as early as 6 AM has shown a noticeable increase.

A6.2

My other concern is the property value impact for Villa Riviera, International Tower and Harborplace Tower as views are obstructed.

A6.3

Another concern: property owner Aphrodite Akopiantz being offered so little for her property - only \$2,000,000 for 18,000 sq.ft? With property values here at about \$300-\$500/sq.ft on the low end, I find Anderson Pacific guilty of outright robbery!

A6.4

One solution: restrict building height to ten stories to minimize traffic and view obstruction impact.

A6.5

Sincerely,

William Fahey



A6. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM WILLIAM FAHEY, DATED JULY 26, 2006.

- A6.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A6.2 Comment noted. The comment is an observation of traffic conditions by the comment's author and does not challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the local traffic system in the project vicinity. No further response is necessary.
- A6.3 The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require analysis of economic and social effects of a project (i.e., property values), except where physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project. Property values are influenced by many factors such as mortgage interest rates, price inflation, supply and demand, cost of new housing construction, income trends and employment growth rates. The interaction of these factors can change over time and are not directly dependent on development of the project site. Section 5.2, Aesthetics/ Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the visual character of the site and surrounding area. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning, which allows for higher density mixed-uses within an unlimited height district. The analysis acknowledges that views of and across the project site would be altered, however, existing views would not be degraded, as development of high-rise uses would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area.
- A6.4 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A6.5 As indicated in Section 5.1, Land Use and Relevant Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project site is zoned Downtown Planned Development District (PD-30) and is located within an unlimited height district of PD-30. The proposed building heights are consistent with the unlimited height district and would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 04:02 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Shoreline Gateway

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 04:00 PM -----



"Eric Gray"
<ericg@ricom.net>
08/15/2006 03:39 PM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway

No Complaints, moving in down there. I say do it! It is going to be great for the Economic Boom of Downtown Long Beach!

A7.1

Eric Gray
RICOM INC

188-G Technology Drive
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel (949)-788-9939
Fax (949)-788-9940
www.ricom.net

You may reach me at EricGRICOM via Instant Messenger (MSN, Yahoo, AIM)
"For all your Cisco Systems, Dell, HP, Nortel Networks, Sun Microsystems, IBM needs..."



A7. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ERIC GRAY, DATED AUGUST 15, 2006.

- A7.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
08/11/2006 08:38 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Ocean and Alamitos Corner Project Concerns

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/10/2006 03:44 PM -----



Tammy Holden
<tammyandgeorge99@
yahoo.com>
08/08/2006 04:09 PM
Please respond to
tammyandgeorge99

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Ocean and Alamitos Corner Project Concerns

I am a liveaboard in the Shoreline Marina. I have concerns with this project that I feel need to be addressed.

The traffic is currently a problem at that intersection. Turning from Ocean Blvd to Shoreline Drive currently you sometimes need to wait for the light to change several times. Sometimes only one or two cars get through the light at a time. With much more traffic at that intersection this needs to be addressed. Also at the Ocean Blvd and Pine intersection. It is the same. That intersection was impacted by the Pike and nothing has been done yet. This needs to be addressed also.

A8.1

I am also concerned about more pollution in the area from cars.

A8.2

The biggest impact on us is the Long Beach Cafe. This is where we eat breakfast, sometimes lunch and dinner 7 days a week. This is like our private kitchen. There are no other restaurants in the area even close to being similar to go to when the restaurant is gone. Their prices and good food is hard to beat. I feel this restaurant should be given special consideration to have a place in the new towers but not at the high rents that the new buildings will probably get. This will put the costs of eating a good meal too pricy. Also parking should be a consideration for the new Long Beach Cafe should they open another restaurant in the new towers. Like a special section for only Long Beach Cafe customers to be able to go straight in and easy out without paying for parking. We will miss this restaurant while the construction is going on if they should open another restaurant in the new towers. They should be built out first so they can open first.

A8.3

I also own a Real Estate and Loan business in Shoreline Village. I do not want the traffic at that intersection to impact my clients trying to come to Shoreline Village.

A8.4

Thank you
Tammy Holden
Sea Lion Real Estate
419Q Shoreline Village Drive
Long Beach, CA 90802
www.SeaLionRealEstate

office (562)285-0200

cell (562)787-6218

fax (562)285-0201



A8. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM TAMMY HOLDEN, DATED AUGUST 8, 2006.

A8.1 The comment is an observation of traffic conditions by the comment's author and does not raise new environmental information or challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. A traffic impact study was completed to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the local traffic system in the project vicinity. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the technical traffic analysis. As indicated in Draft EIR, the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E) under existing conditions. The traffic analysis indicates that the intersection would operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015 without project conditions. With the addition of project-generated trips, the intersection would continue to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015. However, project related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.02 to critical movements during the AM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact, according to the City of Long Beach performance criteria. The analysis indicates that there are no feasible physical measures that would mitigate the project's impact to the intersection. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

The Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard intersection is currently operating at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) under existing conditions. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the Pine Avenue and Ocean Boulevard intersection would operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E) during the PM peak hour for forecast year 2015 without project conditions. With the addition of project-generated trips, the intersection would continue to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E) during the PM peak hour for forecast year 2015. The project would not contribute a V/C of 0.02 or more to critical movements; therefore, project impacts would be less than significant, according to the City of Long Beach performance criteria.

A8.2 The comment does not raise new environmental information or challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. The air quality analysis (Section 5.4 of the Draft EIR) conducted for this project assessed regional and localized emissions based on project-generated traffic. As shown in Table 5.4-6 of the Draft EIR, project-related pollutant emissions associated with vehicular traffic would not contribute to significant regional emissions. Carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations are usually indicative for the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator if its impacts upon the local air quality. A CO hotspots analysis was conducted at 12 intersections within the project vicinity based upon SCAQMD criteria. Table 5.4-7 of the Draft EIR indicates anticipated CO levels within the area. As indicated in Table 5.4-7, CO levels would be below State and Federal standards with implementation of the proposed project. Additionally, Table 5.4-8 of the Draft EIR indicates that CO levels associated with the proposed parking structure would also be below State and Federal standards.



- A8.3 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A8.4 Refer to Response to Comment A8.1.



Craig Chalfant
08/10/2006 12:07 PM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: concerns for the Ocean and Alamitos project

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/10/2006 12:01 PM -----



Tammy Holden
<tammyandgeorge99@
yahoo.com>
08/09/2006 04:31 PM
Please respond to
tammyandgeorge99

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: concerns for the Ocean and Alamitos project

I know I sent another email yesterday.

I just want you to know that I am for the development of Long Beach for higher density but I think it needs to be done in a way so that the impact of more traffic and the need for more parking is handled.

I feel that the idea of going to higher towers and less towers is better and need to have more parking. I'm sure you are aware of the parking issues and lack of parking for the Pike and lack of parking for downtown just in general. I think that if the new developments developed more parking then needed for their project and also rented parking by the month to the general public to solve some of the general parking problems to the current people that live here now that would be great.

A9.1

The traffic problems need to be handled. What happened to the approval of the Ocean and Alamitos intersection to have the Alamitos and Shoreline Drive going under Ocean Blvd? I know this would be an expensive project but very necessary to handle the additional traffic that would be brought into the area. If you build very high density condos and more shopping, people will not come to shop except for the people that live there because of traffic problems. People do not want to come somewhere that has traffic problems everytime they come there. If you want to promote shopping there and for more people to come from other areas to spend money here you need to make it easy for them to get here and out of here.

A9.2

I actually appreciate the fact that the city wants to re-develop the downtown area, but it needs to be for the benefit of the local merchants and local people that live here and will live here. It needs to be a pleasant place to live and shop or people will go away in time and become a bad place because the people you want to attract to live here will go elsewhere where they can be comfortable and not stressed by all the high density, traffic, wasted time and frustration.

A9.3

I am also a Real Estate Broker in the local area with my office at Shoreline Village. I don't want to see the values of real estate go down in the future because of poor planning on the cities part now of the new developments.

A9.4

I am very concerned also about the developer. I feel that the developer that was chosen is only concerned with making money and leaving since he does not live in the area or even the state. I think he needs to be concerned with what is good for our city and not just his pocket book and run.

The fact that Long Beach also has a lot of historic buildings that actually are surrounding the project, the style and building materials need to be selected accordingly. Let's not have anymore buildings built like the Aqua towers, that look like ghetto buildings from Chicago, New York or Miami. Totally out of place and poor quality. Let's concentrate on building more high end buildings especially for the fact that we are on Ocean Blvd. People buying condos with an Ocean view expect higher end properties with high quality, not poor quality.

I would like to be invited to any meetings in regards to this project before it is approved as final. Please let me know where and when they might be.

Thank you
Tammy Holden
Sea Lion Real Estate
419Q Shoreline Village Drive
Long Beach, CA 90802
Office (562)285-0200
fax (562)285-0201
cell (562)787-6218
email tammyandgeorge99@yahoo.com
www.SeaLionRealEstate.com

A9.5



A9. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM TAMMY HOLDEN, DATED AUGUST 9, 2006.

- A9.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR analyzes the project's impact on parking within the study area. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A9.2 Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR analyzes the project's impact on traffic within the study area. As indicated in Section 5.3, implementation of the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the Alamitos Avenue/7th Street and Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersections, based on the City's performance criteria. City staff has studied potential improvements to the Alamitos/7th Street and Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersections to determine if physical or significant operational changes could be made to accommodate additional traffic and/or provide acceptable future levels of service during peak hours. The proximity of existing development, one-way streets and spacing between intersections, limit options for providing additional capacity at the Alamitos Avenue and 7th Street intersection without significant property acquisition. At the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection, the proximity of existing developments along Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard limit the possibility of widening the at-grade intersection without a significant loss of parking to the east of the intersection or large-scale property acquisition. Additionally, the City has determined that a grade separation of the streets (as recommended in the *General Plan*) would not be practical due to the proximity of existing uses (i.e., Villa Riviera and International Tower), as well as the number of access driveways near the intersection. Therefore, improvements along the Alamitos and Ocean corridors would be limited to physical changes within the existing right-of-way and operational or policy-based changes.
- A9.3 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A9.4 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



- A9.5 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. Section 5.7, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR analyzes the proposed project's impact on historical resources (also refer to the Revised Historic Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (August 2006), which is included in Appendix 15.6 of the Final EIR). City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
07/27/2006 10:32 AM

To: gal@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Development

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 07/26/2006 05:23 PM -----



"ROBERT JACKSON
SR"
<mrmarquis2004@msn.com>
07/26/2006 02:01 PM
To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Development

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

I am a resident at 600 East Ocean, in an apartment facing East Ocean Blvd. with a great view of Signal Hill and the mountains. I understand there will be several high rise buildings put up on the site across the street, after demolition of the current structures. Will there be view corridors between these new buildings, or will my current view be entirely destroyed? Is there some kind of a drawing of the plan which is available to the public? Is there some kind of time frame planned for all this demolition to begin, followed by the construction of the new buildings? During construction will there be consideration given to the current residents of the nearby buildings, construction hours, noise abatement, etc?

A10.1

I would appreciate any answers which you might have to my current questions. I will be delighted with any improvement to our lovely part of the city. Thank you in advance for your effort in answering my questions.

A10.2

Sincerely,

Robert J. G. Jackson, Sr.
600 E. Ocean Blvd. #807
Long Beach, Ca. 90802
562-901-9905



**A10. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ROBERT J. G. JACKSON, SR.,
DATED JULY 26, 2006.**

A10.1 Development of the project, as proposed, would alter views of and across the project site. The extent of view alteration would vary depending upon the proximity of the viewer to the project site. The proposed heights and orientation of the buildings would provide view corridors between the buildings. Section 3.0, Project Description and Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR, provide several exhibits illustrating the proposed project.

As indicated in Section 3.0 of the Draft EIR, it is anticipated that the proposed project would be completed in one phase with an estimated demolition time of two months, shoring/excavation time of four months and an estimated construction time of approximately 24 to 28 months.

Section 5.5, Noise, of the Draft EIR, address short-term construction noise impacts resulting from grading and construction activities associated with the proposed project. The project site is surrounded by residential and commercial land uses. The nearest residential development is the Artaban Building, located to the west, which is approximately 100 feet away. According to Table 5.5-7 of the Draft EIR, at 100 feet noise levels would be at approximately 86 dBA. This would exceed the City's noise standards of 60 dBA at any period of time. Construction-related noise levels would only occur during daytime hours. According to Section 8.80.202 of the *Municipal Code*, during the week (including Federal holidays) construction activities are limited between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. On weekends, construction activities are limited to 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Saturdays and are prohibited on Sundays, unless a City issued Work Permit is authorized. Implementation of the recommended mitigation (i.e., engine muffling, placement of construction equipment and strategic stockpiling and staging of construction vehicles) and compliance with the *Municipal Code* requirements, would serve to reduce exposure to significant noise levels. Although short-term construction noise would be reduced, periodic noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable based on the projected noise levels at residential uses surrounding the project.

A10.2 Comment noted. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
07/31/2006 12:55 PM

To: gal@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Comments as part of the public record for the Shoreline Gateway project (SCH# 2—5121066).

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 07/31/2006 10:45 AM -----



jlandau
<jklandau@yahoo.com
>
07/31/2006 10:30 AM

To: Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Comments as part of the public record for the Shoreline Gateway project (SCH# 2—5121066).

Angela Reynolds AICP
Environmental and community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd 7th floor
Long Beach, Ca 90802
E-mail Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov

<?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Dear Angela,

Please record my comments as part of the public record for the Shoreline Gateway project (SCH# 2—5121066).

A11.1

Below I have listed multiple impacts, which the report offers no, weak, or ill-prepared mitigation efforts. Most of these points related to construction related activities. The weaknesses will result in intolerable conditions to neighboring residential communities that are located in very close proximity to this project.

A11.2

Section 8

Traffic and Circulation
TR4 Atlantic Avenue and Ocean Blvd –Right turning phases are required to support Westbound traffic as well as Eastbound.

A11.3

AIR QUALITY
AQ1

Onsite vehicles speed shall be limited to 15miles per hour seems excessive and should be reduced to 12.

A11.4

Periodic watering and or stabilizing of on site roads prior to paving should be inspected daily and watered on a fixed schedule, dependent on the inspection.

A11.5

If dust is visibly generated that travels beyond the site boundariesduring period of high winds should be determined in this document at a rate of 12mph. The wording leads the passage open to interpretation of what constitutes a high wind. Even light winds will have an impact on residential areas surrounding the site.

A11.6

NOISE

Short term construction noise Impacts

Construction hours allowable workdays shall be limited from 8am to 6pm Monday thru Friday and 10am – 4pm Saturdays. Construction should not be allowed on Sundays and holidays.

A11.7

Sincerely

Joseph K Landau
700 E ocean blvd unit 1802
Long beach Ca 90802



A11. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOSEPH K. LANDAU, DATED JULY 31, 2006.

A11.1 Comment noted. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

A11.2 The comment makes a general statement that the Draft EIR offers no, weak or ill-prepared mitigation efforts, mostly related to construction related activities. The following responses address each item identified by the commenter.

A11.3 Right-turn phasing (giving right-turning traffic a green arrow) can only be provided if there is a dedicated right-turn lane for the approach. At the Atlantic Avenue and Ocean Boulevard intersection, only the southbound approach has a dedicated right-turn lane. In general, a dedicated right-turn lane would allow traffic to be given a right-turn protected overlap signal (southbound right-turns are signaled to go while the eastbound left-turns have their green arrow), as well as being allowed to turn when the southbound left-turn traffic has its green signal. Since there is no dedicated right-turn lane for westbound traffic, no westbound right-turn signal can be provided. In addition, the westbound right-turn volume is not significantly increased by the proposed project and the curb lane does not have the limited queue storage issue as identified with the eastbound left-turn lane. Since the proposed project does not have a significant impact on capacity at the Atlantic Avenue and Ocean Boulevard intersection based on the City's performance criteria, no change to the existing signal operation for westbound traffic is proposed.

A11.4 Pursuant to Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has identified a speed limit of 15 miles per hour (mph) for on-site construction vehicles. This speed limit is adequate to reduce short-term fugitive dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors. In addition to the speed limit, all non-paved on-site construction haul routes must be watered twice daily to reduce dust from moving vehicles. On-site construction mitigation pursuant to Rule 403 are subject to periodic inspections by both the City and SCAQMD.

A three mph reduction in the on-site speed limit would be nominal and there is no evidence to indicate that the reduction in speed would result in a greater reduction of short-term fugitive dust.

A11.5 Refer to Response to Comment A11.4.

A11.6 Pursuant to Rule 403 (Fugitive Dust), the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has identified high winds as winds greater than 25 mph averaged over one hour. Clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities that are generating dust would be required to cease during periods of high wind or during Stage 1 or Stage 2 smog



episodes. The Draft EIR specifically identifies the definition of high winds as winds greater than 25 mph averaged over one hour.

- A11.7 The City of Long Beach *Municipal Code* regulates construction activities within the City. Section 8.80.202 of the *Municipal Code* limits construction activities during the week (including Federal holidays) between the hours of 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. On weekends, construction activities are limited to between 9:00 AM and 6:00 PM on Saturdays and are prohibited on Sundays, unless a Work Permit is authorized.



Craig Chalfant
08/08/2006 10:16 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Concerned resident

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 07/25/2006 04:33 PM -----



Heidi Maerker
<Pressrelease@herald
publications.com>
07/22/2006 11:20 AM

To: <Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov>, <Siouxja@aol.com>,
<Suja@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Concerned resident

Dear Ms. Reynolds and Ms. Lowenthal,

I am writing to you with my concerns regarding the EIR report on the Shoreline Gateway project.

I have lived in the Villa Riviera for over 20 years and in this time traffic as continuously worsened.

The EIR report shows that the LOS for our corner, Ocean/Alamitos/Shoreline is supposed to get worse from our current grade of E, to F.

This will negatively affect our health, noise levels, property value and quality of life in Long Beach.

Enough is enough. Heidi Maerker

A12.1

A12.2

A12.3



A12. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM HEIDI MAERKER, DATED JULY 22, 2006.

A12.1 Comment noted. The comment is an observation of traffic conditions by the comment's author and does not raise new environmental information or challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.

A12.2 The comment summarizes findings made within the Draft EIR and does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. It should be noted that the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E) under existing conditions. The traffic analysis indicates that the intersection would operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015 without project conditions. With the addition of project-generated trips, the intersection would continue to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015. However, project related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.02 to critical movements during the AM peak hour, resulting in a significant impact, according to the City of Long Beach performance criteria. The analysis indicates that there are no feasible physical measures that would mitigate the project's impact to the intersection. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

A12.3 The comment does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. The air quality analysis (Section 5.4 of the Draft EIR) conducted for this project assessed regional and localized emissions based on project-generated traffic. As shown in Table 5.4-6 of the Draft EIR, project-related pollutant emissions associated with vehicular traffic would not contribute to significant regional emissions. Carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations are usually indicative for the local air quality generated by a roadway network and are used as an indicator if its impacts upon the local air quality. A CO hotspots analysis was conducted at 12 intersections within the project vicinity based upon SCAQMD criteria. Table 5.4-7 of the Draft EIR indicates anticipated CO levels within the area. As indicated in Table 5.4-7, CO levels would be below State and Federal standards with implementation of the proposed project. Additionally, Table 5.4-8 of the Draft EIR indicates that CO levels associated with the proposed parking structure would also be below State and Federal standards.

The noise analysis conducted for this project assessed the increased traffic noise in the area resulting from the proposed project. The project would increase noise levels on the surrounding roadways by a maximum of 4.3 dBA, which is below the established threshold of 5.0 dBA. Therefore, the project would not result in significant mobile noise impacts on surrounding roadways.



The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require analysis of economic and social effects of a project (i.e., property values), except where physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project. Property values are influenced by many factors such as mortgage interest rates, price inflation, supply and demand, cost of new housing construction, income trends and employment growth rates. The interaction of these factors can change over time and are not directly dependent on development of the project site.

Quality of life is a general term and is usually based on several factors that can vary across populations. Typically, quality of life refers to overall well being with access to goods and services (i.e., transportation, police and fire services, water, schools) and environmental health (i.e., air quality, noise). These issues are addressed throughout the environmental analysis sections of the Draft EIR.

COMMENT NO. A13



Craig Chalfant

08/03/2006 02:04 PM

To: gal@rbf.com

cc:

Subject: Shoreline Gateway

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/01/2006 04:04 PM -----



tm82delorean@netscape.net

08/01/2006 02:45 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

cc:

Subject: Shoreline Gateway

Thank you for planning to make my life safer and better overall, via the Shoreline Gateway.

I live just east of the intersection containing the Cafe and the defunct video store. I have to walk through that area to get downtown, and am regularly accosted by panhandlers, bums and other questionable individuals. Late at night is the worst - I say a prayer and smile when I make it home safely.

Something has to be done about that corner, and I thank you for trying!

Please don't listen to the naysayers. I don't know why they'd want to keep that intersection an eyesore and a safety hazard. Perhaps that is where their drug dealer hangs out?

Sincerely,
Tom McCoy
1250 E. Ocean Blvd

A13.1



A13. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM TOM McCOY, DATED AUGUST 1, 2006.

- A13.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 06:06 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Shoreline Gateway

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 06:06 PM -----



AnaMariaMcGuan@aol
.com
08/13/2006 10:43 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc: Patrick_West@longbeach.gov, suzanne_frick@longbeach.gov
Subject: Shoreline Gateway

Angela:

On July 29, we met with our Councilwoman Suja Lowenthal regarding the proposed Shoreline Gateway development. We seemed to come to some meeting of the minds. Here are, in general, the points we all seemed to agree. I would like to make it part of my comments to the EIR on the development proposed.

Challenges:

- Traffic will worsen from an LOS of E to F by 2015 and there is NO mitigation in sight proposed or suggested by the EIR. Do we know what it will be by 2020, 2050? | **A14.1**
- Structural improvements to the intersection are not considered by the EIR beyond right of way suggestions, mostly in place already. | **A14.2**
- The EIR is written in such a way that it does not offer alternatives or studies other solutions besides telling us there is no mitigation. | **A14.3**
- Commercial development seems to be set for failure if traffic and parking cannot be mitigated. Commercial tenants/Owners would depend only in business generated by residents of the building that houses them or those neighbors within walking distance. | **A14.4**
- Foot traffic improvements don't seem to be addressed in the EIR | **A14.5**
- Contrary to recommendations in the City's Master Plan, walking between different developments along Shoreline/Ocean Blvd /East Village don't seem people friendly, and the EIR offers no solutions or studies alternatives. | **A14.6**
- Parking is not being addressed in a realistic manner, density will be increased, yet the parking proposed does not seem to address the actual need. | **A14.7**
- It was suggested to vacate Lime and establish a "Parking Mitigation Fund" with the proceeds. Funds to be used to find parking solutions for downtown. And having the City require that the developer add parking to help area residents parking needs. | **A14.8**

Development being proposed:

- Proposed design of the compound seems mandated exclusively by utilitarian/economic reasons. | **A14.9**
- Proposed design does not measure up to the importance, historical and pivotal location, of that intersection, Shoreline/Alamitos & Ocean.
- Proposed volumetric design is not grand, much less iconic, does not befit its location nor

does it measure up to its neighbors' architectural significance, the International Towers and the Villa Riviera. The most touted "stepping down" design of the volumes proposed seem to be opposite of what good design would call for.

- The highest most dense tower lacks set backs, to be more esthetically pleasing and to keep up with the characteristics of the Boulevard. Harbor Tower was mentioned as being under-valued, despite of location, because of its lack of main entrance set backs.
- Proposed design needs to be challenged, needs to break its self-imposed glass ceiling. It needs to take advantage of its privileged location. A great opportunity to come up with excellence of design for that significant location seems to be wasted by what's currently proposed.
- Proposed project fails, falls short at least, to recognize the historical significance of its setting, in particular Alamitos.
- Shoreline Gateway or Shoreline GoAway? :)

Overall, we could say with certainty that we all agreed that we welcome development of a Shoreline Gateway, with its increased density, interesting heights and exceptional architecture befitting its location. But we also asked that solutions to the challenges are pursued at the same time and with the same interest.

Ana Maria McGuan
562.436.4732



A14. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ANA MARIA MCGUAN, DATED AUGUST 13, 2006.

A14.1 The Draft EIR indicates that the intersection of Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E). Although 14 study intersections are forecasted to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F) for forecast year 2015 without the proposed project, only the Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue/Broadway intersections would worsen from LOS E under existing conditions to LOS F. For forecast year 2015 with the proposed project, 14 study area intersections are forecast to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS E or F). Of the 14 intersections, only the Lime Avenue and 3rd Street intersection would worsen from LOS E to LOS F with the proposed project. Based on City of Long Beach performance criteria, this is not considered a significant impact; also refer to Response to Comment A14.2.

The traffic analysis for the Shoreline Gateway Project analyzes traffic impacts at the time the project components are developed and occupied (year 2015). Future traffic analysis beyond 2015 would be under the purview of separate future development proposals submitted to the City of Long Beach.

A14.2 The Draft EIR indicates that the intersection of Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard is forecast to operate at a LOS F for forecast year 2015 without the proposed project. The intersection would continue to operate at a LOS F for forecast year 2015 with the proposed project. However, project-related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.020 to critical movements (AM peak hour only), resulting in a significant impact. The intersection of Alamitos Avenue and 7th Street is forecast to operate at a LOS E for forecast year 2015 without the proposed project. The intersection is forecast to operate at a LOS F for forecast year 2015 with the proposed project. Based on City of Long Beach performance criteria, this is not considered a significant impact. However, project-related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.020 to critical movements (PM peak hour only), resulting in a significant impact.

As indicated in the Draft EIR, City staff has studied potential improvements to the intersections to determine if physical (structural) or significant operation changes could be made to accommodate additional traffic and/or provide acceptable future levels of service during peak hours. The proximity of existing development, one-way streets and spacing between intersections, limit options for providing additional capacity at the Alamitos Avenue and 7th Street intersection without significant property acquisition. At the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection, the proximity of existing developments along Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard limit the possibility of widening the at-grade intersection without a significant loss of parking to the east of the intersection or large-scale property acquisition.



