



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
451 Seventh Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20410  
[www.hud.gov](http://www.hud.gov)  
[espanol.hud.gov](http://espanol.hud.gov)

## **Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58**

### **Project Information**

**Project Name:** Anaheim Street and Walnut Avenue Development Project

**Responsible Entity:** City of Long Beach

**Grant Recipient** (if different than Responsible Entity): BRIDGE Housing

**State/Local Identifier:**

**Preparer:** Jenny Vick, Senior Environmental Planner

**Certifying Officer Name and Title:** Christopher Koontz, Planning Bureau Manager

**Grant Recipient** (if different than Responsible Entity): BRIDGE Housing

**Consultant** (if applicable): HDR, Inc.

**Direct Comments to:** Scott Kinsey, Planner V, City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, 411 West Ocean Boulevard – 3rd Floor, Long Beach, CA 90802

**Project Location:** The Anaheim Street and Walnut Avenue Development Project (project) site is approximately 1.54 acres and consists of 7 parcels located between Hoffman Avenue and Walnut Avenue, south of East Anaheim Street, and north of East 11th Street in the central portion of the City of Long Beach (Figure 1). The Assessor Parcel Numbers are 7267001900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, and 906.

**Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:**

The project consists of a new 116,356-square-foot, mixed-use building that is approximately 61 feet (up to maximum 65 feet) above ground level (maximum 5 stories). The building includes an 88-unit, 5-story apartment building, with 93,656 square feet of residential space on levels two through five and 22,700 square feet on the street level, which includes 18,136 square feet of medical clinic space; 1,100 square feet of commercial office space; 1,200 square feet of residential leasing office space; and 2,264 square feet of recreation and lobby space. The building also includes a 3-story, 156-stall parking structure with partial 4th floor outdoor terrace, for a total of 116,356 square feet of building area and 81,903 square feet of parking garage, on a 1.54-acre site. The entrance for the parking structure would be on the west side of the property from an existing alley. The project consists of 100-percent affordable housing units. Units would include 1 bedroom (32 units), 2 bedroom (32 units), and 3 bedroom (24 units) options.

To comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for the project. The City of Long Beach Planning Commission voted to adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration on July 18, 2019.

Figure 1. Regional Location and Project Vicinity



## **Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:**

The provision of adequate affordable housing remains a challenge for Long Beach due to the escalating cost of housing in Long Beach. This continuing trend amplifies the need for providing affordable housing to all household income levels, especially low and very low income levels.

Currently 12.2 percent of Long Beach residents experience overcrowding in their houses, and by 2040, there will be an estimated 28,524 housing units needed. In 2012, there was a supply of 176,000 housing units, offering a range of housing opportunities varying from single-family homes, mobile homes, and moderate-density courtyard apartments and town homes, to higher-density condominium and apartment buildings.

Land costs, construction costs, and market financing contribute to the cost of housing investment, and can potentially hinder the production of affordable housing. A key component in the cost of housing development is the price of raw land and any necessary improvements and infrastructure that must be made to a particular site. The diminishing supply of vacant residential land, combined with a fairly high demand, kept land cost relatively high in Southern California and Long Beach, even during the recent recession. In recognition that land costs affect the feasibility of developing affordable housing, the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency routinely wrote down the cost of land on agency-owned property in exchange for developers placing affordability controls on the units.

The City of Long Beach maintains a number of incentives to build affordable housing. This includes density incentives, compliant with state law, of a 35-percent bonus for development of lower income housing, moderate-income condominiums, and housing for seniors. In addition to the density bonus, parks and recreation and transportation development fees are waived for affordable housing if the criteria on length of affordability and income/affordability level are met. In conjunction with the density bonus ordinance, certain development standards may be relaxed if increased density cannot be physically accommodated on the site.

The proposed project would accommodate a portion of the citywide demand for new housing located near transit, jobs, retail services, and cultural institutions. The proposed project would provide medium-density housing in the Cambodia Town neighborhood. The proposed project would be accessible to various modes of public transit, thereby helping the city meet the objectives of the Housing Element of the General Plan. These objectives include construction of additional residential units in established neighborhoods that will contribute to the city's housing supply.

## **Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:**

The site is currently vacant, graded flat to street level, and contains no vegetation. No sensitive resources have been identified on the project site. The project site is surrounded by urban development, including residences and commercial businesses. The surrounding land uses include residential homes and apartments to the west, north, and east; a market and storage facility to the west; a market and locksmith to the north; and a restaurant and video store to the east.