Additionally, the City has determined that a grade separation of the streets (as recommended in the *General Plan*) would not be practical due to the proximity of existing uses (i.e., Villa Riviera and International Tower), as well as the number of access driveways near the intersections. Therefore, improvements along the Alamitos and Ocean corridors would be limited to physical changes within the existing right-of-way and operational or policy-based changes.

Operational or policy-based changes may improve overall traffic conditions, but would not affect the volume-to-capacity calculation on which the impact criteria are based. Therefore, the project impact cannot be mitigated based on the City's analysis criteria.

- A14.3 Refer to Response to Comments A14.1 and A14.2. Mitigation requiring the project applicant to provide a rooftop camera to monitor real-time traffic operations along the Alamitos Avenue, Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard corridors has been provided to enhance traffic management and safety.
- A14.4 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. It should be noted parking impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level; refer to Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR.
- A14.5 Pedestrian improvements are addressed in Section 5.1 of the Draft EIR, in regards to the project's consistency with the City's *General Plan* and redevelopment planning documents. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the project proposes landscaping and pedestrian paths throughout the site, including transforming the relocated Bronze Way alley into a pedestrian path connecting proposed walk-up townhouse units to existing residential uses to the north. The proposed public paseo area would provide pedestrian access from uses to the north to Ocean Boulevard. The project would be required to comply with the City's Zoning Regulations in regards to providing/maintaining sidewalks for pedestrian use around the site.
- A14.6 The concept of "people friendly" walkability is subjective. The Draft EIR addresses the project's impact on pedestrian circulation and accessibility based on the project's consistency with the goals and polices established in the City's *General Plan* and redevelopment planning documents. The project was found to be consistent with the City's *General Plan* and redevelopment planning documents, resulting in a less than significant impact.
- A14.7 Section 5.3 of the Draft EIR addresses on- and off-site parking. The City's Zoning Regulations determine the number of parking spaces required based on proposed uses. The parking analysis indicates that the amount of parking currently proposed would result in a parking deficit



of 107 spaces without shared commercial/residential parking and 73 spaces with shared commercial/residential parking. The project applicant would be required to complete a shared parking analysis to determine if the amount of parking proposed is sufficient. If the shared parking analysis determines that parking would be insufficient, the project would be required to meet the parking requirements, in accordance with the City's Zoning Regulations.

- A14.8 Comment noted. The comment is a suggestion regarding establishing a "Parking Mitigation Fund". City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A14.9 Comment noted. The comment is subjective and addresses the design of the project. The commenter does not raise new environmental information. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. Refer to the Revised Historic Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (August 2006), which addresses these issues and is included in Appendix 15.6 of the Final EIR). No further response is necessary.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 05:53 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Comments to Shoreline Gateway EIR

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 05:52 PM -----



"William McKinnon"
<mail@williammckinnon.com>
08/14/2006 04:45 PM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Comments to Shoreline Gateway EIR

Angela

Please confirm receipt.

Thank you

William McKinnon

Kristen Autry

A15.1



A15. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM WILLIAM MCKINNON AND KRISTEN AUTRY, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.

A15.1 The correspondence requests confirmation of receipt, however no comments are provided. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
08/11/2006 08:40 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: EIR on Shoreline Gateway

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/10/2006 03:44 PM -----



Patricia Paris
<patparisart@yahoo.com>
m>
08/08/2006 09:26 AM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc: patparis@applebyre.com, pappleby@applebyre.com
Subject: EIR on Shoreline Gateway

Dear Angela,

This email serves as a written response to the EIR for Shoreline Gateway.

The EIR references The East Village Arts District Guide strategies on page 3-5 of the report.

I personally support the Anderson project as it follows the goals and visions defined in the East Village Arts District Guide for Development and urge the City and the RDA to approve this project and do whatever negotiations are needed to transform this blighted corner of the East Village.

I speak for all those residents, property owners, businesses, and participants who spent over a year and a half providing the vital information that helped to compile the plan for the East Village Arts District.

This plan was overwhelmingly supported by the public who participated in development of the plan and the City Council who adopted the plan in 1996. In October of this year, the plan will have been in use for 10 years. It will be a milestone and a positive testament to those who supported and continue to support the plan. It has been an instrument to assist in the change and transform a blighted neighborhood into a energized economic growth area. The area's improvements have been in part, a direct result of this plan. It is working, continues to work, and all the goals set forth should continue until completion.

On page 50 and 51, of the guide, Design Specifications are spelled out and while the current developer is not placing a 500 room hotel, they have actually improved on the concept by adding housing, artist live-work units and pedestrian friendly walkways. These developers have shown their interest in following existing goals and are not trying to force upon the public a development that does not speak to the original community plan.

Ten years is a long time to wait to see development happen. We must not forget the original plan and the goals and visions of the people who are still here

A16.1

patiently waiting to see all of the ideas listed in the East Village Guide for Development, finally developed and completed.

A16.1

Sincerely,

Pat Paris Appleby

*Past East Village Arts District, Inc. President

*Past East Village Association Participant in development of the

East Village Guide for Development

*Past Central Project Area Committee Chairwoman

*Current Central Project Area Committee Vice Chair



A16. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PAT PARIS APPLEBY, DATED AUGUST 8, 2006.

- A16.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant

07/18/2006 04:28 PM

To: gal@rbf.com

CC:

Subject: SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Report & Notice of Public



ripulido@verizon.net

07/18/2006 01:17 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

CC:

Subject: SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT: Draft Environmental Impact Report & Notice of Public

To Whom It May Concern:

I fully support the building of the Shoreline Gateway Project proposed by Anderson Pacific. I support this project for the following reasons:

Upscale Residential Housing - The city of Long Beach has indicated the need for additional housing in downtown. This project fulfills that need.

Upscale Retail - By adding additional upscale residential units, I believe this will attract more retail. "Retail Follows Residential" Retail in the form of cafes, art galleries, cleaners, shops, boutiques, and national chain stores will benefit the community.

Infill Development - The current site for the Shoreline Gateway is a critical location for downtown Long Beach and should have an iconic tower(s), which showcases our city in a positive fashion. In fact, I believe that the Shoreline Gateway should be taller! Currently, the decaying video store and its parking lot is an eyesore. The video store is rundown and its parking lot is full of litter. Why doesn't anyone complain about that? Also, the residential low-rise apartments on the site are dilapidated. Ocean Boulevard deserves better than that. A more dense urban design, high-rise tower(s) would be a better fit for downtown Long Beach.

Iconic Tower - Currently, the only towers on that corner are the International Tower and Villa Riviera. The International Tower is the only tower (on that corner) that is somewhat interesting, as it has height and its architecture is unique. The Villa Riviera is nice from a distance but as you get close, you notice that the façade is in need of MAJOR repair and the original copper roof has turned GREEN. If the residents of the Villa Riviera tower have any issues with the Shoreline Gateway project, I am surprised that they don't have issues with the existing rundown dilapidated corner across the street, or the Gas Station directly across the street, and not to mention their own tower, which needs MAJOR repair. That tower deserves more care than what is currently being provided. I think that the Amazing architecture of the Shoreline Gateway is better than a rundown video store, rundown apartments, and a gas station.

Local downtown residents, like myself, choose to live downtown for the convenience of being able to live, work and play locally. We choose to live in an urban environment and do not want to force suburban mentalities onto a progressive downtown Long Beach revitalization. If people do not like high-rise towers they shouldn't live in one and/or move away from them. Long Beach has many neighborhoods where high-rise urban areas do not exist. I believe that high-density, high-rise structures have a place and that place should be downtown Long Beach. We need to ENHANCE our skyline and I believe that this project will do just that! Please do away with surface parking lots, rundown structures, progress forward and don't let NIMBY mentality

A17.1

stifle the progress that this great city has garnered.

Regards,

Ricardo Pulido
388 E. Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90802

A17.1



A17. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM RICARDO PULIDO, DATED JULY 18, 2006.

- A17.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 05:51 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Project

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 05:51 PM -----



Jeff Rossignol
<mrjeffross@yahoo.com>
m>
08/15/2006 03:31 AM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Project

Hello,
I am sending you this in regards to the proposed Shoreline Gateway Project located on the corner of Ocean Blvd. and Alamitos.
I've seen the presentation by Andreson (?) for the "stacked" structures to be developed at this corner and I just want to state that in my opinion it is a terrible, terrible idea and I am greatly opposed to it. It would be very sad to see such a tall development completely block from sight one of this city's most beloved sites, the historical Villa Riviera, from view of most all angles facing south. Are you aware of how many residents cherish their view of this grand landmark? Why hide it with just another tall, modern building that will never hold the significance to the city of Long Beach that the Villa does?
It seems this project is only to benefit those specifically involved with the development, rather than to serve the community. It is this community that will be defaced and having to suffer the consequences of this action. Sometimes building more and more and bigger and bigger is not a solution to successful development of a desirable community, it often leads to its demise. Please don't forget what it is about Long Beach that makes it such a great city before it's too late.
Thank you in advance for your time in this matter.
J. Rossignol

A18.1

A18.2

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>



A18. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM J. ROSSIGNOL, DATED AUGUST 15, 2006.

A18.1 Comment noted. The comment does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Section 5.2, Aesthetics/ Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the visual character of the site and surrounding area. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning, which allows for higher density mixed-uses within an unlimited height district. The analysis acknowledges that views of and across the project site would be altered, however, existing views would not be degraded, as development of high-rise uses would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area; refer to the Revised Historic Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (August 2006), which is included in Appendix 15.6 of the Final EIR. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

A18.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information provided in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

August 12, 2006
Long Beach, California

Angela Reynolds, AICP, Planning Officer,
City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd., 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA, 90802
angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

RE: SCH No. 2005121006
Public Review Draft Environmental Impact Report
SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT

Dear Ms Reynolds:

Please consider my comments on the above-captioned DEIR.

In short, the project's effects on traffic have been understated due to inadequate consideration of cumulative projects.

As stated at "4.0 Basis of Cumulative Impacts," per *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130(b), a discussion of cumulative impacts should include:

1. *Either:*

- a. *A list of past, present and possible future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the Agency, or*
- b. *A summary of projections contained in an adopted General Plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.*

A19.1

The EIR, at "Table 4.1 Cumulative Projects List," provides a "summarized description" of projects which were considered in the cumulative analysis, but it is unclear which, if either, of the above-cited items from *CEQA Guidelines* is utilized. The list includes projects which are merely "entitled," are "preliminary" or "unoccupied," but omits mention of any *past* projects. This would indicate that *Guideline "a"* is not considered. On the other hand, although the "summarized description" may have been a part of some "adopted General Plan or related planning document," or otherwise be intended to conform to the intent of *Guideline "b,"* there is no indication in the EIR of how this list of

projects relates to any evaluation of “regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.”

A19.1

In either event, nowhere in the description of projects is there any mention of projects—“past, present or possible future” or “adopted or certified”—which are located to the *east* of Alamitos Avenue. Examples of such projects include Villa Riviera (800 E. Ocean), The Pacific (850 E. Ocean), Ocean Club (1000 E. Ocean) and many other high-density Residential projects on Ocean Boulevard extending toward Redondo Avenue. (This is only a partial list, and does not include projects which may be in the vicinity but north of Ocean Blvd.). Such a large number of projects, the source of thousands of daily vehicle trips through the impacted intersections and certainly an exacerbation of the cumulative traffic impacts should not be overlooked. Their omission from consideration in the EIR results in no other conclusion than that the Cumulative Impacts analysis is inadequate to *CEQA Guidelines*

A19.2

Therefore, the conclusion that there can be no mitigation of traffic impacts at the intersections of Alamitos Avenue at Ocean Boulevard and of Alamitos Avenue at Seventh Street, although recognized to be unsuitable for mitigation, have been dramatically understated.

A19.3

If the EIR were to have followed the applicable *CEQA Guidelines* for analysis of Cumulative Impacts and included an accurate and honest list of cumulative projects, the true degree of impacts, which by the EIR’s admission cannot be mitigated, would be available for the public and other decision makers when weighing the value of the project versus the damage of the impacts. As it stands, the EIR does not provide sufficient information for such analysis, cannot be relied upon, and does not meet *CEQA Guidelines* and should be rejected or corrected and re-circulated.

A19.4

Regards,



Gary Shelton
1243 E. Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90802

562-590-9520
mrgshelton@yahoo.com



A19. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM GARY SHELTON, DATED AUGUST 12, 2006.

A19.1 The cumulative projects list includes past, present and probable future projects, which would produce related or cumulative impacts, in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130(b). Past projects are represented by projects, which have been constructed, but are not currently occupied. Present projects are represented by projects, which are currently under construction, or entitlements are final. Probable future projects are represented by projects that are in the preliminary stages.

A19.2 The study area for the traffic analysis includes 68 intersections, which were determined by the City of Long Beach to be most likely to experience potentially significant impacts from the proposed project. Six of the study intersections are located east of Alamitos Avenue with two of the six study intersections located on Ocean Boulevard; refer to Exhibit 5.3-1, Study Area Intersections, of the Draft EIR. Existing intersection counts were taken in the AM and PM peak-hour period to determine the existing operation of the study intersections. The intersection counts represent existing traffic that routes through the study area. Existing traffic includes traffic generated by occupied development within the study area.

Traffic conditions for forecast year 2015 without the proposed project were generated by applying ambient traffic growth to existing traffic volumes plus growth in traffic volumes generated by the cumulative projects provided in Section 4.0, Basis of Cumulative Analysis, of the Draft EIR. To determine the impacts of the proposed project, project-generated trips were added to forecast year 2015 without-project traffic volumes. Therefore, the Draft EIR adequately addresses cumulative impacts in accordance with *CEQA Guidelines*.

A19.3 The extent of the impact at the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection is adequate, as it appropriately accounts for cumulative traffic conditions.

A19.4 As indicated in Section 4.0, Basis of Cumulative Analysis, of the Draft EIR, per *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130(b), the discussion of cumulative impacts shall be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness, and should include the following elements in its discussion of significant cumulative impacts:

1. *Either:*
 - a. *A list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the Agency, or*



- b. A summary of projections contained in an adopted General Plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.*
- 2. A summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available; and*
- 3. A reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects, including examination of reasonable, feasible options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to any significant cumulative effects.*

The Draft EIR adequately addresses cumulative impacts in accordance with the *CEQA Guidelines*. The Draft EIR includes a list of past, present and probable future projects, which were determined to be at least indirectly capable of interacting with the proposed project. These projects are in addition to existing development already occurring within the study area. A discussion of the expected environmental effects and analysis of cumulative impacts is provided within each environmental issue section.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 06:06 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Comments on the Shoreline Gateway EIR

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 06:05 PM -----



"Don Slider"
<dslider@earthlink.net
>
08/13/2006 11:01 PM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Comments on the Shoreline Gateway EIR

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

I am writing in response to the Public Review Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Shoreline Gateway Project. I am a resident living at 425 East Ocean Boulevard, just a few blocks from the proposed project. I have the following comments:

Over the years, I have witnessed the unchecked development of more and more high rise residential units along Ocean Boulevard, and I've also witnessed the corresponding significant increase in vehicular traffic that frequently approaches gridlock, the extensive and pervasive shortage of parking in the area, and the reduction in quality of life resulting from this reckless development permitted by our City leaders. The proposed Shoreline Gateway project will only increase the traffic and parking problems that our city leaders have yet not addressed in their zeal to overbuild the neighborhood for the benefit of developers looking to build their project and quickly leave with profits in hand, leaving the residents of the City paying the long-term price.

A20.1

Given that the report identifies many serious traffic and other "quality of life" impacts that cannot be mitigated, I strongly urge the City to seriously consider the "No Project/No Development" alternative to allow the citizens of downtown Long Beach and the East Village to maintain (or at least not seriously reduce) their current quality of life. The recently completed Aqua development is a good example of promises made but not delivered. Victory Park was taken away from the neighborhood, and, in its place, we now have what appears to be a front lawn for two 17-story residential towers that block the light and open space that we all once enjoyed at the park. Promises of adequate parking have not been kept by the developers of Aqua nor the City. There is no reason to believe that City Hall will not, once again, sell out to the next developer without solving the pervasive parking problem that we have here in the East Village. A poll of the neighborhood would find that the residents of the East Village are strongly opposed to this project and believe that the Shoreline Gateway Project is simply not worth the additional property tax revenue that it would bring the City. Doesn't quality of life mean anything to our City leaders anymore? Do we really need another high-rise development here?

A20.2

Notwithstanding my recommendation to approve the "No Development" alternative, I am cynical enough to know that the project will be approved no matter how many of the City's residents are opposed. It's just business as usual here in Long Beach.

Accordingly, as a condition of approval, the developer should be required to provide significantly more parking than what the development is estimated to require. Every bit of available space taken by high-rise development in our neighborhood is less space that can support a parking structure to reduce the local

A20.3

parking impacts. The promise to meet the parking requirements of the City at some future date after another study is performed is simply not enough, and should not be permitted. I also ask that a more extensive parking study be performed by an independent consultant to verify the accuracy of the estimated parking spaces needed for the proposed development.

A clear plan for the developer to provide a sizeable number of low-cost parking places to visitors and nearby residents is essential to mitigate the significant harm that this project will bring to the neighborhood. If the Shoreline Gateway developer were to add several hundred new parking places, it still would not be adequate to fix the current parking shortage we now face in the neighborhood as a result of other developments previously approved by the City. Providing ample public parking is the least this developer should be required to do to mitigate the significant unavoidable impacts that this project will bring. The larger the project, the more impact our citizens must endure. It's only fair that the Shoreline Gateway developer share in the long-term solution of the neighborhood's pervasive parking problem that now exists.

A20.3

Further, any public works projects necessary to bring more advanced "intelligent" traffic management and other traffic improvements to the City that are required as a result of the development should be fully funded by the developer and be in place in advance of the opening of the proposed project, or the opening should be delayed. I am tired of seeing City tax dollars spent to subsidize private development.

A20.4

Sincerely,

Donald C. Slider
425 East Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802



A20. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM DONALD C. SLIDER, DATED AUGUST 13, 2006.

- A20.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR analyzes the project's impact on traffic and parking within the study area. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A20.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Quality of life is a general term and is usually based on several factors that can vary across populations. Typically, quality of life refers to overall well being with access to goods and services (i.e., transportation, police and fire services, water, schools) and environmental health (i.e., air quality, noise). These issues are addressed throughout the environmental analysis sections of the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A20.3 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues related to the Draft EIR. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR analyzes the project's impact on parking within the study area. Compliance with recommended mitigation measure TR-4 would ensure impacts to parking would be less than significant. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A20.4 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 05:59 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Condos

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 05:59 PM -----



"Patrick Thorpe"
<P_A_Thorpe@msn.com>
08/14/2006 12:44 PM

To: <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>
cc:
Subject: Condos

Good afternoon Angela:

I am writing to express a **NO** vote on the Gateway Condo project.

A21.1

As a 50+ year resident of Long Beach, I have seen far too many City supported developments crash and burn. No additional 'Crackerbox' condos are needed!

A21.2

Use the city owned triangle of land for a **Fountain!**
Create something unique for a gateway to Downtown and Shoreline. No more Aqua, Please!

And while you are at it, would it be possible to find a more appropriate storage location for the unattractive (ugly) concrete barriers the LBGP organizers are allowed to leave behind! I wasn't aware that Shoreline Drive was an industrial storage yard!

A21.3

Sincerely,

Patrick Thorpe

4043 E. 5th Street
Long Beach, CA 90814

562.433.4635



A21. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM PATRICK THORPE, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.

- A21.1 Comment noted. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A21.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- A21.3 The comment is unrelated to the proposed project or the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.

August 14, 2006

John P. Torkelson
375 Atlantic Avenue # 704
Long Beach, CA 90802-2534

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd. – 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

SUBJECT: Concerns (negative) on Shoreline Gateway Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds

I live in a condominium building (the Pacific Royale) just up the way from the proposed Gateway complex project, and as a stakeholder in the process, wish to notify you that our homeowners association was never consulted in regard to:

1. How the esthetic quality of life will be impacted negatively with the filling-up of major view paths towards the south of us;
2. The decline in property values that is surely to ensue with a major wiping-out of the downtown skyline if this behemoth comes to pass;
3. The gridlock and chaos that will tie-up an already choked bottleneck at that confluence of roadways, especially during construction. The developers' EIR of course, will attempt to prove that this percentage influx will be inconsequential.

Our modest condo, sitting at the southwest corner of Atlantic Avenue and 4th Street, built in 1970, will be very adversely affected by yet another developer's monstrosity plugging up Ocean Boulevard's horizon to the extent of no longer providing decent N/S corridors of sight. The Covenant Presbyterian Manor (on the SE corner) assisted living facility located across the street will also suffer.

The twenty-two story (excluding penthouse(s)) bearing at 135 degrees from us will overpower everything around it, blocking off one of the last remaining southerly views to the harbor. By its vastness and bulk, it will wipe out the prospective that gives our city character in that area, vis-à-vis, the Villa Riviera, International tower, et al. Even the eleven (or eighteen?) and eight story proposed structures would be blocking the light and sky pathways down the East side of lower Atlantic Avenue immensely.

This unbridled construction has to be toned down. When I consider the ugliness of those two recent fortresses (the Surf, or whatever they are called) perpetrated upon us citizens

A22.1

and long time residents, between Elm and Linden; the utter unimaginative-ness and third world, socialist society blockiness of it all; I become furious. And now to have this: yet another proposal to "Save" Long Beach from itself, to have it welcomed uncritically by the press, the RDA, and the vested interests is just infuriating.

A22.1

Adding insult; as a sop to the "affordable housing" clique, these developers are going to phony-up the SRO two-story at 135 Ocean, to be "studios" for the qualified, to appease the planning commission. What a joke! Probably going to get variances and taxpayer subsidies to help the whole greedy travesty along.

A22.2

These developers only addressed impacts to neighbors in a very short radius, and perhaps only to Broadway to the north (two blocks is what I heard) - if that far. Nobody ever did due diligence with us long-suffering stalwarts up here on 3rd and 4th, and Lime, Alamitos and Atlantic, and beyond. We're merely second-class citizens, whose quality of life apparently does not have to be taken into account.

A22.3

Lastly, I surely would like to know how all this is going to play in the financial markets. We already have a glut of condominiums and yet more coming on line – where's the money going to come from to fill these places up – at these prices? I see a repeat of the last bust that occurred here in Long Beach in the late 80's & early 90's due to the same factor – greed.

A22.4

I am vehemently opposed to this Anderson Pacific high rise arrogance and ruination of the skyline for the benefit of the few.

Sincerely,



John P. Torkelson



A22. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOHN P. TORKESON, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.

A22.1 In compliance with the *CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Long Beach circulated the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day period beginning December 13, 2005 and ending January 13, 2006. The Initial Study/NOP was made available for review at Long Beach City Hall, the City of Long Beach Main Library and on the City's website. A public scoping meeting was held on January 9, 2006 to solicit comments on the proposed project.

Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR addresses the project's impact on the visual character or quality of the site and surround area as well as light or glare and shade and shadow. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the proposed project would be consistent with the historically acceptable forms of high-rise urban development occurring within downtown Long Beach. However, the increase in building massing and scale would result in enlarged shade/shadow impacts to residential uses located north of Bronce Way alley and Medio Street and east of Alamitos Avenue, to hotel uses north of the project site and to adjacent roadways (i.e., Lime Avenue, Medio Street, Bronce Way Alley, Atlantic Avenue and Alamitos Avenue), thus creating a significant and unavoidable impact. Also, refer to the Revised Historic Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (August 2006), which addresses these issues and is included in Appendix 15.6 of the Final EIR.

Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR addresses the project's impact on the local traffic system in the project vicinity. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the proposed project, along with other cumulative projects, would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to the Alamitos Avenue/7th Street and Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersections, based on the City's performance criteria. Additionally, Alamitos Avenue/7th Street and Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard are CMP study intersections and would result in significant and unavoidable impacts, based on CMP performance criteria.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require analysis of economic and social effects of a project (i.e., property values), except where physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project. Property values are influenced by many factors such as mortgage interest rates, price inflation, supply and demand, cost of new housing construction, income trends and employment growth rates. The interaction of these factors can change over time and are not directly dependent on development of the project site.

A22.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the DEIR. City of



Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

A22.3 Section 5.0 of the Draft EIR provides a detailed environmental analysis of project impacts based on environmental issue areas. The radius around the project site in which impacts are assessed is dependent upon the environmental issue being analyzed and the project's ability to impact the surrounding area. Refer to Sections 5.1 – 5.8 of the Draft EIR for a detailed description of the methodology utilized for the project impact analysis.

A22.4 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental issues or directly challenge information presented in the DEIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant

07/18/2006 04:30 PM

To: gal@rbf.com

cc:

Subject: Shoreline gateway project SCH #2005121066



karen tran
<karenduong2002@yahoo.com>

07/13/2006 06:02 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

cc:

Subject: Shoreline gateway project SCH #2005121066

Dear Angela.

My name is Tim Tran who is the owner of property on 1st street , longbeach. I ' m very happy about the shoreline gateway project SCH # 2005121066.

This development project is very appropriate for this neighborhood in Longbeach.

A23.1

Thank you

Tim Tran



A23. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM TIM TRAN, DATED JULY 13, 2006.

- A23.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

COMMENT NO. A24



Craig Chalfant
08/03/2006 04:32 PM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Re: Shoreline Gateway Project

We will include your correspondence as a comment to the DEIR which will re responded to. thank you

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
NORMAN WIENER <nhotdog@prodigy.net>



NORMAN WIENER
<nhotdog@prodigy.net
>
08/02/2006 06:37 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

In none of the publications and articles, no consideration has been given to The Royal Palms Apts., 100 Atlantic Avenue, Long Beach 90802. We are an 11-story building, and if the plans are approved, all ocean view apartments will no longer have these views as the 3 intended highrises will obliterate same. These units were purchased at a premium price; no longer will we and others enjoy these views and we will surely lose much of our investment.

A24.1

With all the building going on in downtown Long Beach, both rentals and condominiums, we will have extensively overbuilt and vacancies will predominate the real estate market.

A24.2

One smaller highrise at the corner of Alamitos and Ocean, the site of Video Choice, should suffice.

A24.3

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Norman Wiener

100 Atlantic Avenue is over 50-years old and is entitled to historical site status

A24.4



A24. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM NORMAN WIENER, DATED AUGUST 2, 2006.

A24.1 Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the visual character of the site and surrounding area. Although not specifically referenced in the Draft EIR, the Royal Palms Apartments are considered within the surrounding area of the project site. The analysis acknowledges that views of and across the project site would be altered, however, existing views would not be degraded, as development of high-rise uses would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area. Views of towers south of Ocean Boulevard and portions of the skyline would be replaced or combined with views of towers within the project site. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning, which allows for higher density mixed-uses within an unlimited height district. Further, development of the project at a higher density has been anticipated in various planning documents for the downtown area (i.e., General Plan, Zoning Code, The Guide for Development and Strategy for Development) and would be compatible with existing development along Ocean Boulevard.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) does not require analysis of economic and social effects of a project (i.e., property values), except where physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project. Property values are influenced by many factors such as mortgage interest rates, price inflation, supply and demand, cost of new housing construction, income trends and employment growth rates. The interaction of these factors can change over time and are not directly dependent on development of the project site. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

A24.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

A24.3 Refer to Response to Comment A24.1

A24.4 The comment is unrelated to the proposed project or the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
08/08/2006 09:32 AM

To: gal@rbf.com, shack@rbf.com
CC:
Subject: Re: EIR - Shoreline Gateway Project

Clive Williams <clivewill_cid@yahoo.com>



Clive Williams
<clivewill_cid@yahoo.com>
08/07/2006 07:09 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc:
Subject: EIR - Shoreline Gateway Project

Ms Reynolds,

I was unable to attend the public hearing last week so I have attached my comments here.

I am a resident owner of the International Tower directly opposite the project. I have (2) units, one of which directly faces the proposed tower, just below it's top. The developers also made a personal presentation to our owners as they did with the Villa Riviera, as you mentioned.

I am also a practicing architect, so I have both a personal and professional interest in the project. The International Tower owners were generally impressed and in favor of the project as it was presented and so, very much, am I. The developers are fully entitled to develop the site to the density and height that the zoning allows and I believe that they have done that most sympathetically, to protect view lines for neighbors such as myself. The planning and stepping of the building elements also minimizes the massing required to make the project economically viable. (unlike the Aqua, not to name names!).

To claim historic significance for any of the existing buildings on the site is a total stretch! (unless "historic" and "blighted" are synonymous by some people's definition). The main, grand boulevard of our city deserves first class developments and a first class streetscape. I believe this project achieves that and would be a credit to our city.

Clive Williams
700 East Ocean Blvd. #708
(562) 437.3391

A25.1

Groups are talking. We're listening. Check out the [handy changes to Yahoo! Groups](#).



A25. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM CLIVE WILLIAMS, DATED AUGUST 7, 2006.

- A25.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Aug 8 - 2006

A helpline the Long Beach
 cafe at 615 East Ocean should
 be torn down. They have
 had lots of complaints about
 not having a rest room for
 disabled people also no fans
 in the rest room it is so
 small for a wheelchair to
 go into. also at night when
 the cooks are cooking they
 don't ever help take down
 the filters which are above
 the cooking area. the dust
 falls in the food. when
 they are cooking.
 the price of the food is the
 high for any people that are
 on limited income can not
 afford to eat there

See Bally

Rose Wray

Judy Rithe

John Law

Jae anderson

Jae Potter

Peg anderson

Jay cater

Betty Rithe

Beta Gray

Jem Smith



A26. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ROSE WRAY, ET.AL., DATED AUGUST 8, 2006.

- A26.1 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

John Carl Brogdon

MAILING ADDRESS:

100 ATLANTIC AVE.
SUITE 1112
LONG BEACH, CA
90802

(213) 437-2123

~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~
CULVER CITY, CA
90230

Editor, Long Beach Press-Telegram
RE: so-called "Shoreline Gateway Project"

This long-term owner-resident of The Royal Palms, a 12-story OYO built 1958-60, comprising 165 owner-occupied units and located at Atlantic and First, is increasingly concerned that while the deleterious effects of "the shoreline gateway" (to nowhere?) on Villa Riviera and the Artaban are ~~given~~ given lip-service, none is given to the adverse effects on The Royal Palms magnificent ocean views, of the proposed trio of ugly, slab-like high rises at Ocean/Alamitos/Lime

A27.1

Are our amenities, including our views for which we have paid dearly over many decades, to be destroyed, diminished, dessicated? To appreciate that the Redevelopment Agency (and, ultimately, the city council) is on the verge of committing another major blunder in shaping Our Downtown, you only have to proceed one block westerly on Ocean Blvd to another trio of 22-story buildings that have (alas) already been built but not occupied. (What shoddiness has prevented these three ugly sisters from getting a certificate of occupancy?) What should be done with this project area--Shoreline Gateway Project?

Firstly, a commitment by council and agency to protect the views and augment the parking of the venerable Royal Palms, Inc. And any other affected properties.

Secondly, and importantly, this project should consist of ONE, NOT THREE (!) major structures. And that ONE should be a tall, narrow, "skyscraper" of appropriate height, situs, parking, minimizing hstm. Thirdly, the first and maybe the second of this narrow building, shaped to minimize the "taking" of our views, could comprise stores and cafes, with an underground garage wide and deep enough as needed to solve, not exacerbate, long-term parking deficits.

A27.2

The first and second floor areas would blend into a vast, dedicated (to open space), plaza-like, lushly landscaped urban isle, something to behold and to savor--a positive statement, not just another helter-skelter urban jungle with no jingle.

Since it is "in redevelopment", all the more reason to demand design and density criteria beneficial to those of us who have kept Our Downtown alive. Why not protect the equity and affordable housing of those of us who have demonstrated that they are REAL long beach lovers?

JOHN CARL BROGDON

John Carl Brogdon

**25-year downtown owner-resident;
ex-vice chair, CC Redevelopment Agency;
ex-mayor pro tem, CC. (4 I.D. only).



A27. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOHN CARL BROGDON, NO DATE.

- A27.1 Section 5.2, Aesthetics/Light and Glare, of the Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the proposed project on the visual character of the site and surrounding area. Although not specifically referenced in the Draft EIR, the Royal Palms Apartments are considered within the surrounding area of the project site. The analysis acknowledges that views of and across the project site would be altered, however, existing views would not be degraded, as development of high-rise uses would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area. Views of towers south of Ocean Boulevard and portions of the skyline would be replaced or combined with views of towers within the project site. The proposed project would be consistent with the General Plan Land Use designation and zoning, which allows for higher density mixed-uses within an unlimited height district. Further, development of the project at a higher density has been anticipated in various planning documents for the downtown area (i.e., General Plan, Zoning Code, The Guide for Development and Strategy for Development) and would be compatible with existing development along Ocean Boulevard.
- A27.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



Craig Chalfant
07/19/2006 08:03 AM

To: gal@rbf.com
cc:
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Project (SCH#2005121066)



Stephen.Breskin@ubo
c.com
07/17/2006 09:43 AM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc: Catherine.Watkins@uboc.com
Subject: Shoreline Gateway Project (SCH#2005121066)

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

Union Bank of California, in its capacity as Trustee of the Finch Trust manages a property at the north-east corner of Long Beach Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue. The property is currently occupied by a gas station.

We are interested to know whether the proposed above-referenced project will have any impact on traffic flows in the vicinity of our property. Specifically, will potential points of ingress or egress to the existing gas station be modified in any way.

I have reviewed Section 4.15 (Transportation & Traffic) of the RBF Consulting Report dated December, 2005 but could not find adequate information therein to address my question.

Please feel free to respond via email or call me at 619.230.4509.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Stephen Breskin
Vice President & Manager
Trust Real Estate Management
619.230.4509

B1.1

This communication (including any attachments) may contain privileged or confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this communication and/or shred the materials and any attachments and are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this communication, or the taking of any action based on it, is strictly prohibited.

Thank you.



B1. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM STEPHEN BRESKIN, TRUST REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT, DATED JULY 17, 2006.

B1.1 A traffic impact study was completed to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the local traffic system in the project vicinity. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the technical traffic analysis. The efficiency of traffic operations at a location is measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a description of traffic performance at intersections. It is based on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio. Levels range from A to F with A representing excellent (free-flow) conditions and F representing extreme congestion. The level of traffic during the peak hours at an intersection (volume) is compared to the amount of traffic that the intersection is able to carry (capacity). Intersections with vehicular volumes that are at or near capacity ($V/C \cong 1.0$) experience greater congestion and longer vehicle delays. As indicated in DEIR, the Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard intersection is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E) under existing conditions. The traffic analysis indicates that the intersection would operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015 without project conditions. With the addition of project-generated trips, the intersection would continue to operate at a deficient LOS (LOS F) for forecast year 2015. However, project related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.02 to critical movements during the AM peak hour, resulting in greater congestion and longer vehicle delays. According to the City of Long Beach performance criteria, this is considered a significant impact. The analysis indicates that there are no feasible physical measures that would mitigate the project's impact to the intersection. Therefore, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

The proposed project would not result in modifications to the existing ingress and/or egress points of the gas station located at the northeast corner of Ocean Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue. Any future modifications to potential ingress or egress points of the existing gas station would be unrelated to the proposed project and would be reviewed by the City of Long Beach.



Craig Chalfant

07/27/2006 09:55 AM

To: gal@rbf.com

cc:

Subject: Re: Shoreline Gateway DEIR

Thank You...we'll add you comments to the record.

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
Jessjohannsen@aol.com



Jessjohannsen@aol.co
m

07/25/2006 09:24 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

cc:

Subject: Shoreline Gateway DEIR

Ms Reynolds,

International Tower Comments to the Shoreline Gateway DEIR:

Overall the International Tower Owners Association, agrees with what has been outlined in the Draft EIR for the Shoreline Gateway development.

B2.1

Regarding traffic, it is important that conditions for approval of the project, and perhaps with LBC Redevelopment Agency funding, include traffic calming improvements to the intersection at Ocean and Shoreline to reduce noise and to increase pedestrian safety and well being.

These improvements should include, at a minimum, (1) narrowing of the traffic lanes, (2) provide brick paver pedestrian walkways in both directions, (3) widen landscaped planters and (4) improve lighting. These improvements would make the intersection more accommodating to pedestrians, as well as motorists by increasing their sense of place.

B2.2

These recommendations are strongly recommends at the Atlantic/Ocean intersection and Alamitos/Broadway as well.

In addition, the city, and or developer, should redesign and provide funding for improvements to Victory Park at Ocean and Shoreline to eliminate the unsightly jungle environment on that corner to improve visibility for pedestrians, as well as motorists. These improvements would also help eliminate an attractive nuisance for vagrants, homeless, and drug dealers, and would make residents in the neighborhood feel more comfortable. Because International Tower maintains the park in front of the building, the association will be happy to properly maintain these improvements.

B2.3

Otherwise as the project has progressed, it appears to be an improvement to the neighborhood, even though differences in opinions vary within the association membership.

B2.4

Jess Johannsen
ITOA Long Beach City Liaison
International Tower
700 E Ocean Blvd. #1206

Long Beach, CA 90208



Craig Chalfant

07/27/2006 04:29 PM

To: gal@rbf.com

cc:

Subject: Re: Shoreline Gateway DEIR

Got it.

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
Jessjohannsen@aol.com



Jessjohannsen@aol.co
m

07/26/2006 06:40 PM

To: Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov

cc:

Subject: Re: Shoreline Gateway DEIR

Angela,

Thanks you for your response.

In recognizing an error in my email, please replace the forth paragraph with the following.

These recommendations should strongly be considered for the Ocean/Atlantic and Alamitos/Broadway intersections as well.

Thank you.

Jes Johannsen

B2.5



**B2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JESS JOHANSEN,
INTERNATIONAL TOWER OWNERS ASSOCIATION, DATED JULY 25,
2006 AND JULY 26, 2006.**

B2.1 Comment noted. No further response is necessary.

B2.2 As indicated in the Draft EIR, traffic generated by the proposed project would not result in a significant increase in traffic noise in the area that would exceed the City's established standards. The efficiency of traffic operations at a location is measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a description of traffic performance at intersections. It is based on volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio. Levels range from A to F with A representing excellent (free-flow) conditions and F representing extreme congestion. The level of traffic during the peak hours at an intersection (volume) is compared to the amount of traffic that the intersection is able to carry (capacity). Intersections with vehicular volumes that are at or near capacity ($V/C \cong 1.0$) experience greater congestion and longer vehicle delays. The traffic analysis indicates that the intersection of Alamitos Avenue/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard is currently operating at a deficient LOS (LOS E) for existing conditions. Project related traffic would contribute a V/C of 0.02 to critical movements at the intersection of Alamitos/Shoreline Drive and Ocean Boulevard during the AM peak hour, resulting in greater congestion and longer vehicle delays at the intersection. Narrowing of the traffic lanes, as suggested, would result in increased delays at intersections. Potential traffic calming measures and improvements may be developed in future consultation with City staff.

B2.3 As indicated in Section 5.8, Public Services and Utilities, of the Draft EIR, the project proposes recreational and leisure amenities for potential residents including a podium garden with a swimming pool, lawn, garden alcove and clubhouse. Additionally, the townhouse units fronting the terrace garden would have private yards. A workout room and gym would be situated on the first and second floors of the Gateway Tower and a lap pool and sun deck would be provided on the roof. Additionally, the project would incorporate passive open space areas, including an elliptical paseo and forecourt area. Provision of recreational amenities would reduce the demand on park and recreational facilities in the area. Although the project does not proposed development of a park, the proposed project would be required to pay park impact fees, as established by the City, to compensate for the impacts of the proposed project on park and recreational facilities. Chapter 18.18 of the *Long Beach Municipal Code* requires payment of park fees for parkland acquisition and recreation improvements, prior to the issuance of certificate of occupancy for residential developments, as defined in the *Municipal Code*. The park fee imposed on residential development projects reflects the specific project's share of the cost of providing parkland and improvements to meet the needs created by the residential development at established City service level standards.



- B2.4 Comment noted. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- B2.5 Comment noted. No further response is necessary.

JULY 26, 2006

COMMENT NO. B3

Dear PLANNING Dep't,

WE ARE WRITING TO OPPOSE THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THE 2.2 ACRES AT OCEAN + ALAMITOS. THIS IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE RAMPANT DESTRUCTION OF OUR QUALITY OF LIFE. WE ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH HIGHRISES IN THIS AREA. YOU NEVER TELL US WHAT THE OCCUPANCY RATE IS FOR THE BUILDINGS ALREADY HERE - 22, 18, + 8 STORIES AT THIS ALREADY - CONGESTED INTERSECTION?? YOU'VE GOT TO BE KIDDING. WE DON'T NEED OR WANT 358 MORE UNITS AT THIS LOCATION - THE TRAFFIC CONGESTION, POLLUTION AND UNHEALTHY DENSITY WILL FURTHER ERODE THE QUALITY OF LIFE FOR EVERYONE EXCEPT THE VULTURE DEVELOPERS WHO WANT TO LIVE THEIR POCKETS (WITH AN OLD LADY'S MONEY, NO LESS!) AND THEN LEAVE OUR COMMUNITY TO STEW IN OUR OWN JUICES!!

B3.1

WHY NOT LOOK AT COMMUNITIES LIKE SANTA BARBARA WHERE DEVELOPERS ARE HELD TO A ZONING CODE THAT ENHANCES THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT? THE PARCEL AT OCEAN/ALAMITOS WOULD BE OK FOR LOW-RISE, ATTRACTIVE CONDOS, + THE LONG BEACH CAFE, ONE OF OUR RETRO TREASURES, COULD BE SAVED.

B3.2

DON'T LET THIS DEVELOPMENT DESTROY OUR NEIGHBORHOOD!

B3.3

Neighbors on Ocean Blvd.



B3. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM NEIGHBORS ON OCEAN BOULEVARD, DATED JULY 26, 2006.

- B3.1 The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Quality of life is a general term and is usually based on several factors that can vary across populations. Typically, quality of life refers to overall well being with access to goods and services (i.e., transportation, police and fire services, water, schools) and environmental health (i.e., air quality, noise). These issues are addressed throughout the environmental analysis sections of the DEIR. City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- B3.2 The comment does not raise new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the DEIR. The City of Long Beach will consider all comments on the proposed project during the decision-making process for the project. As indicated in Section 5.1, Land Use and Relevant Planning, of the Draft EIR, the project site is zoned Downtown Planned Development District (PD-30) and is located within an unlimited height district of PD-30. The proposed building heights are consistent with the unlimited height district and would be consistent with the high-rise development that currently exists within the downtown area.
- B3.3 Comment noted. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

DRISCOLL & FOX

COMMENT NO. B4

L A W Y E R S

The Petroleum Building
714 West Olympic Boulevard, Suite 614
Los Angeles, California 90015
(213) 745-8480 Telephone
(213) 745-5505 Facsimile

William P. Driscoll wdrisc@pacbell.net
Mark R. Fox markrfox@pacbell.net

(213) 745-8482 Driscoll
(213) 745-8481 Fox

July 27, 2006

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Subject: *Comments on, and Objection to, the Draft Environmental Impact Report Shoreline Gateway Project*

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

This firm represents Henry J. Levin and Margaret Levin the owners of the real property located at 645 E. Ocean Blvd. Long Beach, California (Subject Property). Said property is within the confines of the proposed Shoreline Gateway Project.

We have reviewed the above document and offer the following comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Initial Study).

Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the standards for adequacy of an EIR and states that an EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information, which enables them to make a decision, which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences of a project. The Draft EIR for the Shoreline Gateway Project does not meet this standard for several reasons outlined below.

Inadequate Project Description. The project description is not sufficiently detailed to allow for accurate evaluation or full disclosure of the project's environmental effects. Some of the ways in which the project description is inadequate and how this results in inadequate environmental evaluation is summarized below.

Grading and Excavation. The Initial Study indicates that the site is underlain by uncertified or undocumented fill material, which may be prone to instability. This material will likely need to be removed from the site. The project description needs to identify the volume of this material and what effects this may have on export and additional import of material for the project.

B4.1

B4.2

Inadequate Discussion of Topical Issues. In *Concerned Citizens of Costa Mesa, Inc. v. 32nd District Agricultural Assoc.* (1986) 42 Cal. 3d 929, the court held that "the EIR must contain facts and analysis, not just the agency's bare conclusions or opinions." The EIR does not provide adequate quantification of project impacts or a clear delineation of the significance of residual impacts after implementation of mitigation.

B4.3

Traffic & Circulation. The Initial Study fails to adequately consider the significant increase in traffic flow that will be occasioned by the construction of the proposed improvement in the manner proposed. Particularly Section 5.3 attempts to gloss over and/or fails to acknowledge the massive increase in population at or near the Subject Project and the service vehicles necessary to provide basic services to the increased population at the Subject Location. The preparing Agency must look beyond the incremental tax benefit flowing to the Agency as a result of the proposed Project and instead look to the negative impacts that will be suffered by the greater population of Long Beach who have, for years, enjoyed a pristine community.


B4.4

Noise and Vibration. The Initial Study fails to adequately address the noise and vibration occasioned by the massive construction project that will be required for the construction of the improvements in the manner proposed. Particularly Section 5.5 does not adequately address the increased noise that will be occasioned during the process of construction, particularly how the noise and vibration will affect the early occupants of the Project as the remaining portions are completed. Simple statements that noise will not be a problem, without scientific or statistical evidence to establish the same are of no value and must be disregarded by the decision makers.

B4.5

Based on the foregoing, as well as evidence that may be submitted at the time of a hearing by an independent judicial body, we, on behalf of our clients, Henry J. Levin and Margaret Levin, the owners of the real property located at 645 E. Ocean Blvd. Long Beach, California hereby object to the instant project as described in the Initial Study and furthermore ask that the comments to said study contained herein be incorporated into the official record of this matter.

B4.6

Very truly yours,

William P. Driscoll



B4. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM WILLIAM P. DRISCOLL, DRISCOLL & FOX, LAWYERS, DATED JULY 27, 2006.

B4.1 The comment makes a general statement that the Draft EIR for the project does not meet CEQA standards for adequacy. Refer to the following responses, which address each item identified as being inadequate by the commenter.

B4.2 The comment states that the project description is inadequate resulting in inadequate environmental evaluation in regards to grading and excavation. The commenter refers to a statement in the Initial Study, which indicates, "the site is underlain by uncertified or undocumented fill material, which may be prone to instability". The discussion of soils in the Initial Study does identify the site as being located in an area in which the *General Plan* identifies as consisting of predominately granular non-marine terrace deposits overlying Pleistocene granular marine sediments at shallow depths. This deep marine section is composed of interbedded units of sandstone, siltstone and shale. The near surface soils on the terrace consist predominately of cohesionless soils such as sand, silty sand and sandy silt that are generally medium to very dense. Cohesive soils such as clayey silt and silty clay, although less dominant are also present as layers in these surficial deposits. The consistency of these units is described as ranging from stiff to hard. Development of the project would be subject to site-specific geotechnical analysis and would be designed in compliance with applicable building codes. It should be noted that grading activities would include the excavation and transport of approximately 140,000 cubic yards of soil and other materials, as indicated in Section 5.4, Air Quality and Section 5.5, Noise, of the Draft EIR.

B4.3 The comment makes a general statement that the Draft EIR does not provide adequate quantification of project impacts or a clear delineation of the significance of residual impacts after implementation of the mitigation.

As indicated in Section 5.0, Environmental Analysis, each environmental issue is addressed in a separate section of the EIR and is organized into sections. The "Significance Threshold Criteria" provides the thresholds that are the basis of conclusions of significance, which are primarily the criteria in Appendix G of the *CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 – 15387). Primary sources used in identifying the criteria include the *CEQA Guidelines*; local, state, federal, or other standards applicable to an impact category; and officially established significance thresholds. According to Section 15064.7 (a) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, "A threshold of significance is an identifiable quantitative, qualitative or performance level of a particular environmental effect, noncompliance with which means the effect will normally be determined to be significant by the agency and compliance with which means the effect normally will be determined to be less than significant."



The “Impacts” section describes potential environmental changes to the existing physical conditions, which may occur if the proposed project is implemented. Within each “Impacts” section, the “Level of Significance Before Mitigation” identifies the impact significance level prior to analysis and prior to the imposition of mitigation measures. Evidence, based on factual and scientific data, is presented to show the cause and effect relationship between the proposed project and the potential changes in the environment. The exact magnitude, duration, extent, frequency, range or other parameters of a potential impact are ascertained, to the extent possible, to determine whether impacts may be significant. The impact analysis may be qualitative or quantitative, depending upon the environmental issue and the significance threshold criteria. If impacts are determined to be significant, mitigation measures are provided where feasible. Analysis is provided to determine the level of significance after the mitigation measure is implemented.

The “Level of Significance After Mitigation” identifies the impacts that will remain after the application of mitigation measures, and whether the remaining impacts are or are not considered significant. When these impacts, even with the inclusion of mitigation measures, cannot be mitigated to a level considered less than significant, they are identified as “Unavoidable Significant Impacts.”

“Significant Unavoidable Impacts” describes impacts that would be significant, and cannot be feasibly mitigated to less than significant, so would therefore be unavoidable. To approve a project with unavoidable significant impacts, the lead agency must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations. In adopting such a statement, the lead agency is required to balance the benefits of a project against its unavoidable environmental impacts in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a project are found to outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered “acceptable.” (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15093[a]).

- B4.4 The comment refers to the Initial Study in referencing the topic of traffic and circulation. However, it is assumed that the commenter is referring to the Draft EIR based on the commenter’s reference to Section 5.3, which is the Traffic and Circulation section of the Draft EIR.

The project is comprised primarily of residential uses with a relatively small component of retail/gallery space. Although the population on the site would increase with the proposed project, residential uses do not typically require a large number of service vehicles on a regular basis. Service vehicles to the site would primarily consist of delivery vans and parcel delivery trucks. The number of trips associated with these vehicles would be nominal and would not significantly impact traffic flows in the surrounding area. Section 5.3, Traffic and Circulation, of the Draft EIR provides an extensive analysis of the proposed project on the local traffic system.



- B4.5 The comment refers to the Initial Study in referencing the topic of noise and vibration. However, it is assumed that the commenter is referring to the DEIR based on the commenter's reference to Section 5.5, which is the Noise section of the Draft EIR.

Section 5.5, Noise, of the Draft EIR, addresses short-term construction noise impacts, including temporary noise and/or vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receivers. Table 5.5-7, shows that at 100 feet noise levels would be at approximately 86 dBA, which would exceed the City's noise standards of 60 dBA at any period of time. The analysis indicates that with implementation of mitigation measures, short-term construction noise impacts and on-site long-term impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. As indicated in Section 3.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the project is anticipated to be completed in one phase. An analysis of noise and vibration impacts to early occupants is not required, as the potential for early occupants within the project site would not occur.

- B4.6 Comment noted. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.

Jamilla Vollmann
08/14/2006 02:32 PM

To: David White/CH/CLB@CLB, Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB, Lisa Fall/CD/CLB@CLB
cc:
Subject: [saveLBCskyline] Shoreline Gateway Deadline Monday 8/14

FYI

Jamilla Vollmann Development Project Manager Long Beach Redevelopment Agency 5
62 570 6582
----- Forwarded by Jamilla Vollmann/CD/CLB on 08/14/2006 02:31 PM -----



Kristen Autry
<savelbcskyline@earthlink.net>
Sent by:
savelbcskyline@googlegroups.com

To: savelbcskyline@googlegroups.com
cc:
Subject: [saveLBCskyline] Shoreline Gateway Deadline Monday 8/14

08/12/2006 03:48 PM
Please respond to
savelbcskyline

Hello Friends,

The public comment period of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ends Monday, August 14, 2006 at 5:00pm. If you would like to send any words:

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

OR via E-Mail to: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov

The draft EIR document is available at: www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp

We will be posting our response to the draft EIR on SaveLBCSkyline.org and will provide hosting or links for any others who wish to have their comments on-line. This is the time to have your voices heard and to shape the form and texture of our City's skyline. We urge you to take this opportunity to become involved.

Sincerely,

Kristen Autry, Director
SaveLBCSkyline.org
562/491-1385

"Fortune favors the brave." -Scottish family herald from the Isle of Skye

<http://www.saveLBCskyline.org>

B5.1

savelbcskyline@earthlink.net

You received this message because you are subscribed to the "savelbcskyline" email list..