The project site is located in the Cambodia Town neighborhood. Cambodia Town is a roughly 1-mile long business corridor with numerous Cambodian restaurants, retail stores, religious institutions, and Cambodia-American service centers. This area is one of the most ethnically and physically diverse areas of Long Beach.

Two bus routes, the 45 and 46, run along Anaheim Street, and bus stops for each route are located within one city block of the project site. The Los Angeles Metro Blue line is also located one mile west of the project site and provides access to South Los Angeles and Downtown Los Angeles.

Historically, the site has had a number of different land uses. Beginning from 1923 until demolition of structures on site in 2008, historic uses included:

- 1923-1964: Dry cleaners, used car business, auto repair facility, grocery and liquor store, blacksmith shop, machine shop, residential land uses, and commercial businesses
- 1969-1973: Violin repair shop, radio repair shop, barber shop
- 1975-2008: Offices, donut shop, market retirement homes, residential, laundry facility, nursing/community rehab facilities
- 2008-2019: Vacant

**Funding Information**

<b><u>Grant Number</u></b>	<b><u>HUD Program</u></b>	<b><u>Funding Amount</u></b>
M-16/17/18-MC-06-0518	HOME Investment Partnerships	\$4,000,000

**Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount:** \$4,000,000

**Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]:** \$51,000,000

**Compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities**

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
<p><b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6</b></p>		
<p><b>Airport Hazards</b>  24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is located more than 2 miles southwest of the Long Beach Airport. The project is not located within a Federal Aviation Administration-designated civilian airport Runway Clear Zone or within an Airport Potential Zone. There are no military airfields in Long Beach and no military airfield Protection Zone or Clear Zone would affect the project.</p> <p>Source Document: 1 and Attachment: 1</p>
<p><b>Coastal Barrier Resources</b>  Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>There are no Coastal Barrier Resource System Units or Coastal Barrier Resource System buffer zones, as defined under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501] located in California. The project site is, therefore, not located within a Coastal Barrier Resource System Unit, or Coastal Barrier Resource System buffer zone. As such, the project is not subject to the Coastal Barrier Resources Act or the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act.</p> <p>Source Document: 2</p>
<p><b>Flood Insurance</b>  Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project does not involve construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property within a Federal Emergency Management Agency designated 100-year floodplain or 500-year floodplain identified in Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map panel 06037C1970F.</p> <p>Source Document: 3 and Attachment: 2</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
<p><b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 &amp; 58.5</b></p>		
<p><b>Clean Air</b></p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) &amp; (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes    No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Criteria Pollutants</u></p> <p>Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version (Version 2016.3.2) emission model for estimating exhaust emissions from off-road construction equipment and on-road motor vehicles, as well as calculating long-term mobile, energy, and area source emissions. The modeled criteria pollutants were compared to the federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels and local South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) construction and operational thresholds to determine if the project would result in an adverse air quality effects. Model data and detailed analysis can be found in Attachment 3a and a Record of Non-Applicability for Clean Air Act Conformity can be found in Attachment 3b.</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has classified the South Coast Air Basin as attainment/maintenance for carbon monoxide (CO), particles of 10 micrometers and smaller (PM<sub>10</sub>), and nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and nonattainment for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>) and particles of 2.5 micrometers and smaller (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). In addition, the Los Angeles County portion of the South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment for lead.</p> <p><i>Comparison to Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels</i></p> <p>Construction emissions from the project would result primarily from off-road equipment, vehicle use, and fugitive dust. The modeling results indicate that maximum</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>annual emissions from construction would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.7 ton per year (2019) and 1.1 ton per year (2020) CO</li> <li>• 0.3 ton per year (2019) and 0.5 ton per year (2020) Volatile Organic Gases (VOC)</li> <li>• 2.1 tons per year (2019) and 1.2 ton per year (2020) Oxides of Nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>)</li> <li>• 0.2 ton per year (2019) and 0.1 ton per year (2020) particles of 10 PM<sub>10</sub></li> <li>• 0.1 ton per year (2019) and 0.1 ton per year (2020) PM<sub>2.5</sub></li> </ul> <p>Based on the SCAQMD's designation status, federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels would be 10 tons per year for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC and 100 tons per year for CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. A conformity determination would be required for each criteria pollutant or precursor exceeding the federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> level. Emissions for all criteria pollutants would be below federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act.</p> <p>Operational emissions are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources associated with vehicular trips and on-site energy consumption. Results from the CalEEMod indicate the maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.8 ton per year NO<sub>x</sub></li> <li>• 0.8 ton per year VOC</li> <li>• 5.2 tons per year of CO</li> <li>• 0.01 ton per year of sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>)</li> <li>• 1.2 ton per year PM<sub>10</sub></li> <li>• 0.3 ton per year PM<sub>2.5</sub></li> </ul> <p>Operational emissions would be below the federal <i>de minimis</i> thresholds of 10 tons per year for NO<sub>x</sub> and VOC and 100 tons per year</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>for CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, and PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Therefore, the proposed action is exempt from General Conformity regulations.</p> <p><i>Comparisons to South Coast Air Quality Management District Thresholds</i></p> <p>The construction emissions for each phase of construction were calculated using the CalEEMod. The peak day modeling results indicate that the maximum daily emissions from construction would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30.5 pounds per day CO</li> <li>• 19.5 pounds per day Volatile Organic Gases (ROGs)</li> <li>• 19.5 pounds per day NO<sub>x</sub></li> <li>• 3.6 pounds per day PM<sub>10</sub></li> <li>• 2.2 pounds per day PM<sub>2.5</sub></li> </ul> <p>The peak daily construction emissions would be below the SCAQMD threshold of 550 pounds per day CO, 75 pounds per day ROG, 100 pounds per day NO<sub>x</sub>, 150 pounds per day PM<sub>10</sub>, and 55 pounds per day PM<sub>2.5</sub>.</p> <p>The daily operational emissions for area, energy, and mobile sources were calculated using the CalEEMod. The peak daily emissions from operations would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36.2 pounds per day CO</li> <li>• 12.4 pounds per day NO<sub>x</sub></li> <li>• 5.0 pounds per day ROG</li> <li>• 0.1 pound per day Oxides of Sulfur (SO<sub>x</sub>)</li> <li>• 7.6 pounds per day PM<sub>10</sub></li> <li>• 2.2 pounds per day PM<sub>2.5</sub></li> </ul> <p>The total daily emissions would be below SCAQMD thresholds described above.</p> <p>Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would be below thresholds with</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>respect to SCAQMD and federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels.</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust</u></p> <p>SCAQMD has established Rule 403 for reducing fugitive dust emissions. Dust generated daily during construction would vary substantially, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions. Nearby sensitive receptors and on-site workers may be exposed to blowing dust, depending upon prevailing wind conditions. Fugitive dust also would be generated as construction equipment or trucks travel on unpaved areas of the construction site. Fugitive dust could result in adverse effects to nearby sensitive receptors if not properly managed. <b>Mitigation Measure AQ-1</b> would be implemented to reduce fugitive dust from leaving the project site.</p> <p><u>Asbestos</u></p> <p>The project does not involve demolition of structures because the site is currently vacant; however, Los Angeles County is among the counties listed as containing serpentine and ultramafic rock, which may contain naturally occurring asbestos. The portion of the county in which the project lies is not known to contain serpentine or ultramafic rock. Therefore, the impact from naturally occurring asbestos during project construction would be minimal to none.</p> <p>Source Document: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and Attachment 3 and 3a, 3b</p>