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to

savelbcskyline-unsubscribe@googlegroups.com

For more options, visit this group at

<http://groups.google.com/group/savelbcskyline>



**B5. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM KRISTEN AUTRY,
SAVELBCSKYLINE, DATED AUGUST 12, 2006.**

- B5.1 The comment letter provides notification of the public comment period for the Draft EIR, identifies the contact person to forward comments and provides the website to access the Draft EIR. The comment letter does not provide comments related to the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.



"John Thomas"
<jthomas@dslxtreme.com>

08/14/2006 10:50 AM
Please respond to "John Thomas"

To: <jan_ostashay@longbeach.gov>, "Angela Reynolds" <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>, <jthomas@dslxtreme.com>
cc: "Brian Ulaszewski" <bulaszewski@hotmail.com>, <RPVDAVE@aol.com>, "Maureen Neeley" <neeley@att.net>, <Maureenpoe@earthlink.net>, "Louise Ivers" <livers@csudh.edu>, "Mary Kay Nottage" <preservation@lbheritage.org>, "Mary Sullivan" <maryrsullivan@earthlink.net>, <ReneelMC@aol.com>, <Jon@interstices-lb.com>, "Jan Van Dijs" <jrvandijs@earthlink.net>, "Bill Cwiklo" <wcyclops@aol.com>, <AnaMariaMcGuan@aol.com>, <Becky@blaircommercial.com>, <suja@longbeach.gov>
Subject: Shoreline Gateway EIR

Attached please find our email response form Long Beach Heritage Advocacy Committee. our focus is primarily dealing with the cultural and historical impacts and mitigation measures suggested as a result of the proposed project.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank you.

John Thomas

Vice President Advocacy, Long Beach Heritage



562 400-9803 EIR SLOW.wps

Ms. Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

Re: Response on behalf of Long Beach Heritage for the Environmental Impact Report- Shoreline Gateway Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

I am writing on behalf of Long Beach Heritage (LBH) to provide comments on the Environment Impact Report (EIR) for the Shoreline Gateway Project. Long Beach Heritage is a nonprofit education and advocacy group promoting public knowledge and preservation of significant and historical architectural resources, neighborhoods and the cultural heritage of Long Beach.

Significance

Our review of the EIR focuses on the project's potential impact on the historic and cultural resources of the area generally described as the intersection of Alamitos Boulevard and Ocean Boulevard. LBH agrees with the document's conclusion that the "Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation is Potentially Significant Impact."

B6.1

Of the total of 19 buildings surveyed and evaluated in the EIR, five buildings meet CEQA's definition of historical resources including the Villa Rivera, a City landmark that is also listed in the National Register of Historical Places and the California Register of Historical Resources; the Artaban Apartments at 10 Atlantic Avenue, a City landmark that appears eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources; and three buildings at 40 Atlantic Avenue, 703-705 Medio Street, and 700 E. Ocean Boulevard (International Tower) which appear eligible for designation as City landmarks.

In addition to these historical resources, three other properties, including the building at 711 Medio Street, the boundary between Rancho Los Alamitos and Rancho Los Cerritos, and the early 20th century street light standards on Lime Street, ~~that~~ warrant special consideration in local planning due to their potential local historic value.

10 Atlantic Avenue (Artaban Apartments). The EIR acknowledges the local historic and architectural merits the building contributes to the area as a familiar visual feature. The proposed project would include a 12-story building to the northeast of the Artaban Apartments. The presence of the new building would have a visual and atmospheric effect on the Artaban Apartments integrity in terms of setting and feeling. The EIR states that Artaban has been "significantly compromised" in the past and that the "indirect effects of the proposed project is not considered a substantial adverse change on its significance and integrity". **LBH believes that the this stated conclusion warrants "no**

B6.2

mitigation measures are recommended for this historical resource” not acceptable and LBH would like to see consideration of proposed buildings in the project to be oriented as to protect the visual and physical the Artaban Apartments contributes to the area.

40 Atlantic Avenue. LBH agrees on the findings of the historic significance of this resource. We also agree that that the proposed demolition of the building would result in a significant effect on this resource. Therefore, LBH would support the project alternative including the rehabilitation, and incorporation of the building character defining features, use of the existing façade of the structure. LBH agrees that this alternative would limit the potential effects to this historic resource.

B6.3

703-705 Medio Street. LBH would concur with the EIR findings for this building.

B6.4

711 Medio Street. LBH would concur with the EIR findings for this building.

B6.5

700 E. Ocean Boulevard (International Tower). The “IT” building is one of the most significant buildings in the City of Long Beach. The IT demonstrates architectural and design significance through technological innovation. The proposed 21-story, 233 stepped slab building and the 12-story, 124 foot building across from the IT building would impose some visual affect on the views of the 27-story, 278-foot International Tower. According to the EIR, the affects on the views or “visual effects” would be “localized” to certain directions. LBH would like more information to be provided to support this conclusion. Based on the proposed vacation on Lime Avenue “primary vantages along Ocean Boulevard would not be blocked”. There is no documentation provided in the EIR to support this assumption.

B6.6

800 E. Ocean Boulevard (Villa Riviera). The EIR claims that “similar to the International Tower, the Villa Riviera would not receive any direct effect from the proposed project” and that the proposed project towers based on orientation would “bring about some visual affect to the Villa Riviera, but would not affect the primary vantages from either of the two main thoroughfares”. Based on these statements, no mitigation measures are recommended by the EIR. LBH strongly disagrees. Insufficient documentation is not provided in the EIR to support the assumption made on what are the “primary vantages” when discussing the thoroughfares. In addition, comparing the Villa Riveria to the International tower relating to vistas and viewpoints is difficult to comprehend. The project ~~has~~ does not attempt to recognize the Villa Riviera building orientation and treat the orientation of the proposed tower near the corner of Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard accordingly.

B6.7

Street Lights. More information as to the mitigation measures for the remaining two street lamps is not provided. Additionally, the disposition and treatment of all the historic street lamps is not provided. How the lamps are stored during project construction and the persons and qualifications charged with this task is not provided.

B6.8

Rancho Boundary. As stated in the EIR, early Long Beach history is critical and demonstrated by the history and actions that created the "Rancho Boundary". No attempt in the EIR is made to incorporate these historical vital cultural resources of Long Beach history into the project. LBH would like to suggest that an interactive storyboard or similar history telling opportunity be located within the project to allow resident and visitors alike to learn the history and unique events that created the "Rancho Boundary".

B6.9

While LBH appreciates the attention to historical and cultural resources noted in the EIR, the proposed mitigation measures suggested are at a minimum considering the impacts that will occur as a result of the proposed project. Additionally, no real nexus is made between the negative impacts described in the EIR and the mitigation measures. Mitigation measures CUL-1, CUL-2 and CUL-3 noted on page 5.7-34 are inadequate based on the EIR's conclusion that the level of significance even after "mitigation" remains "Significant and Unavoidable".

B6.10

The impact analysis noted in section 5.7.4 under "Cumulative Impacts" states "potential impacts would be site and project area specific and an evaluation of potential impacts would be conducted on a project -to project basis". LBH would like to see some attempt to "master plan" the project area to develop a level of awareness and secure historical and cultural resources for any future development.

B6.11

We would like to discuss our review and findings pertaining to this EIR and expand more fully our ideas and concepts as a community preservation partner.

Respectfully Submitted,



John W. Thomas
Vice President- Advocacy
Long Beach Heritage
(562) 400-9803
August 14, 2006

RECEIVED AUG 14 2006



**B6. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOHN THOMAS, VICE PRESIDENT
ADVOCACY, LONG BEACH HERITAGE, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.**

B6.1 The comment reiterates portions of the Draft EIR and the commenter's agreement that impacts to historical resources would be potentially significant prior to mitigation. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.

B6.2 The Artaban has been identified as a historical resource pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by virtue of eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach. CEQA identifies a "threshold" for significant impacts to historical resources in Section 15064.5(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Specifically, a "substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resource" must occur as a result of the proposed project. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is defined under CEQA as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register, a local register of historic resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or historic resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code. The character-defining features of the Artaban are the physical characteristics that convey its significance. Character-defining features of the Artaban include its Ocean Boulevard location; rectangular massing; flat roof and cornice; exterior materials; horizontal divisions articulated by the second-story cornice and by stringcourses; fenestration pattern; window detailing and materials; primary (west) entry materials, configuration, and detailing; and balconies. No change to these features would result from implementation of the proposed project.

Because of its corner location at the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and Lime Avenue, the two primary, street-facing elevations on the west and south were the focus of the architectural design. The lack of architectural detailing and finishes clearly identifies the east and north elevations as secondary. Primary views of the building, therefore, are obtained from the west and the south. Historically, a one-story building (the former Artaban Garage, now referred to as 40 Atlantic Avenue or the Wing Building) was located directly north of the building and a three-story apartment building occupied the lot to the south (now the site of the Long Beach Café). The proposed project would result in the construction of a two-story podium containing live/workspaces immediately to the south of the Artaban and the erection of the 12-story Courtyard Tower northeast of



the Artaban. These new buildings would not result in an impact to views of the primary elevations of the Artaban from the northwest, west, southwest, south, or southeast. Views of the east elevation after project construction would be available from the southeast; post-construction views would include the upper stories of the east elevation and would be similar to those available during most of the mid-20th century when the three-story apartment building was in situ. Views of the rear (north) elevation would also still be available from the north and the northwest and would be similar to the current condition.

When it was constructed in 1922, the Artaban, with eight stories, would have been a noticeable feature on the skyline. However, the erection of numerous multi-storied buildings from the mid-1960s through the present, along Ocean Boulevard to the north and south and in downtown to the northwest, has diminished the presence of the building. Construction of the three proposed towers may intensify that effect, but would not result in new, significantly adverse impacts to character defining features such that the significance of the building would be materially impaired. Therefore, potential impacts to the Artaban that may result from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- B6.3 The commenter states their preference for an alternative that would incorporate rehabilitation of the Wing Building and re-use of its character-defining features. (The building's character defining features are identified on pages 7-1 and 7-2 of the Revised Historic Resources Survey Report; refer to Appendix 15.6 of the Final EIR). The Wing Building has been identified as a significant historical resource pursuant to CEQA by virtue of its eligibility for designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.
- B6.4 The commenter states their agreement with the findings of the Draft EIR regarding 703-705 Medio Street. This property has been identified as a historical resource pursuant to CEQA by virtue of eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources. No significant impacts to historical resources related to this property have been identified.
- B6.5 The commenter states their agreement with the findings of the Draft EIR regarding 711 Medio Street. Although of local interest, this property has not been identified as a historical resource pursuant to CEQA. No significant impacts to historical resources related to this property have been identified.
- B6.6 The International Tower has been identified as a historical resource pursuant to CEQA by virtue of eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and potential for designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach.



CEQA identifies a “threshold” for significant impacts to historical resources in Section 15064.5(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Specifically, a “substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resource” must occur as a result of the proposed project. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is defined under CEQA as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register, a local register of historic resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or historic resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

The character-defining features of the International Tower are the physical characteristics that convey its significance. Character-defining features of the International Tower include its Ocean Boulevard location on the bluff overlooking the Shoreline Marina area and the Pacific Ocean; 32-story height; circular massing; reinforced concrete construction; glass curtain walls with aluminum-framed openings; continuous metal-railed balconies; and flat roof with penthouse. No change to these features would result from implementation of the proposed project.

With its arresting shape, height, modern design, and location on Ocean Boulevard, the International Tower has been a focal point since its construction in 1964. However, since 1964, numerous high-rise buildings have been erected to the east and west on both sides of Ocean Boulevard. Due to its shape and height, the International Tower is still highly noticeable but is not a lone presence, and now blends into the wall of buildings established by the row of multi-storied buildings to the west of it. The alignment of Ocean Boulevard to the east and the existing improvements on the south side of the street, including the Villa Riviera, already impede views of the International Tower from the east. Construction of the 24-story, 284-foot tall Gateway Tower and the 233-foot stepped slab building (Terrace Tower) across Ocean Boulevard would impose some visual intrusion into views of the 27-story (aboveground levels), 278-foot tall International Tower, but such intrusion would be localized to views from the north and northeast. A view corridor will be created along Lime Avenue and will retain a portion of the view from the north. Although some diminishment of the available views to and from this 360-degree building will occur, the qualities that convey the significance of the building will not be materially impaired, and the building will continue to convey the reasons for its significance. Therefore, potential impacts to the International Tower that may result from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.



B6.7 The Villa Riviera has been identified as a historical resource pursuant to CEQA by virtue of its inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places, and designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach.

CEQA identifies a “threshold” for significant impacts to historical resources under Section 15064.5(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Specifically, a “substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resource” must occur as a result of the proposed project. Substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is defined under CEQA as physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for inclusion in, the California Register, a local register of historic resources pursuant to Section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code, or historic resources survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code.

The character-defining features of the Villa Riviera are the physical characteristics that convey its significance. Character-defining features of the Villa Riviera include:

- Prominent location on Ocean Boulevard at the foot of Alamitos Avenue, and on the bluff overlooking the Pacific Ocean, offering views of the building from the north, south, east and west; the location is made more commanding by the alignment of Ocean Boulevard, which jogs to the north, east of the intersection, making the Villa Riviera appear to be a terminus when viewing it from the west;
- V-shaped footprint and massing of the apartment building, with the rectangular garage located to the southeast;
- Wedge-shaped corner setback, accommodating a garden area and a formal driveway, and further opening vistas of the building;
- Steeply pitched copper roof and central turret, extensively detailed with cresting, dormers, gargoyles, and other features;
- 15-story height, which made it the second tallest building in Southern California at the time of its construction (the tallest was Los Angeles City Hall);
- Exterior materials and architectural detailing such as cornices, stringcourses, and decorated friezes;



- Horizontal division of exterior elevations into base, shaft, and balconied upper stories;
- Vertical division of exterior elevations through bays and fenestration; and
- Doors and windows, including arched ground level openings and primary entry.

No change to these features would result from implementation of the proposed project.

Primary vantage points of the Villa Riviera are obtained from the east and west, along Ocean Boulevard, from the north on Alamitos Avenue and from the south on Shoreline Drive; refer to Figures 7.2-6, 7.2-7 and 7.2-8, of Appendix 15.6 (Revised Historic Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc.). From the north, east and south, the 284-foot tall Gateway Tower would be visible on the northwest corner of Ocean Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue, and would be taller than the Villa Riviera. There are numerous buildings of equal or greater height than the Villa Riviera on Ocean Boulevard, including the International Tower immediately to the west. The role of the Villa Riviera as the tallest building on the horizon no longer exists, although its commanding presence is still visually and physically evident. Construction of the Gateway Tower would not significantly affect the perception of the Villa Riviera from these vantage points. From the west, the Gateway Tower would intrude into the north portion of the vista of the Villa Riviera, obscuring the northern edge of the building and roof. The effects of this intrusion could be minimized by design of the project, including:

- Siting of the Gateway Tower so as to step back from the corner, perhaps as an echo of the V-shaped plan of the Villa Riviera; and
- Design of the shaft of the Gateway Tower so as to step back in increments on the upper stories, revealing the upper edge and roofline of the Villa Riviera.

However, even with the intrusion into the vista from the west that would result from the project as currently proposed, the significance of the Villa Riviera would not be significantly impaired, and the property would retain its listing in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources, as well as its status as a landmark of the City of Long Beach. Therefore, potential impacts to the Villa Riviera that may result from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- B6.8 The six early-20th-century streetlights on Lime Avenue have been identified as a historical resource pursuant to CEQA by virtue of eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources and designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach. Construction of the



proposed Gateway and Terrace Towers and the vacation of a portion of Lime Avenue in order to construct a paseo may result in the removal of the two streetlights located within the proposed project site, or one-third of the total number of six streetlights in the grouping. This removal would materially impair the significance of the historical resource as a whole and the two affected streetlights individually. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would cause significant impacts to historical resources, and mitigation measures are required. Mitigation measure CUL-3 on page 5.7-34 of Section 5.7, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR addresses the potential impacts to this historical resource. The mitigation measure identified in the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR to address the concerns expressed by Long Beach Heritage, as follows:

CUL-3: The project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that the two early 20th century streetlights located on Lime Avenue in the project site shall be documented in place by 35-mm black-and-white or digital photos and a historical narrative prior to issuance of any project-related demolition or grading permits; removed under the supervision of a qualified historic architect and/or other professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Profession Qualification Standards for Historic Architect, History or Architectural History; stored in a safe place and manner; and reinstalled either at or near their current locations or at an appropriate nearby site. Reinstallation shall utilize the services of a qualified professional, as referenced above, and any rehabilitation of the historic streetlights shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Appropriate sites may be determined in consultation with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Officer. Reinstallation shall occur no later than six months following completion of the proposed project. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. The two early 20th century Corsican-style street light standards within the project boundary shall be protected during construction and reused after rehabilitation, either at or near the current locations, or at appropriate sites nearby.

The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

- B6.9 Alamos Avenue marks the division between the two Spanish and Mexican era ranchos from which most of present-day Long Beach was carved. Rancho Los Alamos to the east and Rancho Los Cerritos to the west were held by the heirs of Juan Manuel Nieto, who received the original grant in 1784 from the king of Spain, in the early 19th century. Subsequent owners included some of the most influential people in the



development of Southern California, including Abel Stearns, John Temple, and various members of the Hellman and Bixby families. The American Colony, planned by William Erwin Willmore on his purchase of 4,000 acres of the Rancho Los Cerritos, represents the founding of the City of Long Beach. The rancho boundary is commemorated by a bronze plaque that was set into a boulder located on the south side of Ocean Boulevard, near the intersection of Ocean Boulevard and Alamitos Avenue, by the Long Beach Parlor No. 278 of the Native Sons of the American West.

As a site of previous activity, with no physical traces of the original setting, and with no feature or association that would set this portion of the boundary apart from any other, the section of the boundary between Rancho Los Alamitos and Rancho Los Cerritos located in the area of potential effects does not meet the criteria for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and does not qualify for designation as a landmark of the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the property does not satisfy the CEQA definition of a historical resource. Therefore, no impacts to historical resources can occur in relation to this property and no mitigation measures can be required. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project.

- B6.10 The Draft EIR identified potential adverse impacts to historical resources in relation to two properties: 40 Atlantic Boulevard, the “Wing Building,” and the early-20th century streetlights on Lime Avenue. Three mitigation measures have been proposed in the Final EIR to minimize the adverse impacts to the Wing Building, including one measure (CUL-2b) in addition to those included in the Draft EIR. Mitigation measure CUL-2b was added to specifically address the impacts posed by the potential demolition of the character-defining feature of the Wing Building, the façade designed by prominent Long Beach architects Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and Wing and Associates. The mitigation measures on page 5.7-34 of the Draft EIR have been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

CUL-1: Although the impacts from demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance, the project applicant shall require and shall be responsible for ensuring that comprehensive data recording and documentation of the Wing Building are completed prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permits. The documentation shall be in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II and shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation, detailed written description, sketch plan, and compilation of historic background research. The documentation shall be completed by a historian or architectural historian meeting the Secretary



of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original, archival-quality documentation package shall be deposited with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Office in the Department of Planning and Building. Copies of the documentation on archival-quality paper shall also be provided to the City of Long Beach Public Library; the library of California State University, Long Beach; the Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. archives housed in the Architecture and Design Collection at the University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara; the Long Beach Heritage Historical Society of Long Beach and the California Office of Historic Preservation. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. Prior Demolition and Grading Permit Issuance, a comprehensive documentation program, including photographic recordation, detailed written description, scaled mapping and compilation of historical background pursuant to the Secretary of Interiors Standards for historical documentation shall be completed for 40 Atlantic Avenue.

CUL-2a The project applicant shall require and be responsible for the production and placement of a commemorative plaque memorializing the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates with the 40 Atlantic Avenue location. The plaque shall be placed at or near the site of the existing building. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. A commemorative plaque commemorating the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. to the 40 Atlantic Avenue shall be established at or near the site of the existing building.

CUL-2b: Within one year of project approval and prior to the issuance of demolition or grading permits, the project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that a retrospective exhibit, brochure, and/or web page documenting the architectural careers of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates, are prepared. Such an exhibit, brochure, or web page shall be accessible to the general public for a period of at least one year and shall include both text and historic images. The history and architecture of the Wing Building shall be included in the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. A historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History shall be engaged to research and write the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. The exhibit, brochure, and/or web page shall be completed within a period of no more than two years. Completion of the mitigation measure



shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach.

However, CEQA recognizes that impacts resulting from demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance¹, thereby resulting in the finding that implementation of the project as proposed would result in “significant and unavoidable impacts” to historical resources.

One mitigation measure has been recommended in response to potential adverse impacts to the 20th-century streetlights on Lime Avenue and noted in Response to Comment B6.8. Implementation of this mitigation measure, as revised, would reduce impacts to the streetlights to below the level of significance.

- B6.11 As defined by CEQA, “a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.”² After implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, one significant adverse impact, the demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue, the “Wing Building,” would result from implementation of the proposed project. The Wing Building is significant for its Mid-century modern style façade, which was designed by prominent Long Beach architect Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and Wing and Associates. Although no related projects are known that may cause adverse impacts to the significance of other Wing designs in the City, the loss of any historical resource contributes to the overall loss of historic fabric in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the impact of the demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue is considered to be cumulatively significant. Page 5.7-35 of the Draft EIR, has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

5.7.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- **DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WOULD NOT RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE CULTURAL RESOURCES IMPACTS.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Potentially Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: After implementation of proposed mitigation measures, one significant adverse impact, demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue, would result from implementation of the proposed project. Although, no related projects are known that may cause adverse impacts to the significance of other

¹ CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.4(b)(2).

² CEQA Guidelines, Section 15130(a)(1).



Wing designs in the City, the loss of any historical resource contributes to the overall loss of historic fabric in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the impact of the demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue is considered to be cumulatively significant. Potential impacts from development of related cumulative projects would be site and project area specific and an evaluation of potential impacts would be conducted on a project-by-project basis. Each incremental development would be required to comply with all applicable City, State and Federal regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources. ~~In consideration of these regulations, potential e~~Cumulative impacts upon cultural resources would not be considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. No additional mitigation measures are recommended. ~~No mitigation measures are recommended.~~

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable Impact ~~Not applicable.~~

The comment regarding development of a master plan in the proposed project area is noted, and will be forwarded to the City of Long Beach for their consideration.

Angela Reynolds
08/15/2006 05:53 PM

To: Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB
cc: shack@rbf.com
Subject: Draft EIR re Shoreline Gateway Project

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 08/15/2006 05:53 PM -----



srwolff@comcast.net
08/14/2006 04:21 PM

To: angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov
cc: president@eastvillageartsdistrict.com, Sé Reed
<se@idiosyncratic.net>, "Casey Carver" <ccaseyacarver@aol.com>,
"Christine DiSandro" <lamusecafe@aol.com>, "Dennia Apodaca"
<lbdenis@hotmail.com>, "Kristen Autry" <liquidelbow@mac.com>,
"Ryan Smolar" <yopunani@yahoo.com>, "Sander Wolff"
<sander@longbeachculture.org>
Subject: Draft EIR re Shoreline Gateway Project

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

From:
Board of Directors
East Village Arts District, inc.
PO Box 22015
Long Beach, CA 90801
562.268.EVAD

Dear Ms. Reynolds,

The East Village Association ("EVAD") would like to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Shoreline Gateway Project.

B7.1

There are three alternate projects (7.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project) that were never presented to the association.

Over a year ago, the developer, AndersonPacific LLC, presented at an EVAD meeting a single proposal. There were many unanswered questions and they agreed to return. A phone call was

B7.2

made to their office but we never received a reply. As of this date, the developer has made no effort to communicate with the association.

B7.2

The EVAD would like to recommend a Shoreline Gateway Scoping Session similar to the Artists Exchange Scoping Session.

B7.3

The EVAD can not currently support the AndersonPacific development proposal without further community outreach and dialog .

B7.4

Respectfully,

East Village Association Board of Directors
Dennis Apodaca
Kristen Autry
Casey Carver
Christine DiSandro
Sé Reed
Ryan Smolar
Sander Wolff

EAST VILLAGE ARTS DISTRICT, INC.

The East Village Arts District, Inc. is a 501 (c) 3 not-for-profit corporation, representing the businesses, residents & artists of the East Village Arts District.

MISSION STATEMENT

To address the concerns and visions of the East Village Arts District and implement actions to improve the quality of life for residents and businesses in this community, while creating opportunities for artists of all disciplines to flourish.


Sander Roscoe Wolff
Executive Director
LongBeachCulture.org

Board of Directors
East Village Arts District, inc.



B7. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM SANDER WOLFF, EAST VILLAGE ARTS DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DATED AUGUST 14, 2006.

- B7.1 The Alternatives analysis conducted in the Draft EIR is in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which requires that an EIR analyze a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project. The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding significant environmental effects or reducing them to less than significant levels, even if these alternatives would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed project objectives.
- B7.2 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- B7.3 Comment noted. In compliance with the *CEQA Guidelines*, the City of Long Beach circulated the Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a 30-day period beginning December 13, 2005 and ending January 13, 2006. The Initial Study/NOP was made available for review at Long Beach City Hall, the City of Long Beach Main Library and on the City's website. A public scoping meeting was held on January 9, 2006 to solicit comments on the proposed project. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.
- B7.4 Comment noted. The City of Long Beach decision makers will consider all comments on the proposed project. No further response is necessary.



COMMENT NO. C1
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
Telephone: (562) 699-7411, FAX: (562) 699-5422
www.lacsd.org

JAMES F. STAHL
Chief Engineer and General Manager

July 26, 2006

File No: 03-00.04-00

Ms. Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental and Community Planning Officer
Department of Planning and Building
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Shoreline Gateway Project

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on July 3, 2006. The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 3. We offer the following comments:

1. The Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) currently processes an average flow of 316.1 million gallons per day. **C1.1**
2. The JWPCP provides full secondary treatment to all wastewater received.
3. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the project site is 43,608 gallons per day (gpd) or a total of 60,255 gpd. **C1.2**
4. The Districts appreciate the opportunity to review and to comment on projects within the City of Long Beach (City). In order to reduce costs and paper waste, when large environmental documents are available on the City's website, it will no longer be necessary to forward hard copies of the documents. Please forward instead, to the undersigned, Notices of Availability that include website information for downloading these documents. **C1.3**

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

James F. Stahl

Ruth I. Frazen
Engineering Technician
Facilities Planning Department

RIF:rf
659385.1



C1. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM RUTH I. FRAZEN, COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY, DATED JULY 26, 2006.

- C1.1 The comment provides updated flow and treatment information for the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP). The corrections do not alter the impact conclusions identified in the DEIR. Paragraph 3 on Page 5.8-11 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Wastewater generated from the project area is treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) located in the City of Carson. The JWPCP is the largest of the Districts' wastewater treatment plants, providing advanced primary and ~~partial~~ secondary treatment with a design capacity of 385 mgd of wastewater. The plant currently processes an average flow of ~~324.9~~ 316.1 mgd of wastewater.

- C1.2 The comment provides expected wastewater flow from the project site based on the Districts' average wastewater generation factors. The Districts anticipate an average increase of 43,608 gallon per day (gpd) or a total of 60,255 gpd of wastewater flow with development of the proposed project. Table 5.8-11 of the Draft EIR calculates expected wastewater flow from the project site based on demand factors provided in the LBWD's Comprehensive Sewer System Master Plan and Management Program. The LBWD anticipates an average increase of 59,171 gpd or a total of 78,966 gpd of wastewater flow with development of the proposed project. The generation factors utilized within the Draft EIR provide a more conservative assessment of potential wastewater flows with project implementation. Impacts to wastewater facilities and services were determined to be less than significant within the Draft EIR. Therefore, the projected increase in average wastewater flow provided by the Districts would not change the impact conclusion.

- C1.3 Comment noted. No further response is necessary.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

August 9, 2006

Angela Reynolds, AICP
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Re: SCH# 2005121066; Shoreline Gateway


As the state agency responsible for rail safety within California, we recommend that any development projects planned adjacent to or near the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Blue Line right-of-way be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind. New developments may increase traffic volumes not only on streets and at intersections, but also at at-grade highway-rail crossings. This includes considering pedestrian circulation patterns/destinations with respect to railroad right-of-way.

Safety factors to consider include, but are not limited to, the planning for grade separations for major thoroughfares, improvements to existing at-grade highway-rail crossings due to increase in traffic volumes and appropriate fencing to limit the access of trespassers onto the railroad right-of-way.

The above-mentioned safety improvements should be considered when approval is sought for the new development. Working with Commission staff early in the conceptual design phase will help improve the safety to motorists and pedestrians in the City.

Please advise us on the status of the project. If you have any questions in this matter, please contact me at (213) 576-7078 or at rxm@cpuc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Rosa Muñoz, PE
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Consumer Protection & Safety Division

C: Vijay Kwami, LACMTA


C2.1



**C2. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ROSA MUNOZ, PE, CALIFORNIA
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DATED AUGUST 9, 2006.**

- C2.1 The project site is not located adjacent to the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Blue Line right-of-way. The Metro Blue Line runs south via Long Beach Boulevard to the Long Beach Transit Mall. Implementation of the project would not result in development adjacent to the rail corridor.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



ASSOCIATION of GOVERNMENTS

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers: President: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • First Vice President: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Second Vice President: Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Immediate Past President: Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Imperial County: Victor Carrillo, Imperial County • Jon Edney, El Centro

Los Angeles County: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County • Jim Aldinger, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Paul Bowen, Cerritos • Todd Campbell, Burbank • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles • Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark, Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Mike Dispenza, Palmdale • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood • Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Galin, Downey • Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los Angeles • Frank Gurulé, Cudahy • Janice Hahn, Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W. Hanks, Azusa • José Huizar, Los Angeles • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles • Paula Lantz, Pomona • Paul Nowatka, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Alex Padilla, Los Angeles • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry, Los Angeles • Ed Reves, Los Angeles • Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greig Smith, Los Angeles • Tom Calkins, Walnut • Paul Tolbot, Alhambra • Mike Ten, South Pasadena • Tonia Reyes Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack Weiss, Los Angeles • Herb J. Wesson, Jr., Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

Orange County: Chris Norby, Orange County • Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman, Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Art Brown, Buena Park • Richard Chavez, Anaheim • Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach • Leslie Daigle, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel • Marilyn Poe, Los Alamitos

Riverside County: Jeff Stone, Riverside County • Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron Roberts, Temecula

San Bernardino County: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow • Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry NicCallon, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto • Alan Wapner, Ontario

Ventura County: Judy Mikels, Ventura County • Gien Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Orange County Transportation Authority: Lou Correa, County of Orange

Riverside County Transportation Commission: Robin Lowe, Hemet

Ventura County Transportation Commission: Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

August 10, 2006

Ms. Angela Reynolds, AICP
Environmental & Community Planning Officer
City of Long Beach
Department of Planning and Building
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: SCAG Clearinghouse No. I 20060448 Shoreline Gateway Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Thank you for submitting the **Shoreline Gateway Project** for review and comment. As areawide clearinghouse for regionally significant projects, SCAG reviews the consistency of local plans, projects and programs with regional plans. This activity is based on SCAG's responsibilities as a regional planning organization pursuant to state and federal laws and regulations. Guidance provided by these reviews is intended to assist local agencies and project sponsors to take actions that contribute to the attainment of regional goals and policies.

We have reviewed the **Shoreline Gateway Project**, and have determined that the proposed Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Criteria and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines (Section 15206). Therefore, the proposed Project does not warrant comments at this time. Should there be a change in the scope of the proposed Project, we would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment at that time.

A description of the proposed Project will be published in SCAG's **July 1-31, 2006 Intergovernmental Review Clearinghouse Report** for public review and comment.

The project title and SCAG Clearinghouse number should be used in all correspondence with SCAG concerning this Project. Correspondence should be sent to the attention of the Clearinghouse Coordinator. If you have any questions, please contact me at (213) 236-1851. Thank you.

Sincerely,

APRIL GRAYSON
Associate Regional Planner
Intergovernmental Review

Doc #124743

C3.1



C3. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM APRIL GRAYSON, ASSOCIATE REGIONAL PLANNER, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS, DATED AUGUST 10, 2006.

- C3.1 The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has reviewed the project and determined the Shoreline Gateway Project is not regionally significant per SCAG Intergovernmental Review (IGR) Criteria and California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines (Section 15206). No further response is necessary.



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

COMMENT NO. C4

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294
(323) 890-4330

P. MICHAEL FREEMAN
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

August 3, 2006

Angela Reynolds, AICP
City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
Department of Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 7th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT, "CITY OF LONG BEACH" – (FFER #200600033)

The Draft Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed by the Planning Division, Land Development Unit, and Forestry Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The following are their comments:

PLANNING DIVISION -- SERVICE RESPONSIBILITY:

- 1. The subject property is totally within the City of Long Beach and does not appear to have any impact on the emergency responsibilities of this Department. It is not a part of the emergency response area of the Consolidated Fire Protection District.

C4.1

LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT:

- 1. This project is located entirely in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the City of Long Beach Fire Department has jurisdiction concerning this project and will be setting conditions. This project is located in close proximity to the jurisdictional area of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. However, this project is unlikely to have an impact that necessitates a comment concerning general requirements from the Land Development Unit of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department.

C4.2

SERVING THE UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF:

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| AGOURA HILLS | BRADBURY | CUDAHY | HAWTHORNE | LA MIRADA | MALIBU | POMONA | SIGNAL HILL |
| ARTESIA | CALABASAS | DIAMOND BAR | HIDDEN HILLS | LA PUENTE | MAYWOOD | RANCHO PALOS VERDES | SOUTH EL MONTE |
| AZUSA | CARSON | DUARTE | HUNTINGTON PARK | LAKEWOOD | NORWALK | ROLLING HILLS | SOUTH GATE |
| BALDWIN PARK | CERRITOS | EL MONTE | INDUSTRY | LANCASTER | PALMDALE | ROLLING HILLS ESTATES | TEMPLE CITY |
| BELL | CLAREMONT | GARDENA | INGLEWOOD | LAWNDALE | PALOS VERDES ESTATES | ROSEMEAD | WALNUT |
| BELL GARDENS | COMMERCE | GLEN DORA | IRWINDALE | LOMITA | PARAMOUNT | SAN DIMAS | WEST HOLLYWOOD |
| BELLFLOWER | COVINA | HAWAIIAN GARDENS | LA CANADA FLINTRIDGE | LYNWOOD | PICO RIVERA | SANTA CLARITA | WESTLAKE VILLAGE |
| | | | LA HABRA | | | | WHITTIER |

Angela Reynolds, AICP
August 3, 2006
Page 2

2. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.
3. Should any questions arise regarding subdivision, water systems, or access, please contact the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Land Development Unit's EIR Specialist at (323) 890-4243.

C4.2

FORESTRY DIVISION – OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:

1. The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance.
2. The areas germane to the statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, Forestry Division have been addressed.

C4.3

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (323) 890-4330.

Very truly yours,



DAVID R. LEININGER, CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION
PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU

DRL:lc



C4. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM DAVID R. LEININGER, CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION, PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES FIRE DEPARTMENT, DATED AUGUST 3, 2006.

- C4.1 The Los Angeles County Fire Department has determined that the project site is within the City of Long Beach and is not part of the emergency response area of the Consolidated Fire Protection District. No further response is necessary.
- C4.2 The Los Angeles County Fire Department has determined that the project site is within the City of Long Beach and although the project site is located in close proximity to the jurisdictional area of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department, the project is not likely to have an impact that necessitates comments concerning general requirements from the Land Development Unit of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. No further response is necessary.
- C4.3 The comment provides the statutory responsibilities of the Los Angeles County Fire Department, Forestry Division and states that areas germane to the statutory responsibilities have been addresses. No further response is necessary.



Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Maureen F. Gorsen, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

August 10, 2006

Ms. Angela Reynolds, AICP
City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90802

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR SHORELINE GATEWAY PROJECT (SCH#2005121066)

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted (EIR) document for the above-mentioned project. "The project proposes mixed-use residential units including live/work spaces, town homes, one to three bedroom apartments units, penthouse units and associated amenities and 13,561 square feet of retail/gallery space. Parking for approximately 820 vehicles would be provided in three subterranean parking levels and in a concealed parking structure located at-grade and one level above-grade".

Based on the review of the submitted (EIR) document DTSC has comments as follow:

1. The draft EIR needs to identify and determine whether current or historic uses at the Project site have resulted in any release of hazardous wastes/substances at the Project area. C5.1

2. The draft EIR needs to identify any known or potentially contaminated sites within the proposed Project area. For all identified sites, the draft EIR should evaluate whether conditions at the site pose a threat to human health or the environment. A Phase I Assessment may be sufficient to identify these sites. Following are the databases of some of the regulatory agencies: C5.2
 - National Priorities List (NPL): A list is maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).
 - CalSites: A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control.

- Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
 - Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S. EPA.
 - Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations. **C5.2**
 - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) / Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC): A list that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs).
 - Local County and City maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.
3. The draft EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If hazardous materials or wastes were stored at the site, an environmental assessment should be conducted to determine if a release has occurred. If so, further studies should be carried out to delineate the nature and extent of the contamination, and the potential threat to public health and/or the environment should be evaluated. It may be necessary to determine if an expedited response action is required to reduce existing or potential threats to public health or the environment. If no immediate threat exists, the final remedy should be implemented in compliance with state laws, regulations and policies. **C5.3**
4. If the subject property was previously used for agriculture, onsite soils could contain pesticide residues. Proper investigation and remedial action may be necessary to ensure the site does not pose a risk to the future residents. **C5.4**
5. All environmental investigations, sampling and/or remediation should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous waste cleanup. The findings and sampling results from the subsequent report should be clearly summarized in the EIR. **C5.5**
6. Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to the new development or any construction, and overseen by a regulatory agency. **C5.6**

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 7. If any property adjacent to the project site is contaminated with hazardous chemicals, and if the proposed project is within 2,000 feet from a contaminated site, then the proposed development may fall within the "Border Zone of a Contaminated Property." Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is within a "Border Zone Property | C5.7 |
| 8. Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities. A study of the site overseen by the appropriate government agency might have to be conducted to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment. | C5.8 |
| 9. If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If so, the facility should obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942. | C5.9 |
| 10. If hazardous wastes are (a) stored in tanks or containers for more than ninety days, (b) treated onsite, or (c) disposed of onsite, then a permit from DTSC may be required. If so, the facility should contact DTSC at (818) 551-2171 to initiate pre application discussions and determine the permitting process applicable to the facility. | C5.10 |
| 11. Certain hazardous waste treatment processes may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA. | C5.11 |
| 12. If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be required to obtain a wastewater discharge permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board. | C5.12 |
| 13. If during construction/demolition of the project, soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented. If it is determined that contaminated soil and/or groundwater exist, the EIR should identify how any required investigation and/or remediation will be conducted, and the appropriate government agency to provide regulatory oversight. | C5.13 |

Ms. Angela Reynolds
August 10, 2006
Page 4

14. If structures on the Project Site contain potentially hazardous materials, such as; asbestos-containing material, lead-based paint, and mercury- or PCB-containing material, such materials should be removed properly prior to demolition, and disposed of at appropriate landfills or recycled, in accordance with the regulatory guidance provided in California Code of Regulation (CCR) and following the requirements of the Universal Waste Rule (40 CFR part 9).

C5.14

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact me at (714) 484-5461 or call Mr. Al Shami, Project Manager, at (714) 484-5472 or at "ashami@dtsc.ca.gov".

Sincerely,



Greg Holmes
Unit Chief
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch - Cypress Office

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat, Chief
Planning and Environmental Analysis Section
CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
P.O. Box 806
Sacramento, California 95812-0806

CEQA # 1455



C5. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM GREG HOLMES, UNIT CHIEF, DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES CONTROL, DATED AUGUST 10, 2006.

- C5.1 Section 5.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR evaluates impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials based on information contained the Phase I Environmental Assessment prepared by SCS Engineers (August 2005). As indicated in Section 5.6, a former service station was located within the project site, at 725 East Ocean Boulevard. The property is listed as a UST site, therefore, the potential that adverse environmental conditions were created by this previous use is considered high. LBFD files indicate that four USTs were removed from this address. However, no additional records could be located for this address. Implementation of mitigation requiring verification of any releases that may have occurred from these tanks and to identify and comply with appropriate remediation, if applicable, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- C5.2 As indicated in Section 5.6 of the Draft EIR, a Phase I Environmental Assessment was prepared by SCS Engineers (August 2005). As part of the Phase I, a database search for sites listed on various Federal and State databases was conducted. The purpose of the search was to determine if sites are located within the project site boundaries or within a 0.25-mile radius that have been reported as contaminated or that generate hazardous materials. A listing of the databases searched is provided in the Draft EIR (refer to page 5.6-4 through 5.6-9). One regulatory site was identified within the project site (725 East Ocean Boulevard). Refer to Response to Comment C5.1. Six regulatory sites were identified within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. The Draft EIR evaluates whether conditions at each site pose a threat to human health or the environment. One site (805 East Ocean Boulevard) has experienced several releases from USTs that have impacted soils and groundwater beneath the site. Implementation of mitigation including review of files by a qualified hazardous materials consultant to delineate the vertical and lateral extent of contamination relevant to the project site would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- C5.3 Refer to Response to Comments C5.1 and C5.2. Additionally, mitigation measures have been identified in the Draft EIR in the event unknown hazardous materials or unknown wastes or suspect materials are encountered within the project site or are discovered during construction. Identification of hazardous materials and results of sampling (if necessary) shall indicate the appropriate level of remediation efforts that may be required. Compliance with the mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- C5.4 The project site is currently developed with residential, retail, restaurant and parking uses. The site is not being used for agricultural purposes.



- C5.5 As indicated in Section 5.6 of the Draft EIR, public records identified one listed regulatory site within the project site and six regulatory sites within a 0.25-mile radius of the project site. A summary of the findings and remediation, if applicable, has been provided in the Draft EIR. Refer to Response to Comment C5.3.
- C5.6 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.7 Refer to Response to Comment C5.2. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.8 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Section 5.6 of the Draft EIR provides mitigation measures in the event hazardous materials are discovered during demolition and construction activities. Any remediation would be required to comply with State law.
- C5.9 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.10 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.11 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.12 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.
- C5.13 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. Section 5.6 of the Draft EIR identifies mitigation measures to determine if soil and/or groundwater contamination exists and compliance with State and Federal regulatory requirements. If hazardous materials or contamination is verified or discovered during construction, sampling would indicate the appropriate level of remediation efforts that may be required.
- C5.14 Comment noted. The commenter does not raise any new environmental information or directly challenge information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

COMMENT NO. C6



Sean Walsh
Director

August 15, 2006

Angela Reynolds
Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
333 W. Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802

Subject: Shoreline Gateway
SCH#: 2005121066

Dear Angela Reynolds:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on August 14, 2006, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Terry Roberts
Director, State Clearinghouse

C6.1

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2005121066
Project Title Shoreline Gateway
Lead Agency Long Beach Redevelopment Agency

Type EIR Draft EIR
Description The project proposes a mixed-use residential development involving three towers with 358 residential units including live/work spaces, townhomes, one to three bedroom apartments units, penthouse units and associated amenities and 13,561 square feet of retail/gallery space. Parking for approximately 820 vehicles would be provided in three subterranean parking levels and in a concealed parking structure located at-grade and one level above-grade.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Angela Reynolds
Agency Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
Phone (562) 570-6357 **Fax**
email
Address 333 W. Ocean Boulevard
City Long Beach **State** CA **Zip** 90802

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Long Beach
Region
Cross Streets Ocean Boulevard, Alamitos Avenue, Shoreline Drive

| Parcel No. | Township | Range | Section | Base |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|

Proximity to:

Highways I-710
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools Benjamin Franklin, Charles Lindbergh and Herbert Hoover middle s
Land Use The project site is currently developed with residential, retail, restaurant, office and parking uses. The project site is zoned Downtown Planned Development District (PD-30) and is designated Land Use District (LUD) No. 7 Mixed Use.

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Cumulative Effects; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Geologic/Seismic; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply

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

Date Received 06/30/2006 **Start of Review** 06/30/2006 **End of Review** 08/14/2006



C6. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM STATE OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH, DATED AUGUST 15, 2006.

- C6.1 The State Clearinghouse has indicated that no state agencies submitted comments by the close of the review period and acknowledges compliance with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to CEQA. No further response is necessary.

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you



| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Paula G Smith | 5241 W. 142nd pl., Hawthorne | 310-433-7107 |
| 2. Damon | 60 LIME AVE L.B. | 562-642-5952 |
| 3. BOBBY LUDENMAN | 2435 2038 VIA CERRITOS PUE | 310 213 2277 |
| 4. Daron Lew | 71 Lime Ave. Apt # 10 | 248-935-0400 |
| 5. JULIAN ZULUAGA | 120 GRAND AVE L.B | (562) 331-5760 |
| 6. Angel Rodriguez | 10015 SAN ANSELMO SU. | 323) 353-9688 |
| 7. Mariama T. Myers | 138 Elm Ave #22 L.B. | 562-445-0668 |
| 8. BOBA OBARUSAN | 32766 FIELDS LN CASTANA CA | (888) 765-3647 |
| 9. Dwayne Wallace | 1400 Viorca-Ave, Santa Fe Springs, CA | 562-906-0650 |
| 10. DAVID ENRICK | 555 E OCEAN BLVD, LB 3RD FLOOR | 562-901-0413 |
| 11. MARCO | 555 E OCEAN | |
| 12. Krystal Jimenez | 990 244TH | 562-901-0460 |
| 13. Alysona Crowder | 23200 S. Western Apt 132 | 310 930 9960 |
| 14. Cheryl FRANK | 23200 S Western Apt 107 | (310) 326 1966 |
| 15. MELISSA BEBICH | 555 E. OCEAN, #700 Long Beach CA, 90802 | (562) 506-2820 |
| 16. D. STEURUS | moving | 562-544-0204 |
| 17. Jesse Aguilar | 91145 JESUS #1111 | 562-762-5962 |
| 18. Robert Ramirez | 12521 Centralist #95 Lakewood | 562 688-2371 |
| 19. Keisharachal | 555 E. Ocean Blvd #810 LBCA | (562) 436-1231 |
| 20. John | 555 E. OCEAN Blvd #810 LB CA | 562) 436-1231 |
| 21. John | 366-B CARROLL PK. E. LBCA | |
| 22. John | 400 E Long Beach LB 90815 | 562-599-0247 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

②

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|------------------------|---|----------------|
| Sandy Chavez | 2135 E. 4th St #201 Long Beach, CA | (562) 221-7445 |
| 2. JOHN BROWN | 79 XIMENO AVE Long Beach, CA | 562) 385-0265 |
| 3. Tom Madsen | 525 Seaside way Long Beach, | 562-983-3886 |
| 4. Tom Madsen | 455 E ocean Blvd | 562 438 5922 |
| 5. Tristian Wheeler | 1074 Freeman AVE. | 562) 506-6604 |
| 6. Stephanie Haldel | 1030 E. Ocean Blvd 210 | 562-256-4634 |
| 7. Camile Lewis | 140 Linden Avenue #756 ^{Long Beach} 90802 | (562) 912-4047 |
| 8. Francesco Rensel | 140 Linden Ave. #775 | 562 282 8917 |
| 9. Diana Capelle | 102 B Roswell, LB CA 90803 | (949) 533-2554 |
| 10. Chris DiSanfilippo | 485 E Ocean #12 LB 90802 | (562) 492-1965 |
| 11. Charles W. Taylor | 488 E. Ocean Blvd, #307 ^{Long Beach,} CA 90804 | |
| 12. Chris Pi-Sandro | 255 E. Ocean Blvd | 562-432-1965 |
| 13. Kevin Hurley | 1074 Freeman LB 90804 | 562) 439-7190 |
| 14. KAY MINTH | 425 E ocean #110 LB CA | 562 436 3076 |
| 15. Ruby Castaneda | 425 E Ocean #100 LB CA | (562) 445-0207 |
| 16. Craig Williams | 225 W 6th ST Unit 57 | 562-436-2912 |
| 17. RIZZA AQUINRE | 427 ORANGE AVE #9 | 562-980-2966 |
| 18. David Aguirre | " " " " | " " " |
| 19. Annie Brown | 329 Lynwood Rd, Lynwood, CA 90262 | 310-722-8311 |
| 20. Matt Miller | 250 W. Ocean | 816-210-9000 |
| 21. Cliff Lewis | Call for personal address | (562) 508-5211 |
| 22. [Signature] | 250 Elmwood #210 LB 90802 | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

3

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| Hugo Garzona | 555 E OCEAN BLVD | (562) 435-8079 |
| 2. Joe DeLuca | 5585 DOLBY AVE | (562) 423-0990 |
| 3. Bronson Giddings | 700 E. Ocean Blvd #1001
LONG BEACH, CA 90802 | (562) 435-6030 |
| 4. SAMUEL DeLeon | 555 Ocean Blvd | (562) 595 0167 |
| 5. Francesca Frausto | 555 ocean Blvd. | (562) 429-7801 |
| 6. Joe Mendez | same | (562) 432-6360 |
| 7. Mark Lee | 577 E. 1st St. | 626 627-1824 |
| 8. Jemaine D. Evans | 500 Redondo St. Apt. 104
Long Beach 90814 | (562) 537-6017 |
| 9. Brian Dewit | 53 Linden APT 24 | (562) 225-8996 |
| 10. Victor Copeland Jr. | -117 West 31st street | (562) 607-1352 |
| 11. Jivonde Villalba | 426 E. 1st St LB, CA
90802 | (562) 254-2688 |
| 12. BARBARA FOSS | 406 E. 1st. St LB, CA
90802 | (562) 901-0555 |
| 13. Nicole Haeger | 400 E 1st St LB, CA
90802 | 562-432-6869 |
| 14. Kathy Kelton | 488 E Ocean Blvd #1001 | (210) 834-5710 |
| 15. Darlene M. Harris | 16809 Bellflower Bl. #321 Bellflower, CA, 90706 | (562) 491-1977 |
| 16. Julie Vu | 62 Kimonail Spa | 562-983-9100 |
| 17. Tracy Phan | same | 11 |
| 18. Quincy Leftwich | Quincy Leftwich | (562) 912-7517 |
| 19. Jameer Williams | 406 E. 1st St #400 | (562) 422-734 |
| 20. David Hayden | 421 EAST FIRST ST | 562 435 5699 |
| 21. Corrie A. Grassmuck | 209 1/2 Linden Ave. #B | 562 739-0355 |
| 22. Moose Conowsay | 1522 Lime Ave | 562 376 6035 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(4)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------|
| 2. Jan Burt | 13811 WOODHILL
NORW. CALIF. | 818 677 2229 |
| 3. Jim Hely | SHORELINE MARINA | 714 581 4581 |
| 4. Steve Hughes | 11310 W 139 T | 913-685-9163 |
| 5. Edmund Silverio | | 714-404-8102 |
| 6. D. D. Dantes | WILSON, CA | 310-549-9775 |
| 7. M. DeLeon | AVADON | 310-570-2754 |
| 8. S. Field | 455 E OCEAN | 323-960-7919 |
| 9. C. VALENCIA | L.A. | 323 2695-967 |
| 10. J. MADRA | 12737 ROSECRANS AVE SP-#439060 | (92) 404-4718 |
| 11. C. Casca | 2632 Silverwood, Roseman | 562-493-4353 |
| 12. G. Miano | 2632 Silverwood Los Alamitos | 562-493-4353 |
| 13. N. Carles | 11012 LARRYMAN DR. | 562-947-7952 |
| 14. KEN WOODS | 5267 WARNER #129 HB 9264 | 949-510-7924 |
| 15. Anthony E. Barrett | 110 W OCEAN AVE STE 331 L.B. | 661-345-2928 |
| 16. Therese Stewart | 96 Cerritos Ave | |
| 17. Rebecca Stewart | 96 Cerritos Ave LB | |
| 18. Kim Smith | SLIP A-2 - Long Beach | 626 971 4665 |
| 19. [unclear] | 2131 W. Covina CA 91790 | (626) 306-6817 |
| 20. Linda A. Tan | 2542 Loomis St Inglewood (CA 90712) | 562 984 9586 |
| 21. STERYN W. CABE | 241 E. Cherry LB | 562) 4581000 |

22. → Innocent parking & location - Don't go!