<p align="center"><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p align="center">Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p align="center">Compliance determinations</p>
<p><b>Coastal Zone Management</b></p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) &amp; (d)</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is located approximately 1.27 mile from the Pacific Ocean. The project site is not located within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission, which generally extends 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line along the California Coast. The project site is not located within the Coastal Zone Management area; therefore, the project would have no effect on the coastal zone.</p> <p>Source Document 10 and Attachment: 4</p>
<p><b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b></p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) &amp; 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes    No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>   <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site consists of several parcels that are currently unpaved vacant land with gravel surfacing. The site was previously developed and was reported to have historically comprised of commercial and residential uses since 1926. Historic commercial uses include grocery, liquor store, barber and beauty shops, radio repair, used furniture sales, physician, dentist, real estate, restaurants, laundry, dry cleaning, three underground storage tanks removed in 1971, and auto repair.</p> <p>Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and Phase II ESAs were conducted in 2006 and most recently in 2019. This analysis is based on both the 2006 and 2019 ESAs, which are included as Attachments 5a, 5b, and 5c.</p> <p>The Phase I ESA concluded no evidence of recognized environmental conditions in connection with the project site, with possible exceptions including the historic dry cleaning facility, USTs, and auto repair facility.</p> <p>The Phase II ESA conducted a subsurface assessment based on recommendations in the Phase I ESA regarding the presence of underground storage tanks, a former dry</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>cleaning facility, an automotive repair facility, lead-based paint, pesticides, and termiticides. Constituents of concern included total petroleum hydrocarbons within the gas, diesel, and oil range, elevated levels of lead and/or Title 22 Metals, pesticides, and VOCs. The results are summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lead: One sample location reported concentrations above the residential California Human Health Screening Level. The three highest lead concentration samples were analyzed for their Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration and all were reported below the limit, and therefore, are not susceptible to leaching.</li> <li>• Title 22 metals and arsenic: All Title 22 metals were reported to be below their respective regional screening level. Arsenic was reported above naturally occurring levels at one sample location and exceeds applicable health risk screening criteria for residential users.</li> <li>• Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons: All samples were below laboratory reporting limits.</li> <li>• VOCs: All samples were below laboratory reporting limits.</li> <li>• Soil Vapor: Benzene, Tetrachloroethene, and Trichloroethene had samples above the laboratory reporting limits, but below the regional screening level.</li> </ul> <p>Lead and arsenic were the only constituents of concern that require mitigation. <b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1</b> would be implemented to achieve acceptable levels of risk suitable for residential development.</p> <p>The results from the Phase II ESA did not conduct exploratory boreholes or test pits to conclude with certainty that all USTs had been removed from the site. However, the</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>2006 Phase II ESA did conduct borings at five locations and did not identify USTs. The 2019 Phase II ESA identified several anomalies throughout the study area showing high electromagnetic and magnetic responses, contrasting soil conditions, or shallow non-metallic objects. In order to evaluate these features further, <b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2</b> would be implemented to conduct exploratory boreholes and/or test pits prior to construction.</p> <p>Source Document: 11, 12 and Attachment: 5, 5a, 5b, 5c</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species</b>  Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is disturbed and surrounded by urban development with no ornamental trees. The site is unpaved and covered in gravel. Database searches of California Natural Diversity Database, Information for Planning and Consultation, and the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California indicate no species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status have the potential to occur on the project site. There is no critical habitat in the project vicinity.</p> <p>Source Document: 13, 14, 15 and Attachment: 6</p>
<p><b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</b>  24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>As part of the Phase I and Phase II ESAs, no visual evidence was observed during site reconnaissance of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at, or immediately adjacent to, the project site. Based on the record search as part of the Phase I ESA, there are no above ground storage tanks within 0.25 mile of the project site. The closest above ground storage tanks are located more than 1 mile away according to the California Environmental Protection Agency Regulated Site Portal. In addition to</p>