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(5)

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|---------------------------|--|----------------|
| BERNARDO DOMINGUEZ | 21211 TOLAN CT
DIAMOND BAR CA 91765 | 562 547 1661 |
| 2. Don Crines | PO Box 3166 L.B. 90803 | 562-986-9102 |
| 3. Adrienne Joyce-Elicker | 828 Magnolia Ave. LB 90813 | 562 435 6628 |
| 4. STEVE Elicker | " " " | " " |
| 5. Jan Herrera | 1506 E. 4th St # 209 | |
| 6. Joan Cohen | 5232 Fidler Ave. Lakewood | |
| 7. Drew Lambro | 269 Los Ventos Pkwy 91320 | |
| 8. MARTIN MILLER | 3845 OLIVE AVE | |
| 9. Venetia Lambro | 7063 WHITAKER AVE. BALBOA, CA 91406 | (818) 781-2506 |
| 10. M. Schneider | 10746 Francis Plac. #296, LA, CA 90034 | (818) 926-6127 |
| 11. RAY KUEHC | 850 DAISY # C | (310) 602-9314 |
| 12. J. M. Hunter | 5227 Keynote St LB CA 90808 | (562) 627-9827 |
| 13. Phil Howell | 513 N. MARINE AVE WILM. PA. | (610) 503-1554 |
| 14. Rick Berenda | 228 ATLANTIC AVE LB 90803 | (562) 437 6367 |
| 15. DAVE MILLER | 3436 ARROYO DR. Modesto LA. | 209-848-6525 |
| 16. Chris Plante | 955 E 2nd St LB | (562) 951-1711 |
| 17. FRANK CENSO | 700 S Ocean Blvd | |
| 18. Clark Houghton | 4348 Gandy Ave L.B. | |
| 19. JESSE HOOD | 434 CEDAR COMPTON 90226 | |
| 20. NICK SNELL | 4 BENSON RD., CROWTHORNE,
BERKS. RG45 6DH GREAT BRITAIN | |
| C. W. Jison | 1140 E OCEAN BL. UNIT 302 LB | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(6)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 2. Anna Volkman | 1355 Coma Ave 202 LB | 562 448 3670 |
| 3. Kenneth Williams | 1130 East First St, #204, LB | 562-495-9150 |
| 4. Faith Herrmann | 1130 East First St, #204, LB | 562-495-9150 |
| 5. KATHY BLESER | 800 E OCEAN BLVD #150 LB | 562-432-4222 |
| 6. Antonia Gonzalez | 134 Gavio 1/2 Ave | 562-437-6670 |
| 7. JEMETRIUS JAFFER | 600 E. OCEAN PL. #706 | 562 495 9505 |
| 8. David Grecco | 42 Lime Lime | 562-212-8779 |
| 9. CECILIA ELLISON | 42 LIME LB, CA 90802 | 562 212 8638 |
| 10. Robert Loughner | 706 Roswell Av 90801 | 562-439-6043 |
| 11. TY DUNN | 10 ATLANTIC AVE. APT. #509 90802 | 562-981-4384 |
| 12. Jason Williams | 1163 E 10th St #109 LBCA90813 | 562 595-2323 |
| 13. Valerie Williams | 1163 E. 10th St #109 LBCA90813 | 562 595-2323 |
| 14. Christopher Dotson | 437 Lim. Ave. LB, CA 90802 | cdot77@hotmail.com |
| 15. Rhonda Muzzey | 319 Shoreline Dr. LB | 562-510-8809 |
| 16. Sharon Cotell | 2035 E Broadway LB 90803 | 562-433-7025 |
| 17. Danylle Hart | P.O. Box 1404 Hawaiian Garden Co. 90716 | 562-256-5411 |
| 18. Kathy Lustig | 220 Elm Ave. #209 LB 90802 | tallkat11@netzero.com |
| 19. CHIDI DILLIBE | 146 HIGHLAND PL. MONROVIA CA 91016 | (626) 703-4037 |
| 20. Emory Custer | 14815 Anselmo Ave Hawaiian Heights CA 91175 | (626) 336-0149 |
| 21. Keith Sandoz | 915 E Ocean Blvd #51 | |
| 22. Jaime Lee | 2125 E Florida St LB, CA 90804 | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(7)

| NAME | address | Phone # |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| C. HUGGINS | 520 E. Willow #20 | 562-492-6819 |
| DAVE McCARTHY | 705 JAY CIR H.B. CA | 714-374-6426 |
| L. Montan | 4934 V.R. Fresco Cam. | 917. 747-2318 |
| Mary Tripps | 128 Leme apt 15 LBC. | 983-07711 |
| STUE DUNING | 65 Pine Ave #144 LBC. Calif. | 907-3535 x2 |
| NICK STAPATAS | 615 E ocean BLVD L.B. CA | 562-436-6037 |
| RODOLFO RUBEN | 5818 E ALLINGTON ST - LAKEWOOD CA 90713 | (562) - 866 8872 |
| JUDY ALBERT | 800 E. OCEAN BLVD L.B. 90802 | (562) 590-3225 |
| DAVE BITTNER | 2630 LINDEN AV #8 L.B. 90806 | 562. 947. 1776 |
| JAMES TAOUS | 850 E. Ocean #1205, L.B. 90802 | 562 397-4850 |
| DENNIS EDWARDS | 906 OAKMERE DR. HARBOUR CITY 90719 | 310 783-6444 |
| Melissa & Michael Goodman | 1835 Stanley Ave #C SH 90755 | (562) 290-2571 |
| Matthew M. Stetrek | 1825 Stanley Ave. #C SH 90755 | 562) 498-3181 |
| Madeline Goodman | 1825 Stanley Ave #1 SH 90755 | (562) 986-9022 |
| Tom Kallouvent | 5937 Los Encinos St. B.P. CA 90620 | 714-995-3027 |
| Rebecca Miskey | 5450 N. Paramount Bl. #309 L.B. 90805 | 562-221-5097 |
| Gerry Miskey | 5450 N. Paramount Bl. L.B. 90805 | 562-633-7652 |
| Mary L. Chandler | 1034 E. 3rd St. L.B. 90802 | |
| Robert Riedel | 2764 Harrison St. L.B. | 310-835-6965 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you



| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2. Kevin McCue | 244 ATLANTIC B. #1 | 562-3928 |
| 3. BARNEY ADAMS | | |
| 4. Renee C Hunt | Angel Renee 2000@yahoo.com | 310-613-9848 |
| 5. Samantha Delacruz | Sammyjazz2200152104@yahoo.com | 662-957-5720 |
| 6. Ashley Ann Delacruz | red girl Park Place@yahoo.com | (5722) 951-5720 |
| 7. Hector Lopez | 411 S. CENTRE ST #41 S.P. | (310) 982-9213 |
| 8. Super W. Fajal | 147 37 mananita, LMa 90638 | (714) 523-7246 |
| 9. Dean Ziegel | 2108 Louisa Ave, LB | 562 596-248 |
| 10. David P. Martinez | 801 N Loma Vista
LONG BEACH, CA | 562 590 9595 |
| 11. Joe Bonello | 20028 SATHALE RD. APPLE VALLEY | 92307 |
| 12. Staci Stephens | 20 ORANGE AVE Long Beach CA 90802 | (562) 951-5508 |
| 13. B. Kelly | 20 Orange Av LB 90802 | " " " |
| 14. Staci Stephens | 4074 S Florida Ave LB | 562 432-7856 |
| 15. Maria Vasquez | 117 Sycamore CA 90262 | 310-639 0744 |
| 16. MARCELIANO VASQUEZ | " " | " " |
| 17. Glenn Jensen | 1827 E Ocean Blvd | 562 673 0437 |
| 18. John Kelt | ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| 19. Kimber Hamilton | ✓ - | ✓ - - |
| 20. Alfredo Montenegro | 3635 E 1ST # 211 | 562 211 5211 |
| 21. L. Gaye | | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

9

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. Charlene Pfeiffer | 925 ROSE AVE # 1 | (562) 218-0011 |
| 2. Dawn Wolfe | 386 N. Stearns | 562-8 |
| 3. MIKE RAPPAPORT | 12 3 rd PLACE | 562 436-7549 |
| 4. William R. Bua | 13201 N. Point Ln.
Laurel MD 20707 | 301-362-9503 |
| 5. Ken Forsythe | 13201 N Point Ln
Laurel MD 20708 | 3/362 9503 |
| 6. GREG CLARK | 12876 CAPE COTTAGE LN SYMMAN | 818 361 2566 |
| 7. GARY R CARUN | 555 E Ocean Blvd Suite 600 | 562-432-8933 |
| 8. Anastasia Giannis | 27639 TARRASA DR. R. PVCA | 310 514 3354 |
| 9. J.C. | E 915 OCEAN BLVD | 562 7040 |
| 10. Ignacio Lara | 580 Nebraska Ave #1 | (562) 590 7210 |
| 11. Juan Carlos Merada | 1047 S 5 th ST #2 L.B.C.A. | (562) 436-75-62 |
| 12. MANUEL MORALES | 9822 LA DOCCENA LN ^{PIRO} REVERA | (562) 949-5839 |
| 13. Natty Morales | 9822 La Doccena Ln P.P. | 512/949-5839 |
| 14. Justa Morales | 1435 La Doccena Ln. PIR. | 562/949-7865 |
| 15. Sylvia Morales | 1060 Se Heiter Ave Lb | 322/780-9085 |
| 16. Eugene Martin | 245 LINDEN AV. Long Beach, Ca | 562-760-5569 |
| 17. Jonathan Burkett | 1084 N Diamond Ct LB 9002 | 562-599-4844 |
| 18. ALDO R. PEARSE | 1023 E 1 st ST L.B. | 562-424-8013 |
| 19. Gerald Meaker | 5333 Marina Pacifica Ln. LB | 562-594-7433 |
| 20. Rickell | 45470 Sumbrook Ln La Brea CA | 710 222 7043 |
| 21. J.G. ARMAND | 3635 E 1 st ST #402 LB | 310/721-4468 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(10)

| * NAME * | * address * | * Phone # * |
|----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. GLENN MASSEY | 360 W OCEAN Blvd #508 LB | 435 4318 |
| 2. THOMAS TIMMERMAN | 360 W OCEAN Blvd #508 LB | 435 4318 |
| 3. BOB JENICH | 1530 Delmar Dr Sp 90732 | 310 831-4927 |
| 4. Joseph Riedel | 16520 Mountain St Lake Elsinore Co, CA | 951-245-2248 |
| 5. Lynne Cihlar | 1410 EIDERWOOD DR. CORONA CA 92882 | 951 549 1034 |
| 6. AGLATE MORGAN | 542 E. SHORELINE DR. LONG BEACH CA 90802 | 702-592-3039 |
| 7. Sharon Moskowitz | 6615 W 83 ST LA 90045 | 310-670-5768 |
| 8. June Renwand | 1711 E. 6 th St Long Beach | 562) 864-2691 |
| 9. Paola Monner | 800 E. Ocean Blvd | 562 307 3210 |
| 10. Sara Mummolo | 96 Cerritos Ave. Long Beach | 908 770 8092 |
| 11. William Stewart | 96 Cerritos Ave LB, CA 90802 | (516) 732-1412 |
| 12. Bosonetta, D | 2351 Granada Ave | 525 221 571 |
| 13. Ceron Christie | 408 S. Spruce St LA, CA 90013 | 562 388-3900 |
| 14. Mark Anthony | 3000 E. 7 th St LB, CA 90802 | 562-577-2827 |
| 15. Russ Collinswood | PO Box 173 LB CA 90801 | 310 213-1867 |
| 16. Phil Halquist | 901 12 th St. HAWAII BEACH 92649 | 714 960 7300 |
| 17. GRETCHEN Howard | 709 MEDIST #2 LONG BEACH CA 90802 | 516-734 7143 |
| 18. | | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(11)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| XXXXXXXXXXXX | XXXXXXXXXXXX | (562) 436-6057 |
| 2. Salu Stone | 455 E. Ocean #507 LB | (562) 822-6022 |
| 3. Charles Griffin | 25 Linden Ave | (562) 590-3809 |
| 4. Andrew Reyes | | (562) 430-6924 |
| 5. EC PONCE | 1059 E 1st STREET | 562-463-4313 |
| 6. Robert Johnson | 9301 Velando HP | 714 315-3594 |
| 7. Michael J. Newman | 8653 LaFaire Alta Loma | |
| 8. MICHAEL HICKS | 1174 E OCEAN BLVD #14 LB 90802 | (562) 843-4114 |
| 9. DAVID GIRON | 6112 ALISADE DR | 562-491-7241 |
| 10. JOAN RASTLE | 628 N. VIRGINIA CT., L.B., CA. 90802 | 562/435-1878 |
| 11. Leonard Rodriguez | 24892 Hault Way Laguna Niguel 92672 | 949-322-7179 |
| 12. Robert [unclear] | 417 W. OCEAN BLVD LB | 562-2491-6570 |
| 13. PATRICK WILSON | 2835 E 6th #A LB CA | 4393388 |
| 14. TERRY SAFIAN | 6538 WOODLAKE AVE WEST HILLS 91307 90014 | 818-943-9875 |
| 15. Kevin Gm [unclear] | 3530 ARUNDOLL CIR VENTURA, CA | 7805644860 |
| 16. Long [unclear] | 28514 White Oak Ln | 051 237 1948 |
| 17. John Prado | 3900 E. main st #11 Ventura | 805-509-0320 |
| 18. J.A. Plank | P.O. Box 740 VA LA 43002 | 805 630-2020 |
| 19. Brian Biggers | P.O. Box 206 Long Beach | 562/900-6667 |
| 20. Tre Turner | 6101 FELTON AVE # V. NUGY 91401 | (818) 466-5798 |
| 21. Eugenio MARTINEZ | 245 LINDEN AV. Long Beach, Ca. | 562)-260-5569 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(12)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| 2. Amy Rowe | 91357 8th Mills, CA 90244 | (760) 396-9141 |
| 3. Brent E. Shel | 2112 W 124th Long. TA CA 90717 | (310) 292 2162 |
| 4. Mr. Wennstrom | 7425 MIDFIELD AVE. WESTCHESTER CA 90045 | (310) 641-3365 |
| 5. Ken Runnels | 1030 E. Ocean Blvd | 562 1208-3453 |
| 6. Dixie Dorsey | 850 E Ocean Blvd #1401 | 562-833-5623 |
| 7. [Signature] | 444 E Ocean Blvd #1406 | 925-330-2100 |
| 8. [Signature] | 3939 E ALLIN ST #208 L.R. CA 90803 | 310-387-8356 |
| 9. James Freeland | Murson Pa | |
| 10. [Signature] | 1011 E Appleton Apt 2 Long Beach CA 90802 | 562-689-7130 |
| 11. [Signature] | 1157 E. Hellman St. L.B. 90813 | 562-599-0870 |
| 12. Amy Green | 1155 E HELLMAN ST LIB 90813 | 562-499-9860 |
| 13. [Signature] | 2205 GRAMERCY AVE TOR. CA 90501 | 310-920-5247 |
| 14. [Signature] | 429 MARVISTA AVE 90744 | (310) 213-6889 |
| 15. [Signature] | RUTSCHBERG 29, 8608 BUBIKEN, SWITZERLAND | 0041 794078956 |
| 16. Felipa Lanaspadilla | 2501 E. 4th St #10 LB, CA 90814 | 714 473 7236 |
| 17. Brian Lanzarotto | 860 W. Grissold Rd. Covina, CA 91722 | (626) 922-3629 |
| 18. STEVE GOLF | 3030 PETALUMA AVE LB. CA 90808 | 562) 260 7769 |
| 19. FERNANDO MORALES | 16704 WILTON PL TORRANCE 90504 | (310) 817-1152 |
| 20. SANDY MARENGO | 1702 E. ERIEST. APT. 2 LONG BEACH CA 90802 | (562) 901-9322 |
| 21. JOYCE MARENGO | 1702 E. ERIEST. APT. 2 LONG BEACH CA. 90802 | (562) 901-9322 |
| 22. | | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

13

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| John Bridges | 15635 Connetta Ln H.B | 714-898-7933 |
| Treuer Adamo | 6251 Winslow H.B. | 714-891-1953 |
| 3. Chris Schaffner | 44 N. Albani PL #11 L.B | 562 432-0801 |
| 4. George Hardy | 840 Catalina, SB | 714 915-5958 |
| 5. Todd D. Jones | 245 Temple Ave #3 Long Beach | 562 439-3249 |
| 6. MARK ALTENSTADTER | 3012 E. 6 th St., Long Beach, | 562 366-5505 |
| 7. ERIC LANGDON | 1527 S. GRAND AV. SAN PEDRO | 310 831 1067 |
| 8. Ken Gonzalez | 703 Brynne Blvd Ste B #159 LB | 562 428 5620 |
| 9. Michael B CURIALE | 600 EAST OCEAN BVD #1506 | 562-492-3747 |
| 10. Kathleen Peterson | 700 E Ocean 905. | 562 590 3499 |
| 11. Janice Clamm | 1205 W Cypress #8 San Dimas 91773 | 909-599-4659 |
| 12. Paul Benji | 3618 Sava Dr Torrance CA | 90 310-212-6173 |
| 13. Debbie Poldermeert | 1066 Wray LB | 562 728 4530 |
| 14. Lydia Kumskaw | 1804 Bella Vista Place Torrance | 805 415-4953 |
| 15. Joseph Platt | 200 Pacific Ave. Long Beach, CA 90802 | 562 434-1004 |
| 16. Brad Loughran | 1445 Brett Place #306 San Pedro 90732 | (310) 519-1499 |
| 17. NICK BALSZ | 131 E. LIVE OAK ST #19 SAN GABRIEL CA | (626) 286-6732 |
| 18. Lisa M. Massimino | 35 N. Albani PL #501 Long Beach, CA 90802 | (949) 606.3284 |
| 19. Jonathan Bueno | 35 N. Albani PL #504 " | 562. 590. 6972 |
| 20. Robin Hernandez | P.O. Box 62355 | 323 294-5167 |
| 21. MARK HECKETT HORN | 175 LA VERNE AV. L.B. CA 90803 | 562-289-3122 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(14)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Jose Tostado | 1865 Stanley ave unit 1 | (562) 843-7014 |
| 2. Blake Desmond | 2519 W. 230th St. | (310) 438-6198 |
| 3. Armando Sanchez | 1760 Marinette St | (310) 212-6788 |
| 4. Daniel Powell | 17429 ASCONA DR. | (1061) 252-0488 |
| 5. JOHN RYAN | 11518 CANYON PARK | (619) 498-5518 |
| 6. Jim Corinman | 525 E. SEASIDE WAY, LB, CA | 562 355-0625. |
| 7. CLIFTON KESTER | 1152 E. 1ST ST LB CA | 805.458.3097 |
| 8. George Rodriguez | 2425 Palm Plaza | 323-581-0786 |
| 9. Cathy Mora | 13234 Deming Ave Downey CA 90242 | (562) 305-2924 |
| 10. Brian Ogden | 1030 E Ocean Blvd Apt 210 | (330) 701-7965 |
| 11. Pabrosi S. Cruz | 1047 Ocean Blvd | (562) 937-6275 |
| 12. Km Cuc Cilla | 114 G Cedar LB. | 562-544 7305 |
| 13. Dr. Biwell | 12412 KENNINGTON | 562-493-7167 |
| 14. Daniel Snyder | 4220 S 1350E SLC UT | 801-509-1166 |
| 15. Phil Vossenback | 4222 S 1350E SLC UT | 801-277-3804 |
| 16. ROSS JONES | 1802 S. 1510 W. WY. UT. | 801-294-4044 |
| 17. Chris Clark | 444 E. 92ND St. LA, CA | 323-397-1547 |
| 18. Myrna Sal. Sadala | 940 Lighthouse way PL, CA | 805-982-6310 |
| 19. I Fly | 17 Rutherford Ln Bedford NH | 603-472-5363 |
| 20. BOB STARR | 333 JUNIPERO AVE, LB. CA | 562-434-3623 |
| 21. CHARLES ZEBROSKI | 4714 N. HASALA AVE #5B, TAMPA, FL. | 813-876-1771 |
| 22. Melinda Starni + SCS | 23986 Petrel Ct. Laguna Niguel | 1949 831 2392 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

15

for

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| LINDA SCHOLL | 700 E Ocean Blvd | 714 420 3196 |
| 2. Billy T. Reese | 4531 Falcoo LB | 310 413 9009 |
| 3. Robert Eckenrode | 1021 E 70 th Way | 562-6335949 |
| 4. MARGOT BERGMAN | 100 ATLANTIC #707 | 562 436 1109 |
| 5. Jessica Beckman | 3 Claymont Dr | 949 347 1066 |
| 6. Mike Beckman | 3 Claymont Dr | 949 347 1066 |
| 7. Ryan Beckman | 3 Claymont Dr | 949 347 1066 |
| 8. Leslie Stanitsas | 23086 Petrel Ct. Laguna Niguel | 949 831-2392 |
| 9. Nick Stanitsas | 23086 Petrel Ct. Laguna Niguel | 949 831-2392 |
| 10. Nicole Stanitsas | 23086 Petrel Ct. Laguna Niguel | 949 831-2392 |
| 11. Lily Stanitsas | 23086 PETREL CT. LAGUNA NIGUEL | 949 831-2392 |
| 12. Michael Stanitsas | 23086 Remy Ct Laguna Niguel CA | 949 831-2392 |
| 13. SHEPWOOD KELLEY | 525 E. SEASIDEWAY #409 LB | 562-951-1229 |
| 14. KATH HYNLF | 525 E SEASIDEWAY #409 LB. | 562-951-1229 |
| 15. Nicole DesVerney | 2616 E. Spaulding St | 562) 439. 6367 |
| 16. David DesVerney | 2616 E. Spaulding St | 562) 439-6367 |
| 17. Rhonda Crumble | 13935 Kornblum #12 Hawthorne | 310) 749. 4542 |
| 18. George GAMBLE | 13935 Kornblum #12 Hawthorn | 310) 749. 4542 |
| 19. LYLE FONG | 1065 E 3RD ST #6 LB | |
| 20. NEM COLLINS | 250 W. OCEAN BLVD #1710 LB | 562-528-6263 |
| 21. Patsy Booth | 1745 N Wester #40 | 523-460-4692 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(16)

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|---------------------|--|----------------|
| 1. KRISTEN NAKHTIRI | 1010 E. 2ND ST. #2
LONG BEACH, CA 90802 | 562) 397-7521 |
| 2. GABRIEL VARGAS | 6430 EL SARDIN ST ⁴⁰⁸¹⁵
LONG BEACH, CA | (562) 480-2473 |
| 3. Sandra Alvarez | 309 east 220 th St
Carson, CA 90745 | 310-830-6596 |
| 4. Russell Bennett | 1134 N. SYCAMORE #307
LA, CA 90038 | 323 240-5287 |
| 5. Raymundo Moreno | 11347 ^{#307} Sycamore LA CA 90038 | 323-462-099 |
| 6. MaryClenfregos | 1666 1/2 Wilmington Blvd. Wilm CA | 310-427-0369 |
| 7. Manuel Martinez | 1666 1/2 Wilmington Blvd Wilm CA | 310-427-0369 |
| 8. CAROL RODRIGUEZ | 639 W 9th St Long Beach CA. | 562-240-3102 |
| 9. SCOTT BRAY | 311 CHESTNUT LB 90802 | 562/305-5189 |
| 10. STEVE CALDWELL | 220 17th St SEAS BEACH | 562-972-5286 |
| 11. Wally Reafini | 15375 Saverne Cir. IRVINE, CA | 949-786-1217 |
| 12. MAZAROVICH | 19748 Mt Schelini Vly CA | |
| 13. STEVE DUE | 1750 E. OCEAN BLVD. LONG BEACH | 562-437-5822 |
| 14. REBECCA DUE | 1750 E. OCEAN #504 LONG BEACH | 562-437-5822 |
| 15. Janet E Lustig | 8856 Winnetka Ave. ^{Northridge}
CA | (818) 882-6216 |
| 16. Joyce Palacio | 1405 E Ocean Blvd #3 | (562) 552-2811 |
| 17. Gary Watters | 437 Lime Ave #B 90802 | 562 590 6901 |
| 18. Derrick Fenley | 834 E 4th St. #32 90802 | (562) 436-8996 |
| 19. ROBERT FORBES | 1610 E. OCEAN BLVD #6 90802 | (562) 912 9835 |
| 20. CHARLENE ONO | 2581 E. Washington St ^{L.B. CA}
90810 | 310 922-5112 |
| 21. Mo Ono | 2581 E WASHINGTON ST ^{L.B.}
90810 | 310 549-5112 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(17)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-----------------------|---|--------------|
| 1. DAVID FLEMING | 33021 Arrowbear Dr, Rummy Springs ^{CA 92582} | 928-232-9307 |
| 2. ERIC FRANTZ | 600 E Ocean LB CA 90614 | |
| 3. ALLISON LIZZI | 11922 King St Valley Village 91607 | |
| 4. Michael Herrera | 120 Cerritos LB CA 90802 | |
| 5. Andie Lynn | 120 Cerritos LB 90802 | |
| 6. Annika Butler | 1200 S. Weymouth Ave S.P | |
| 7. Jeff Baldwin | 33117 Pines of the World Dr, Arrowbear ⁹²³⁸² | |
| 8. JEFF HESTON | 24502 MARINE AVE CARSON, CA ⁹⁰⁷⁴⁵ | |
| 9. CARLOS N. NARANJO | 431 N. Mc DONALD AVE WILM. CA ⁹⁰⁷⁴⁴ | |
| 10. Darian Dominguez | 3309 Froquois LB CA 90808 | |
| 11. Antonia Ortiz | 1251 Marine Ave. Wilmington 90744 | |
| 12. Alejandro Rios | 4144 Ann Arbor Rd. Ukiah 90712 | |
| 13. Alex Rios | 1352 GULF AVE, WILM. 90744 | |
| 14. Luis Andrade | 1456 N. RAVENNA AVE Wilm 90744 | |
| 15. Jason Bohm | 106 E. Colorado Bl Monterey CA 9106 | |
| 16. Umberto | 56 St H | |
| 17. Felipe | 1352 GULF AVE 90744 | |
| 18. William McFadden | 1125 E Broadway 90802 | |
| 19. Bob McCormick | 6155 BUDLEFORD 34786 | |
| 20. Eric Rickard | 1175 OCEAN #111 LB, CA. 90802 | TLWD 13 |
| 21. Kari Carswell | 8007 W. 147TH FERR OR, KS 66285 | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(18)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Ted Wheeler | 3911 Kinmount, Los Alamitos CA | 562 4306202 |
| 2. Mahfay Elami | 525 E. Seaside Way #1802 | 562 |
| 3. Mini Jekit | 740 S.V. Hwy | |
| 4. Don Merkes | 1345 San Wesley | |
| 5. Joe Habersetz | 6501 90th St S.V. Tacoma WA | |
| 6. Jack Woot | 10223 Eagle Rock Ave San Diego, CA 92126 | |
| 7. SERGIO GONZALEZ | 3510 LAUFRENCO ST LACA 90063 | (323) 202-0037
(323) 261-2159 |
| 8. Claudia Gomez | 3233 Hunter St #9 LA 90023 | (323) 265-2154 |
| 9. Samuel Padilla | 2350 FAYSS AVE Long Beach ⁹⁰⁸¹⁵ | (310) 946-5925 |
| 10. Oanh Kim Nguyen | 1963 1/2 St. Louis Ave 90955 | 310-801-5387 |
| 11. COL | | 310 877-40400 |
| 12. Ana Jeyo | 219 Tichener | 310 7645986 |
| 13. Dan Han | 401 Ocean #500 LBB | 526-528-7721 |
| 14. MANA Acosta | 1600 E. OCEAN #3 LB, CA | |
| 15. LOUANNIE SMITH | 234 ATLANTIC #14 LB CA | (562) 519-6145 |
| 16. Elizabeth Johnson | 2740 E. 19th St LB | 562 494-7331 |
| 17. ROGER Livingston | 2740 E. 19th St LB. | 562 494-7331 |
| 18. Diana Wilkes | 1921 FLORIPA ST LB | (562) 435-9742 |
| 19. JIM BROOKS | 1218 PACIFIC COAST HWY | 562 433-1199 |
| 20. DALE HUTCHINSON | 1054 APPLETON St LB | 562 714-5663 |
| 21. S. Hunter | 645 Chestnut Ave. #34, LB, CA | 209-4106 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(19)

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| John Sarena | Chicago | 847-638-0484 |
| 2. Nyeshia Easterling | Los Angeles | (310) 926-5237 |
| 3. Shannette Aguilera | Hawthorne | (310) 590-9265 |
| 4. Doralea | | |
| 5. Frank | Hampton Court | 555 |
| 6. CARVAL | LAX | |
| 7. DEN LAITHWALCE | BRITISH AIRWAYS | +44 7774 28 79 64 |
| 8. Luis A FERNANDEZ | Montebello | 323-725-7164 |
| 9. Lynn Gardner | Colestra | (626) 335-0559 |
| 10. JOHN PACTA | Long Beach | 4260988 |
| 1. Paul Huddle | 839 E 4th St #12 LB, CA | 562 597-3298 |
| 12. MAX BAZ | Temple city CA | (626) 454-3350 |
| 3. Nathan Rubin | Glendale, CA | (562) 866.8872 |
| 14. K. L. Wynn | 2241 E 2nd St | 562 510 2435 |
| 5. KATHARINE | 2725 EAST 2nd ST | 522-121-5017 |
| 6. PATRIK RUSKO | 5274 CHARING CROSS West | 714 8912444 |
| 17. Patsy Hadden | 257 Coronado LB, | 562 433 9348 |
| 18. Sophie Green | 1231 Patton Ave San Pedro CA 90731 | 310-831-3078. |
| 19. Zach Cloud | 3029 Charleagne LB 90808 | 562 310-2357 |
| 20. Nicole Cumberland | 5810 W. Olympic Blvd LA 90030 | 323 857-1750 |
| 21. Terry Derske | 13651 Crestmont St Westminster CA | 714-898-6334 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

20

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|---------------------|--|----------------|
| Tom Garrison | 497 ST LOUIS AVE, L.B. | 562-987-0383 |
| 2. KAREN Weddle | 721 E. 1 st St. LB | 562-500-6523 |
| 3. Dow Parkes | 455 E Ocean Blvd LB | 562 436 1054 |
| 4. Matt Celis | 850 E. OCEAN BLVD #400 | 562-508-4024 |
| 5. Charles Menne | 850 E. Ocean Blvd. #604 | 562-508-4289 |
| 6. SALVADOR Orozco | 4 ST 2455 | (562) 8565836 |
| 7. Duke R. Dantin | 118A INDUSTRIAL WY CARSON CA | 310-795-2670 |
| 8. Steven Franklin | 218 Linden Ave LB, CA 90802 | 562) 519 3243 |
| 9. Guerezma Ste | 455 E Ocean #507 LB. | |
| 10. Jeff Link | 1462 2nd Ave. NY, NY 10021 | (917) 509-3508 |
| 11. S. Cooper | 1462 2nd. AVE NY NY 10021 | 917 5093508 |
| 12. Ray Bonaventura | 1830 Ocean Blvd. Long Beach CA 90802 | 562-307-0717 |
| 13. Brett Young | 332 Manhattan Ave Brooklyn NY 11211 | 917-809-6410 |
| 14. Jose Bullins | 23058 Serra Dr. Carson CA 90745 | 310 619-5970 |
| 15. Marlene Alford | 23058 Serra Dr Carson 90745 | 619-5970 |
| 16. Joseph Pearson | 1510 W. Gales St. Long Beach, CA 90813 | 562-432-5215 |
| 17. ROGER BERTON | 1510 W. Gales Long Beach 90813 | 562 432 5215 |
| 18. ROMAN TORRES | 25621 BELLIPORTE, HARBOR CITY CA 90710 | 310 418-2803 |
| 19. Fay Von BRUGSEN | 34051 Formosa DR. DANA POINT | 949 234 0014 |
| 20. LISA Lewis | 404 E 3rd St Long Beach CA | 562) 495-8935 |
| 1. Wynne Rucker | 308 Elm Ave LB 90802 | 562) 4355568 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(21)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Lucy M Lewantes | 555 E OCEAN BLVD | 562 901-0433 |
| 2. Maria Castellanos | 555 E. Ocean Blvd | 562 901-0409 |
| 3. Sonia Gonzalez | Hayden, Long Beach | 310 507-4287 |
| 4. Manny GARCIA | 2256 KNOXVILLE AVE BEACH LONG | 562 431-3657 |
| 5. J.R. Terry Reems | 6339 Rullike Dr. Rubidoux, Ca. | 951-212-5888 |
| 6. Elizabeth Reems | 6339 Rullike Dr. Rubidoux, Ca | 951-212-4234 |
| 7. EVAN JACOBSON | 5110 E. 7TH ST. LBCA 90803 | 562-498-3136 |
| 8. LOST LUND | 831 E OCEAN BL # C | |
| 9. Helen Adams | 411 E. 10th ST # 207 | (562) 491-9100 |
| 10. PAUL ORSBETH | 1000 E. OCEAN BL #617 | |
| 1. Michelle Roder | 2696 E 56th WAY APT #6 Long Beach | (818) 219 8773 |
| 12. Dennis TABURNA | 1310 E. Ocean Blvd #001 | 562 9830008 |
| 13. Joe Gallagher | 645 E. Ocean } Manager
Long Beach | 562
435-1365 |
| 14. Sandra S. Larimer | 3138 S. Gaffey St #8 SPCA 90731 | 310 833 0116 |
| 5. J C Licavetz | 1125 S. Gaffey St SP, CA 90731 | 310 833 832 6993 |
| 6. Chatter Kathy | #5 The Dungeon Villa Riviera LB | 562-432 4222 |
| 17. Robert Kozma | 15904 E 50th St N Okasso, OK | 918-272-9362 |
| 18. DEMNIS SRELLING | 214 YACHT CLUB C.Y. #19 Redondo Beach, CA | 310-592-5915 |
| 19. LISA SIMPSON | 223 1/2 Linden Ave LB 90802 | 949-201-9467 |
| 20. Hilary Mosh | 223 1/2 Linden Ave LB 90802 | 562-480-5483 |
| 21. BERT SIMPSON | 4611 Castana Ave LB 90712 | 562-303-0480 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

22

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|----------------------|--|------------------------------|
| JEFF VILLARDO | | 206 504 529 |
| 2. Brian Taylor | | 925-736 5550 |
| 3. Heather Taylor | 9764 Belladonna San Ramon | 286 4605 |
| 4. Caroline Woodburn | 1679 Dalmatian St Lakewood CAL. 90458 | 310-951-2103 |
| 5. William J. Vessie | 20824 HAWAIIAN AVE Lakewood | 562-860-0103 |
| 6. John Vessie | 20716 VERVE AVE Lakewood | 562-860-3695 |
| 7. Jay [Signature] | 8911 330th St E Estoville WA 98328 | 206 281 3869 |
| 8. [Signature] | 3540 S. OCEAN BLVD. PALM BEACH FL | 701 767 4072 |
| 9. [Signature] | 39655 Mc AIR MERCADERA | 562 843 3448 |
| 10. E. Schlitt | 6117 Schirra Ct. Bakersfield | 661-342-2443 |
| 11. Andrés Benitez | 1595 Mendocino dr. SD, CA | 661-809-6602 |
| 12. H. Bordesix | 138 FLY AV. L.B. CA, 90804 | |
| 13. CARL Dearth | 426 E Shoreline Dr LB | 310 741 593 |
| 14. Jamie Drummond | 2408 Mary Ann Sulphur LA | 337-625-8398 |
| 15. [Signature] | 25881 DANABUFFLE DANABUFF CA. | 914-4932319 |
| 16. MIKE LENING | 4827 CHERENNE WAY CHINO CA | 909 464 2529 |
| 17. [Signature] | PO BOX 5 San Ramon CA | 925 330-2100 |
| 18. JAMES BERINGTON | 444 W. OCEAN BLVD Long Beach | 562 495-2280
714 458-7045 |
| 19. Laelle Kelly | 29 Bramwood Rd Smyer, NY 14226 | 716-833-0088 |
| 20. Mark Peña | 2625 Santa Clara Ave Alameda, CA 94501 | 510-769-8417 |
| 21. Brad Adams | 250W Ocean #11802 Long Beach 90802 | 714-6096134 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(23)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Pat Adams | 250 W. Ocean #16 at LB | 562-495-2590 |
| 2. J.W. Rubin | 515 Fellows Ct 93224 | 661-768-4809 |
| 3. Dawn M. Darnell | 14117 Okinawa ^{AND P. 4922N} ST 55304 | 763-421-2123 |
| 4. [Signature] | 1918 fur one in San Rochester, NY | 507-255-9581 |
| 5. NIEMBERG Ursula | Bülach, SWITZERLAND | - |
| 6. VALT RECEPUBER | Büdingen, WIENNA, AUSTRIA | |
| 7. ZENÉ ENRIQUEZ | 2454 EARL AV, LB, 90802 | 562.397.5178 |
| 8. [Signature] | 659 Penfold ST LB 90805 | |
| 9. Roger [Signature] | 659 Penfold ST LB 90805 | |
| 10. [Signature] | 4190 Shoreline Village Dr LB 90802 | (562) 787-6218 |
| 11. MATT SHOOK | 1510 COWLES ST. L.B. CA | (562) 432-2811 |
| 12. Dave McGossin | | |
| 13. GARY McGINNIS | 3522 ROXANNE AVE.
LONG BEACH, CA 90808 | |
| 14. JOHN FORBES | 10 ATLANTIC AVE #604 LB. CA 90802 | |
| 15. Joseph Johnson | 1751 Loma Ave. #3 L.B. 90804 | (562) 960-2022 |
| 16. Nathan Thayer | 35625 Narbonne Ave #27 Comita, Ca 90717 | |
| 17. [Signature] | 339 Jase Ave. Long Beach, CA 90808 | |
| 18. HARTLEY LEE | 2700 PANAMA DR #306
SLEIGH HILL 90755 | |
| 19. Alexis Willis | 53900 Avenida Mendocino
La Quinta, Ca. 92253 | |
| 20. SADIA | | |
| 21. Tina Landavari | 330 Golden Shore LB | (562) 624-4100 |
| 22. Cynthia Nunez | 330 Golden Shore LB | (562) 624-4100 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(24)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| 2. BARBARA TROELLER | 431 ALAMITOS LONG BEACH | 437-5880 |
| 3. Wayne Epstein | 431 Alamos Ave. " | " " |
| 4. RON ATLAS | 1531 S. CAMDEN L.A. | 310-968-2655 |
| 5. Cathy Bishop | 40 Alamos #305 Long Beach 90802 | 437 |
| 6. Jenni DeLatorre | 115 E 232 nd CARSON | |
| 7. GARY SEDGWICK | 5337 Knottville Ave ^{LA 90208} 90713 | |
| 8. Chris Bellamy | 31 Laguna Ct. MB 90266 | |
| 9. Don Paul | 5959 Fern | |
| 10. Jon Rodgers | P.O. Box 288 Long Beach, CA 90801 | (562) 762-1598 |
| 11. Robert Amos | 2634 E. 4 th Long Beach CA 90814 | 562 310-525-2480 |
| 12. Pamela Garcia | 459 E. Norton St LB CA 90805 | 562 841-2594 |
| 13. Osceas Garcia | 1084 E. 7 th St LB CA 90803 | 562 451-0341 |
| 14. Michelle Sanchez | 110 W. Ocean Blvd 510 ^{LB} CA | 562 432-8826 |
| 15. Greg Cudahy | 2717 Bacon St. Lake Isabella | 760 379 5859 |
| 16. LUDIA MOLINA | 711 OLIVE AVE. Long Beach 90813 | |
| 17. RW Kennedy | BB L.B. MARINA | |
| 18. SL Kennedy | 35311 Cornubey Palm Desert CA | |
| 19. ALEX GARCIA | 1620 Baker St | 661 323 7066 |
| 20. Brian Jenkins | 15809 Stephanie St | 661 588-9471 |
| 21. Amy Watts | 506 N Tercero Cir Palm Springs ^{CA} 92262 | 760 992-9319 |
| 22. Darrell Marks | 865 MEADOW LN ^{WINSLOW} AZ 86047 | 314 288 9217 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(25)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Les John | 110 W. 6 th St. #326 | (562) 631-5009 |
| 2. Christa Stepanian | 341 Gladys Ave Long Beach, CA. | (562) 716-5767 |
| 3. Cindy Gowett | 2809 E 11 th St LB 90804 | 90814 ⁵⁶² 754-2309 |
| 4. Peggy Sauvageau | 351 Temple Av #C LB 90814 | (701) 799-3768 |
| 5. Theresa Cochran | 3617 Leland St San Pedro ⁹⁰⁷³¹ | (310) 548-4698 |
| 6. Ryan Alari | 1009 E. 1 st Long Beach CA 90803 | (562) 435 7290 |
| 7. David Ziffkuhl | 2243 McKee Dr San Pedro, CA 90732 | (310) 519-0304 |
| 8. BRANDY PEREZ | 446 W. 15 St, S.P. 90731 | (310) 936-6693 |
| 9. John Brodin | 809 W 26 th St SP 90731 | 310 (542) 2155 |
| 10. Maurice Federn | 861 W. 18 th St SP 90731 | (310) 489-7622 |
| 11. JACKIE MOORE | 1721 CORONADO AVE #202 | 562-597-4254 |
| 12. GEORGE YAMAMOTO | 17800 E Colima Rd #104 Rowland Hts, 91248 | (626) 806-7764 |
| 13. Kawafey Zab | | |
| 14. Nyle Puschell | 5551 E 23 rd St Apt #11 | (562) 347-9987 |
| 15. Kristina Puschell | " | " |
| 16. Wileen Puschell | " | " |
| 17. DAVE ZERTAR | 4136 Corrine Rd. RP/CA 90275 | 562-254-4202 |
| 18. PAUL HAVEN | 700 E. Ocean Blvd #2306 LB | 562 547-1334 |
| 19. The Coltharps | 120 Alamos #23 LB | 562-491-4604 |
| 20. CORBY BENNETT | 1250 E. 1st #7 LB 90802 | (562) 437-0664 |
| 21. TERESA FULTON | " | " |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

26

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|------------------------|--|--|
| R. Linder | P.O. Box 3054
Long Beach, CA 90803 | (562) 490-3909 |
| M. Deanovich | 5585 E. PCH | (562) 494-7040 |
| J. ENGBERG | 3432 CANTHILL AVE
LAKEWOOD CA 90713 | (562) 866-7743 |
| Barbara Young | 5216 E. Harvey Way L.B. 90808 | freturf@aol.com |
| PAT ALVISO | 17040 Bhowater, HB 92649 | 562-833-8035 |
| JEFF MERRICK | 1827 X17ENCO AVE L.B. 90815 | 562-522-4241 |
| Ali Goldman | 3740 Bishop Ave #4 L.B. CA 90804 | 323-388-7002 |
| EMILIE STEIN | 624 B MAIN ST. GAITHERSBURG, MD 20878 | (240) 241-1249 |
| Peter Joseph Rosenwald | P.O. Box 14525, Long Beach 90833 | 562-438-5394 |
| JEAN STABLESORD | 6264 Crystal Lake - | 562-432210 |
| Yenwen Zeng | 519 OKIZABA | 7211144Look@aol |
| S. Li | 5720 Luna Lane | tenoram@att.net |
| Michael Seratt | (formerly of)
1102 Dawson Ave #7, Long Beach, Ca. | (562) 754-0415
<small>Message</small> |
| R. Elwa | 1400 E 3rd #7 Long Beach, 90802 | 562 |
| Arum Yulandig | 5643 Cord Av Long Beach | (800) 427-5817 |
| SAVATH | 550 Orange Ave Long Beach 90802 90805 | 562-281-9994 |
| W. [Signature] | 4323 Star Street LB 90803 | 5894479 |
| Karen Aslureh | 341 Bonito, Long Beach 90802 | (562) 590-3739 |
| Betsy Tamhat | 355 Coronado Ave | (562) 438-2748 |
| Emery Namay | 5116 ELDERHALL AVE. LAKEWOOD 90712 | (562) 630-5873 |
| Dan Mullin | 714 Pacific Av #409 LB 90813 | (562) 951-0822 |
| Egorov di Ye | 525 1/2 19th St. L.B 90806 | 562 230 5413 |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(27)

| NAME * | ADDRESS * | PHONE # * |
|-------------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Lucia Esquiv | Patterson 546 Cedar A.A.D.P.E. | 935 6132 |
| 2. Maria Rivera | 1073- E 4th st. L.B. CA | 562/35-9587 |
| 3. Rosa Gueter | 1420 - ALAMITOS | Ronald Brante |
| 4. Letysa Payne | 1392 9TH ST | Royl Prestige |
| 5. Ma Glor de Santiago | 2805 delta st - 90813 | Royl Prestige |
| 6. Sandra Sandy | White st 90806 | Royl Prestige |
| 7. Gloria Gabriel | 1928 Lincoln st L.B 90810 | 234-2520 |
| 8. Patty Blake | 1742 W. 6th st. L.B. 90813 | --- |
| 9. Elvira Dorneio | 242 W 6th St. L.B. 90813 | --- |
| 10. Martha Helman | 2222 Applelan L.B 90813 | --- |
| 11. Abel Salazar | 2187 LB BL 90806 | 562 4892303 |
| 12. Evelyn Knight | 2521 CoFA LB CA 90810 | 562-4261342 |
| 13. DAVID SUNDSTROM | 6900 LOS VERDES DRIVE #1
RANCHO PALOS VERDES 90275 | 310-371-8398 |
| 14. S. ZOSKE | 920 IDAHO AVE # B, SM 90403 | 310/806-1244 |
| 15. Bob Banks | 14320 CANON Dr LA Mirada, CA 90638 | 949 303 9393 |
| 16. Susan L. Dunn Monia | 1900 East Ocean Blvd Long Beach CA 90802 | --- |
| 17. Richard C. Diamond | 1404 Flagler Lane, Redondo Beach ⁹⁰²⁷⁸ | (310) 376-3599 |
| 18. M. Ready-Paano | 2513 Del Amo Blvd, Lawd, CA 90712 | 562-630-2406 |
| 19. Jack Bolger | 215 Quincy Ave # 3 | |
| 20. | | |
| 21. | | |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(28)

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Don Sevilla | 1702 E Washington
Long Beach, CA 90805 | (562) 569-8800 |
| 2. Migena Oden | 1825 Easy ^{3rd St} CA LB | (562) 4270622 |
| 3. Nick Birakos | 934 Ashbridge Lane Harbor City
CA | (310) 326-7446 |
| MIKE RIVERA | 1855 STANLEY AVE APT E LONG BEACH CA | 562) 597-8640 |
| 5. KAM | | (26) 429-8778 |
| 6. Josie Jay | P.O. Box 4883
1825 Easy St Orange CA 92863 | |
| 7. JOEL PATTERSON | 1053 E. 45TH WAY LONG BEACH 90807 | (562) 423-2542 |
| 8. Craig Patterson | 1053 E. 45th Way Long Beach 90807 | (562) 423-2544 |
| 9. Marcus Tucker | 1066 E 45th way Long Beach
90807 | 562 4284337 |
| 10. Linda Palacios | 1415 Cedar # LB 90813 | (562) 218-1381 |
| 11. Don Bernz | 1240 W 17th St LB | (562) 704711 |
| 12. JACK C SMITH | 2453 GOLDEN AVE, LB 90806 | 426-9002 |
| 13. Jane Keltner | 3929 E. Anaheim St LB 90804 | 562-961-3414 |
| 14. ANNIE GREENFIELD | 1951 CHESTNUT AVE, LB 90806 | 562-225-9462 |
| 15. Walter Wisner | 1951 Chestnut Ave LB 90806 | 562-225-2491 |
| 16. Donna Pessberg | 167 E. SOUTH ST. LB CA 90805 | 562-428-7710 |
| 17. Maria Patricia Quintanilla | 5452 Linden Ave LB CA 90805 | (562) 954-3714 |
| 18. Keri Gallegos | 645 Atlantic Ave #12. | (562) 212-9756 |
| 19. Maria Tino Selva | 1473 A Houta AV suite D LB 90813 | 562-833-1470 |
| 20. Costavo Jimenez | 473 Atlantic Ave suite D | 562 5910325 |
| 21. Melissa Herbera | 1310 W PARADE ST - 2 | 562) 495-7106 |
| 22. Mary Remy | 1349 E 8th St - | Ramp Red |

Help Save Long Beach Cafe

Long Beach Cafe and the employees are asking for your help in saving the cafe from a redevelopment project that is being considered by the City of Long Beach. We ask that you help us in not letting this happen. Please sign this petition if you want to keep Long Beach Cafe as part of this community. Thank-you

(29)

| NAME | ADDRESS | PHONE # |
|----------------------|---|----------------|
| 1. Rachael Alexandra | 1000 E 1st LBC 90802 | 928-542-9058 |
| 2. TYLER WUETHRICK | 1000 E 1st Long Beach CA 90806 | 928-542-9058 |
| 3. KRISTINA TOSSIL | 33279 E. Elizabeth Rd Temecula CA 92592 | 951-491-1818 |
| 4. James Sullivan | 1002 East Long Beach | 562-569-0129 |
| 5. Raul Ombra | 11030 Foster Rd Norwalk CA 90650 | 714-774-7022 |
| 6. Destiny Gardner | 1006 E 1st St Long Beach CA | 310-741-7895 |
| 7. Braden Hamilton | 1006 E 1st St " | 970 201 9535 |
| 8. JESSIE McMILLAN | 1027 E 1st St #1 | (562) 437-3878 |
| 9. Sara Pavaos | 105 ANAHIC AVE APT #9 90250 | 310 590-5293 |
| 10. Charmaine Ivory | 11503 Menlo Ave #2 Hawthorne CA | 562 422-9307 |
| 11. Luz | 6241 Cessato S. | 562-436-5801 |
| 12. Steve Nelson | 131 Beato ave #1 Long Beach CA | 562-432-99 |
| 13. HOON LEE | 85 ALARITES AVE | 310-333-6137 |
| 14. Kurt S | 701 S. Aviation blvd | 562-435-7998 |
| 15. DEIRIQ BRANDICA | 1230 1st | 562 435-7 |
| 16. Gladys Larios | 1230 1st | 562-628-1141 |
| 17. Jennifer Poff | 1327 E Appleton St #7 LB 90802 | 562-624761 |
| 18. James Cole | 1327 E Appleton #7 LB 90802 | 619-884-32 |
| 19. Adele Sandusky | 923 E. Ocean Blvd #2 90800 | 714 968 135 |
| 20. Leah Fitzsimmons | 10645 El Prador Cir FV 92708 | 542 4205 |
| 21. Norma Clements | 4302 Buyl Shore Walk 90803 | (562) 213-71 |
| 22. Norma Clements | 1227 E Ocean Blvd #310 90802 | |



**D1. RESPONSES TO PETITION TO “HELP SAVE THE LONG BEACH CAFÉ”,
NO DATE.**

- D1.1 A petition entitled “Help Save the Long Beach Café”, consisting of 29 pages with 605 signatures was received. The petition does not include any comments introducing new environmental information or directly challenging information presented in the Draft EIR. No further response is necessary.



14.5 ERRATA FOR FINAL EIR

The Final EIR will be a revised document that incorporates all of the changes made to the Draft EIR in order to provide clarification or corrections that have been identified during the public review period. Added or modified text is double underlined (example) while deleted text is struck out (~~example~~).

Section 2.0 Executive Summary

Section 2.0, Executive Summary, of the Draft EIR provides a summary of the document, including the project description, impacts, mitigation measures and levels of significance after mitigation and project alternatives. Changes made in the following sections of the Draft EIR, as a result of corrections or responses to comments received on the Draft EIR have been incorporated in this section of the Final EIR.

Section 3.0 Project Description

Page 3-1, second paragraph, third sentence of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Uses west of Video Choice, between Lime ~~Street~~ Avenue and Broadway Court, include a 3-story 30-unit apartment building, a 2- to 3-story 33-unit apartment building and two surface parking lots.