<b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>database searches, a review of aerial photos using Google earth was conducted, and no above ground storage tanks were observed. The project would not involve explosive or flammable operations. Additionally, no known sites containing flammable, explosive, hazardous, or toxic materials were found to be of concern to future development of the site.</p> <p>Source Document: 16 and Attachment: 7</p>
<b>Farmlands Protection</b>  Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is located in urbanized Long Beach and is not utilized for agriculture production. No farmland is present that would be converted. The project site is not zoned for agriculture and is not under a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source Document: 17 and Attachment: 8</p>
<b>Floodplain Management</b>  Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is not located in an existing floodplain. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the project site is in an area of minimal flooding risk. The site is not subject to flooding by failure of a levee or dam; therefore, no impacts related to floodplain hazards or management would occur.</p> <p>Source Document: 3 and Attachment: 9</p>
<b>Historic Preservation</b>  National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the purposes of archeological resources is limited to the project site; however, an expanded APE was utilized to identify historic properties adjacent to the project site that may be exposed to adverse indirect effects.</p> <p>In December 2018, the South Central Coastal Information Center was contacted to perform a record search of all previously</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>recorded cultural resources (including archaeological sites) within one-quarter mile of the project site. The records search indicated no cultural resources have previously been identified within the project site. Outside the project site, but within one-quarter mile of the project site, 16 resources (all historic-age buildings) have previously been recorded. The 16 historic-age buildings include 15 residences and 1 commercial structures. No prehistoric resources have been recorded in the one-quarter mile search area. The APE has been previously surveyed three times, most recently in 2014 (after demolition of all buildings on site); for this reason, a new survey of the APE was deemed unnecessary.</p> <p>One built environment resource has been identified adjacent to the project site. Resource P-19-187653 is a seven-story commercial building constructed in 1923 as Bekins Storage and currently operates as Security Storage, located at 1430 East Anaheim Street. The building was recorded by Chambers Group and recommended not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Place in 2003. However, it was given a status code of 4X, which indicates it may become eligible for the National Register of Historic Place as contributing to a district.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the APE is situated in an area that has been heavily developed and built-up for both commercial and residential purposes for the last 70 years based on historic aerial imagery. Additionally, various portions of the APE itself have been developed since the 1920s with commercial businesses and residences. This has resulted in considerable past ground disturbance in the APE, which would have resulted in the destruction or loss of integrity of any potential buried cultural resource. Therefore,</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>there is low to no potential for encountering intact buried cultural resources.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Due to the lack of identified cultural resources within the APE, as well as past land use activities and ground disturbance within the APE, the proposed project is expected to have no effect on historic properties. Therefore, the city recommends a finding of No Historic Properties Affected.</p> <p>Source Document: 18 and Attachment 10, 10a</p>
<p><b>Noise Abatement and Control</b></p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes    No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise, although temporary, can potentially affect nearby sensitive receptors, such as residences closest to the project site. Project construction would require the use of heavy equipment that may be periodically audible at off-site locations. Received noise levels would fluctuate, depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and distance between noise source and receiver. Additionally, noise from construction equipment would vary dependent on the construction phase and the number and type of equipment at a location at any given time.</p> <p>The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site is the short-term healthcare facility located on the southern property line. At its closest point, the construction activity would be located within 50 feet of this land use. The average distance from the construction activities on the project site to these sensitive land uses on a daily basis is approximately 125 feet. Construction noise would attenuate with increased distance from the noise sources.</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>Maximum noise levels at 50 feet and composite <math>L_{eq}</math> noise levels at 125 feet were evaluated assuming spherical free-field spreading. As a general construction practice, functional mufflers are anticipated to be maintained on all equipment to attenuate noise levels as low as reasonably achievable. During the loudest construction phase, the maximum noise level is projected to be 85.0 decibel (dBA) <math>L_{max}</math>, and the average level is projected to be 75.5 dBA <math>L_{eq}</math>. This is considered an adverse effect.</p> <p>Compliance with the <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-1</b> would require limited work hours, which would reduce adverse effects. Although construction noise would be higher than the ambient noise in the project vicinity, construction noise is naturally short-term and would cease to occur once project construction is complete.</p> <p>Traffic noise associated with project construction is not anticipated to be a substantial source of noise. Traffic noise is not greatly influenced by lower levels of traffic, such as those associated with the project's construction effort. For example, traffic levels would have to double for traffic noise on adjacent roadways to increase by 3 dBA. The project's construction traffic on adjacent roadways would increase hourly traffic volumes by much less than a factor of two; therefore, acceptable noise levels would not be exceeded.</p> <p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>The acceptable exterior noise levels set forth by HUD regulations for new construction of housing are 65 day-night average sound level (DNL) or less. DNL is a 24-hour average noise level with a 10 dBA penalty for noise occurring during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>The regulations consider the range between 65 dBA DNL and 75 dBA DNL to be normally unacceptable, unless appropriate sound attenuation measures are provided. Unacceptable noise levels, set by the HUD regulations, are 75 dBA DNL and higher.</p> <p>Based on the preliminary site plan and an analysis of long-term (year 2040) traffic volumes, the proposed residential units will be constructed within 40 feet of the centerline of Anaheim Street. At this distance the proposed residential units would be exposed to noise levels of up to 73 dBA Ldn. Standard building construction in warm climates provides 24 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are closed and 12 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are open (Protective Noise Levels, Environmental Protection Agency 550/9 79 100, November 1978). All new construction of residential units requires some form of mechanical ventilation to ensure that proper indoor air quality is maintained even with all windows and doors closed. Therefore, with windows closed, the new residential units would be exposed to interior noise levels exceeding the 45 dBA Ldn standard (73 – 24 = 49). Therefore, <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-2</b> would be implemented.</p> <p>HUD regulations also establish standards for exterior noise (24 CFR § 51.101(a)(9)). Associated open outdoor areas where people may congregate are considered in the evaluation for noise. The resident’s courtyard is located in the center of the parcel and is shielded from traffic noise by buildings. Additionally, there are no balconies. Due to this design characteristic for outdoor attenuation purposes, acceptable noise levels for exterior noise would not be exceeded.</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>The project site is located more than two miles southwest of the Long Beach Airport. The noise from the airport would not contribute to the noise environment at the project site based on each airport's respective noise contour map.</p> <p>Source Document: 19, 20 and Attachment 11, 11a, 11b, 17</p>
<p><b>Sole Source Aquifers</b></p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes    No  <input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project is not located in an area designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as being supported by a sole source aquifer. The project is served by the Long Beach Water Department, which is not provided from a sole source aquifer. The nearest sole source aquifer is over 100 miles southeast near the Mexico border, east of San Diego.</p> <p>Source Document: 21 and Attachment 12</p>
<p><b>Wetlands Protection</b></p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes    No  <input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is