Page 3-14 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR to add the following project objective:

- Provide high density residential within the downtown area to accomplish, among other things, a reduction in traffic and air quality impacts caused by commuters.

Section 5.1 Land Use and Relevant Planning

Page 5-1.1, second paragraph, fifth sentence of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

West of Video Choice, between Lime ~~Street~~ Avenue and Broadway Court, is a three-story apartment building, a 2- to 3-story apartment building and two surface parking lots.



Page 5-1.1, fourth paragraph of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

RELEVANT PLANNING DOCUMENTS

Development in the City is subject to the policies and development guidelines contained within several planning policy documents. A project is considered to have a significant impact on land use and relevant planning, due to inconsistency with planning documents, only if the project is determined to be inconsistent with the Long Beach General Plan or the Long Beach Zoning Code. Relevant planning policy documents related to land uses for the project are described below.

Page 5.1-14, Table 5.1-1, second row and second column of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Consistent. The project proposes a variety of residential uses (i.e., live/work spaces, townhomes, one to three bedroom apartments and penthouse units) and retail/gallery uses within the downtown area. The project would also provide a variety of park/recreation open space uses in the form of open paseos, roof top gardens and other open spaces. The project would be required to pay park impact fees, which would be used for the development of parkland in the City (refer to Section 5.8, Public Services and Utilities).

Section 5.2 Aesthetics/Light and Glare

Exhibits 5.2-2a, 5.2-2b, 5.2-2c and 5.2-2d, which illustrate exiting shadow patterns and Exhibits 5.2-8a, 5.2-8b, 5.2-8c and 5.2-8d, which illustrate proposed shadow patterns in the Draft EIR were created with two different base maps, resulting in different shadow patterns during the same time periods (i.e., summer, winter, vernal and autumnal) for buildings surrounding the project site. For consistency purposes, the exhibits have been revised in the Final EIR. Shadows cast by the proposed project would not change with the revised exhibits. Therefore, the conclusion that development of the proposed project would introduce significant shade and shadow impacts onto adjacent buildings in the Draft EIR would remain the same in the Final EIR. Shade and shadow impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Section 5.3 Traffic and Circulation

Page 5.3-40 in the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Alamitos/Shoreline/Ocean Intersection

The analysis indicates that the project impact at the Alamitos/Shoreline/Ocean intersection cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, based on the City's



analysis criteria. Imposition of the grade separated intersection improvement is infeasible because it would require the creation of an additional lane of travel, necessitating the acquisition of property from the intersection eastward for a great distance. This would entail: (1) the condemnation of at least two historically significant buildings (the Villa Riviera and the Green and Green residential structure at 920 East Ocean Boulevard) resulting in an unavoidable significant impact to historical resources; and (2) the condemnation of at least thirty other multiple family condominium buildings resulting in the loss of hundreds of individually owned residential units. However, traffic management and safety can be enhanced through the installation of a monitoring camera(s) at the intersection to provide real-time information on traffic conditions at the intersection and the nearby roadways. The camera would be mounted on the top of the building tower located the closest to the intersection. A fiber-optic cable would connect the camera to a junction box located at the intersection and would be connected back to the City's Traffic Management Center (TMC).

The project would not produce a significant impact at the Lime Avenue and 3rd Street intersection based on the City's significance criteria. Mitigation measure TR-3 of the Draft EIR, which requires the project applicant to install a traffic signal at the intersection has been removed in the Final EIR. The City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency will be responsible for the installation of a traffic signal at the Lime Avenue and 3rd Street intersection when traffic counts warrant. Page 5.3-40 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Lime Avenue Corridor

Several intersections along the Lime Avenue corridor do not have traffic signals. Three of the intersections with Lime Avenue (7th Street, 3rd Street, and Broadway) currently or are projected to operate at failing levels of service. Although the proposed project does not have a significant impact at these intersections, based on the significance criteria, the City wants to install traffic signals at all of the intersections along Lime Avenue as a part of completing the traffic signal grid system in the downtown area. In order to complete this effort, the City is developing plans to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Lime Avenue with Broadway. The proposed project and the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency will be responsible for providing the traffic signals at the intersections of Lime Avenue with 7th Street and Lime Avenue with 3rd Street, respectively. The installation of traffic signals at these intersections will provide acceptable operating conditions at all three locations. A summary of the operating conditions with the proposed mitigation measures is listed in Table 5.3-9, Year 2015 With Project Intersection Operating Conditions with Mitigation.

Page 5.3-42 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

~~TR-3 — Lime Avenue and 3rd Street. While the project would not produce a significant impact at this intersection based on the significance criteria,~~



it would experience an increase in delay with the full development of all cumulative projects referenced in the analysis. In order to improve traffic operations and safety at this intersection, the project applicant shall be responsible for the installation of a traffic signal.

The remaining Traffic and Circulation mitigation measures in the Draft EIR have been renumbered in the Final EIR to reflect the above correction.

Page 5.3-48 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Mitigation Measures: Refer to mitigation measures TR-1 through TR-3 ~~TR-4~~. No additional mitigation measures are recommended.

Section 5.4 Air Quality

Page 5.4-13, last paragraph of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

The SCAQMD Handbook provides significance thresholds for both construction and operation of projects within its jurisdictional boundaries. Exceedance of the SCAQMD thresholds could result in a potentially significant impact; however, although the SCAQMD recommends that these thresholds be used by lead agencies in making a determination of significance, ultimately the lead agency determines the thresholds of significance for impacts, pursuant to Section 15064(B) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Page 5.4-26 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Cumulative Operational Emissions

Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in emissions, which would contribute to region-wide emissions on a cumulative basis. Although the project would not result in exceedances of criteria pollutants for long-term operational impacts and would be consistent with the City's General Plan and the Redevelopment Plan, implementation of the project in combination with other developments within the City would result in an increase in criteria pollutants. As the Basin is in Non-attainment for CO, O₃ and PM₁₀, the project's contribution to region-wide emissions would result in a significant cumulative air quality impact. Although the implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-6 through AQ-8 would lessen the project's contribution to the regional pollutant burden, the project's cumulative operational air quality impacts are concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-8. No



additional mitigation measures are recommended.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

Section 5.5 Noise

Page 5.5-21 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

Page 5.5-27 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

Page 5.5-27 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

ON-SITE LONG-TERM (MOBILE) NOISE IMPACTS

- **TRAFFIC NOISE GENERATED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT MAY CONTRIBUTE TO EXISTING TRAFFIC NOISE IN THE AREA AND EXCEED THE CITY'S ESTABLISHED STANDARDS.**

Page 5.5-30 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

LONG-TERM (STATIONARY) NOISE IMPACTS

- **THE PROPOSED PROJECT HAS THE POTENTIAL TO RESULT IN AN INCREASE IN AMBIENT NOISE LEVELS DUE TO THE GENERATION OF ON-SITE NOISE.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.

Page 5.5-32 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Less Than Significant Impact.



Section 5.7 Cultural Resources

Concurrent with the 45-day public review period of the Draft EIR, a peer review of the Historical Resources Survey Report (CRM Tech, June 2006) was conducted by Sapphos Environmental Inc. (August 2006). The purpose of the peer review was to provide clarifications and refinements to the existing Historical Resources Survey Report, as well as to provide supplemental information for the administrative record and to confirm compliance with CEQA with respect to historic resources. Sapphos Environmental Inc. concluded that the findings of historic significance presented in the Draft EIR were accurate. Therefore, the findings of historic significance in the Draft EIR have not been altered.

Page 5.7-1, first paragraph of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

The purpose of this section is to identify historic, archaeological and paleontological resources existing in the project area and to assess the significance of such resources. The analysis in this section has been prepared in accordance with Section 15064.5 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, which considers potential impacts on prehistoric, and historic and paleontological resources. This section is based upon the information contained in the Historic-Period Building Survey conducted by CRM Tech (June 2006) and the Revised Historical Resources Survey Report prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (August 2006), which is and included in Appendix 15.6, Historical Resources Survey Reports and included in Appendix 15.

Page 5.7-31, last paragraph, first sentence of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

In addition to these “historical resources,” three other properties, including the building at 711 Medio Street, the boundary between Rancho Los Alamitos and Rancho Los Cerritos, and the early 20th century street light standards on Lime ~~Street~~ Avenue, warrant special consideration in local planning due to their local historic value.

Page 5.7-32 through Page 5.3-35, of the Draft EIR have been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

10 Atlantic Avenue (The Artaban Apartments). The historic significance of the Artaban Apartment stems primarily from its association with a pattern of historic events that was important in local history and secondarily from its architectural merit and its long presence as a familiar visual feature in the neighborhood. The building retains excellent integrity in the aspects of location, design, materials, workmanship, and association, which would not be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project ~~since it stands outside the project boundaries.~~ Character



defining features of the Artaban include its Ocean Boulevard location; rectangular massing; flat roof and cornice; exterior materials; horizontal divisions articulated by the second story cornice and by stringcourses; fenestration pattern; window detailing and materials; primary (west) entry materials, configuration and detailing; and balconies. No direct impacts to character-defining features such as demolition or physical alteration would result from implementation of the project.

The current project plan calls for the construction of a 12-story building to the northeast of the Artaban Apartments. The presence of this new building would have a visual and atmospheric effect on the Artaban Apartments integrity in terms of setting and feeling. The Artaban is urban in its placement, with the building sitting directly on the sidewalk with no setbacks or garden. Because of its corner location at the intersection of Ocean and Lime Avenue, the two primary, street-facing elevations on the west and south were the focus of the architectural design. Lack of architectural detailing and finishes clearly identifies the east and north elevations as secondary. However, these aspects of the Artaban Apartments' integrity have been significantly compromised in the past, now that it is surrounded on all sides by modern or modern-looking buildings. Furthermore, The placement of the proposed new building would avoid visual intrusion on the Artaban's Apartment's more ornate western and southern façades, which contain essentially all of its character-defining architectural elements.

When it was constructed in 1922, the Artaban, with eight stories, would have been a noticeable feature on the skyline. However, the erection of numerous multi-storied buildings along Ocean Boulevard has diminished the presence of the building. Construction of the proposed project may intensify that effect, but would not result in new, significantly adverse impacts to character defining features such that the significance of the building would be materially impaired. Therefore, potential impacts to the Artaban that may result from the implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required. The indirect effects of the proposed project on the Artaban Apartments, therefore, is not considered a substantial adverse change in its significance and integrity. No mitigation measures are recommended for this "historical resource."

40 Atlantic Avenue. Based on the CRM Tech study results, the historic significance of the building is embodied primarily in the modern-style façade that was designed and implemented by famed local architect Kenneth S. Wing, Sr., in 1967, around the time when Mr. Wing moved his architectural design studio to this location. The remainder of the otherwise unremarkable structure, although more than 40 years old, contributes little to the significance of this property.

The project plan calls for the demolition of this building, which clearly constitutes "a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource." Recommended mitigation includes a comprehensive documentation program (including photographic recordation), a detailed written description, scaled mapping, and compilation of historical background be completed for this building prior to the commencement of the project. A commemorative plaque identifying the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr., to this location is also to be established at or near the site of the building. However, the implementation of these mitigation measures would not reduce project effects to a level less than significant. If



demolition or other substantial physical alterations to the building is to occur, particularly to the Kenneth Wing-era façade, the project would have a significant and unavoidable effect on a “historical resource.”

Preservation of the building (including preservation of the façade of the building only) is infeasible because doing so would eliminate the required project access (including access to underground parking) from Atlantic Avenue. The building is situated so close to Atlantic Avenue that a ramp to the underground parking garage cannot be constructed without demolishing the building’s façade. Nor can access on Atlantic Avenue be moved to another location. Moving the access southward would result in the demolition of a portion of the Artaban building, which is a building with substantially more historic significance than 40 Atlantic Avenue. Nor is it feasible to forego project access and egress on Atlantic Avenue. To do so would create significant and unavoidable traffic impacts. In order to better preserve the integrity of this “historical resource,” a project alternative should be considered so that the building, or at a minimum, the existing façade, which is the most important character-defining feature of the structure, be retained, rehabilitated as necessary, and incorporated into the project. If demolition of or other substantial physical alterations to the façade can be avoided, the project’s potential effect to this “historical resource” would be reduced.

703-705 Medio Street. The historic significance of this building is derived primarily from its outstanding architectural merit and secondarily from its long presence as a familiar visual feature in the neighborhood. Since it is located outside the project boundaries, the proposed development would not have a direct impact on the building’s architectural integrity and its character-defining features. As a three-story structure located in a mixed-use area with several existing high-rise buildings and parking lots at the former sites of demolished buildings, the original setting of this building, as related to its period of origin in the 1920s, is no longer intact. The implementation of the proposed project would not further compromise the setting and feeling of this “historical resource,” nor would the potential visual and atmospheric intrusion significantly affect the view of this building as a localized neighborhood landmark. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in its significance and integrity, and no mitigation measures are recommended.

711 Medio Street. The significance of this building lies in its notable architectural design by the firm of Killingsworth, Brady, and Smith. Located adjacent to the building at 703-705 Medio Street, this building would not be adversely affected by the proposed project for the same reason discussed above. No mitigation measures are recommended for this property.

700 E. Ocean Boulevard (International Tower). The International Tower attains its historic significance through its architectural merit, especially in the aspect of technological innovation, and through its widely recognized status as a prominent physical landmark. Character-defining features of the building include its Ocean Boulevard location on the bluff overlooking the Shoreline Marina area and the Pacific Ocean; 32-story height; circular massing; reinforced concrete construction; glass curtain walls with aluminum-framed openings; continuous metal-railed balconies; and flat roof with penthouse. Since it is located outside the project



boundaries, no direct impacts to the proposed project would not have any effect on the character-defining features, such as demolition or physical alteration would result from implementation of the proposed project. The building may be subject to indirect effects to its setting, architectural and technological characteristics of the International Tower, or any other direct impact.

The construction of the 21-story, 233-foot stepped slab building and the 12-story, 124-foot building across Ocean Boulevard would impose some visual affect on the view of the 27-story (above-ground), 278-foot International Tower, but such affect would be localized to views from the north and northeast certain directions. Most importantly, the new buildings would not block the primary vantages along Ocean Boulevard and Lime Avenue, which according to the project plan would be vacated for the construction of a landscaped paseo. Based on these considerations, the CRM Tech study concludes that the proposed project's potential indirect effect on this "historical resource" would not constitute a substantial adverse change in its significance and integrity since the qualities that convey the significance of the building would not be materially impaired, and the building would continue to convey the reasons for its significance. Therefore, potential impacts to the International Tower that may result from implementation of the proposed project would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are recommended.

800 E. Ocean Boulevard (Villa Riviera). The Villa Riviera is listed in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for its architectural design, and is a designated City of Long Beach landmark, eligible not only for its architecture but also for its role as "an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood or community due to its unique location or specific distinguishing characteristics. Similar to the International Tower, the Villa Riviera would not receive any direct impacts to the character-defining features such as demolition or physical alteration that would result from implementation of effect from the proposed project. Primary vantage points of the Villa Riviera are obtained from the east and west, along Ocean Boulevard, from the north on Alamitos Avenue and from the south on Shoreline Drive. Also as in the case of the International Tower, the construction of a 22-story, 284-foot residential tower on the northwestern corner of Alamitos Avenue and Ocean Boulevard would bring about some visual affect to the Villa Riviera, but would not affect the primary vantages from either of the two main thoroughfares. There are numerous buildings of equal or greater height than the Villa Riviera existing on Ocean Boulevard, including the International Tower, immediately to the west. The role of the Villa Riviera as the tallest building on the horizon no longer exists, although its commanding presence is still visually and physically evident. Construction of the Gateway Tower would not significantly affect the perception of the Villa Riviera from these vantage points. From the west, the Gateway Tower would intrude into the north portion of the vista of the Villa Riviera, obscuring the northern edge of the building and roof. The effects of the intrusion could be minimized by design of the project including siting of the Gateway Tower so as to step back from the corner, perhaps as an echo of the V-shaped plan of the Villa Riviera or design of the shaft of the Gateway Tower so as to step back in increments on the upper stories, revealing the upper edge and roofline of the Villa Riviera.

However, even with the intrusion into the vista from the west that would result from



the project as currently proposed, the significance of the Villa Riviera would not be significantly impaired, and the property would retain its listing in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register, as well as its local landmark status. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance and integrity of the Villa Riviera this “historical resource,” and no mitigation measures are recommended.

Street Lights. As stated above, two of the six early 20th century street light standards noted in the study area are located within the project boundaries, on the west side of Lime Avenue. Character-defining features of this historical resource include their regular placement in the parkway or sidewalk in proximity to each other; cast-iron square bases, fluted shafts and ornamental capitals; and single, acorn-shaped luminaries. At the present time, the proposed project plan is unclear as to the future disposition of these two light standards, and the implementation of the project may have an adverse effect on these historic features. Removal would materially impair the significance of the historical resource as a whole and the two affected streetlights individually. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project could cause significant impacts to historical resources. The other four light standards in the study area, however, would not be affected. Mitigation measures for the two light standards that would be affected has been identified.

Rancho Boundary. As a symbolic site with no physical components, this historic site of local historic interest would receive no effect from the proposed project. No mitigation measures are recommended.

Summary of Conclusion

As stated above, among the five properties that constitute “historical resources” under CEQA provisions and the three that warrant special consideration in local planning, the building at 40 Atlantic Avenue would be adversely affected by the proposed project, and two of the six street light standards noted in the study area may be affected. Although mitigation measures are recommended, the impact to 40 Atlantic Avenue would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures:

CUL-1 Although the impacts from demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance, the project applicant shall require and shall be responsible for ensuring that comprehensive data recording and documentation of the Wing Building are completed prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permits. The documentation shall be in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II and shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation, detailed written description, sketch plan, and compilation of historic background research. The documentation shall be completed by a historian or architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original, archival-quality



documentation package shall be deposited with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Office in the Department of Planning and Building. Copies of the documentation on archival-quality paper shall also be provided to the City of Long Beach Public Library; the library of California State University, Long Beach; the Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. archives housed in the Architecture and Design Collection at the University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara; the Long Beach Heritage; Historical Society of Long Beach and the California Office of Historic Preservation. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. Prior Demolition and Grading Permit Issuance, a comprehensive documentation program, including photographic recordation, detailed written description, scaled mapping and compilation of historical background pursuant to the Secretary of Interiors Standards for historical documentation shall be completed for 40 Atlantic Avenue.

CUL-2a The project applicant shall require and be responsible for the production and placement of a commemorative plaque memorializing the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates with the 40 Atlantic Avenue location. The plaque shall be placed at or near the site of the existing building. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. A commemorative plaque commemorating the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. to the 40 Atlantic Avenue shall be established at or near the site of the existing building.

CUL-2b Within one year of project approval and prior to the issuance of demolition or grading permits, the project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that a retrospective exhibit, brochure, and/or web page documenting the architectural careers of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates, are prepared. Such an exhibit, brochure, and/or web page shall be accessible to the general public for a period of at least one year and shall include both text and historic images. The history and architecture of the Wing Building shall be included in the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. A historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History shall be engaged to research and write the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. The exhibit, brochure, and/or web page shall be completed within a period of no more than two years. Completion of the mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach.

CUL-3 The project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that the two early 20th century streetlights located on Lime Avenue in the project site shall be documented in place by 35-mm black-and-white or digital photos and a historical narrative prior to issuance of any project-related demolition or grading permits; removed under the supervision of a qualified historic architect and/or other professional meeting the



Secretary of the Interior's Profession Qualification Standards for Historic Architect, History or Architectural History; stored in a safe place and manner; and reinstalled either at or near their current locations or at an appropriate nearby site. Reinstallation shall utilize the services of a qualified professional as referenced above, and any rehabilitation of the historic streetlights shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Appropriate sites may be determined in consultation with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Officer. Reinstallation shall occur no later than six months following completion of the proposed project. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. The two early 20th century Corsican-style street light standards within the project boundary shall be protected during construction and reused after rehabilitation, either at or near the current locations, or at appropriate sites nearby.

Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable Impact.

5.7.4 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

- **DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND OTHER RELATED CUMULATIVE PROJECTS WOULD NOT RESULT IN CUMULATIVELY CONSIDERABLE CULTURAL RESOURCES IMPACTS.**

Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation: Potentially Less Than Significant Impact.

Impact Analysis: After implementation of proposed mitigation measures, one significant adverse impact, demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue, would result from implementation of the proposed project. Although, no related projects are known that may cause adverse impacts to the significance of other Wing designs in the City, the loss of any historical resource contributes to the overall loss of historic fabric in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the impact of the demolition of 40 Atlantic Avenue is considered to be cumulatively significant. Potential impacts from development of related cumulative projects would be site and project area specific and an evaluation of potential impacts would be conducted on a project-by-project basis. Each incremental development would be required to comply with all applicable City, State and Federal regulations concerning preservation, salvage, or handling of cultural resources. In consideration of these regulations, potential cumulative impacts upon cultural resources would not be considered significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures: Refer to mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. No additional mitigation measures are recommended. No mitigation measures are recommended.



Level of Significance After Mitigation: Significant and Unavoidable Impact—Not applicable.

5.7.5 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

Despite recommended mitigation measures, the demolition of the 40 Atlantic Avenue building on the project site and cumulative impacts to historic resources have ~~has~~ been concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

If the City of Long Beach approves the Shoreline Gateway Project, the City shall be required to adopt findings in accordance with Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines and prepare a statement of overriding considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 5.8 Public Services and Utilities

Page 5.8-10 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

The project proposes the development of 358 residential units and 13,561 square feet of retail/gallery space. The project would not demand an amount of water equivalent to or greater than the amount of water required by a 500 dwelling unit project. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to SB 610 or SB 221.

Section 7.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Exhibit 7-1, Reduced Project Alternative Aerial Map, of the Draft EIR incorrectly illustrates the boundaries of the Office/Hotel Alternative. Exhibit 7-1 has been revised in the Final EIR. The description of the alternative and impact comparison to the proposed project is correct in the Draft EIR and does not require revision.

Exhibit 7-2, Office/Hotel Alternative Aerial Map, of the Draft EIR incorrectly illustrates the boundaries of the Reduced Project Alternative. Exhibit 7-2 has been revised in the Final EIR. The description of the alternative and impact comparison to the proposed project is correct in the Draft EIR and does not require revision.

Section 8.0 Inventory of Mitigation Measures

Page 8-3 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

~~TR-3 Lime Avenue and 3rd Street. While the project would not produce a significant impact at this intersection based on the significance criteria, it would experience an increase in delay with the full development of all cumulative projects referenced in the analysis. In order to improve traffic~~



~~operations and safety at this intersection, the project applicant shall be responsible for the installation of a traffic signal.~~

The remaining Traffic and Circulation mitigation measures in this section of the Draft EIR have been renumbered in the Final EIR to reflect the above correction.

Page 8-8 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

CUL-1 Although the impacts from demolition of a historical resource cannot be mitigated to below the level of significance, the project applicant shall require and shall be responsible for ensuring that comprehensive data recording and documentation of the Wing Building are completed prior to issuance of any demolition or grading permits. The documentation shall be in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level II and shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation, detailed written description, sketch plan, and compilation of historic background research. The documentation shall be completed by a historian or architectural historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original, archival-quality documentation package shall be deposited with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Office in the Department of Planning and Building. Copies of the documentation on archival-quality paper shall also be provided to the City of Long Beach Public Library; the library of California State University, Long Beach; the Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. archives housed in the Architecture and Design Collection at the University Art Museum, University of California at Santa Barbara; the Long Beach Heritage; Historical Society of Long Beach and the California Office of Historic Preservation. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. Prior Demolition and Grading Permit Issuance, a comprehensive documentation program, including photographic recordation, detailed written description, scaled mapping and compilation of historical background pursuant to the Secretary of Interiors Standards for historical documentation shall be completed for 40 Atlantic Avenue.

CUL-2a The project applicant shall require and be responsible for the production and placement of a commemorative plaque memorializing the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates with the 40 Atlantic Avenue location. The plaque shall be placed at or near the site of the existing building. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. A commemorative plaque commemorating the association of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr. to the 40 Atlantic Avenue shall be established at or near the site of the existing building.



CUL-2b Within one year of project approval and prior to the issuance of demolition or grading permits, the project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that a retrospective exhibit, brochure, and/or web page documenting the architectural careers of Kenneth S. Wing, Sr.; Kenneth S. Wing, Jr.; and the architectural firm of Wing and Associates, are prepared. Such an exhibit, brochure, or web page shall be accessible to the general public for a period of at least one year and shall include both text and historic images. The history and architecture of the Wing Building shall be included in the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. A historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History shall be engaged to research and write the exhibit, brochure, and/or web page. The exhibit, brochure, and/or web page shall be completed within a period of no more than two years. Completion of the mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach.

CUL-3 The project applicant shall require and be responsible for ensuring that the two early 20th century streetlights located on Lime Avenue in the project site shall be documented in place by 35-mm black-and-white or digital photos and a historical narrative prior to issuance of any project-related demolition or grading permits; removed under the supervision of a qualified historic architect and/or other professional meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Profession Qualification Standards for Historic Architect, History or Architectural History; stored in a safe place and manner; and reinstalled either at or near their current locations or at an appropriate nearby site. Reinstallation shall utilize the services of a qualified professional as referenced above, and any rehabilitation of the historic streetlights shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Appropriate sites may be determined in consultation with the City of Long Beach Historic Preservation Officer. Reinstallation shall occur no later than six months following completion of the proposed project. Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach. The two early 20th century Corsican-style street light standards within the project boundary shall be protected during construction and reused after rehabilitation, either at or near the current locations, or at appropriate sites nearby.

Cumulative Impacts

Refer to Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3. No additional mitigation measures are recommended. No mitigation measures are recommended.



Section 9.0 Level of Significance After Mitigation

Page 9-2 of the Draft EIR has been revised in the Final EIR, as follows:

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Despite recommended mitigation measures, the demolition of the 40 Atlantic Avenue building on the project site and cumulative impacts to historic resources ~~have~~ has been concluded to be significant and unavoidable.

If the City of Long Beach approves the Shoreline Gateway Project, the City shall be required to adopt findings in accordance with Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines and prepare a statement of overriding considerations in accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines.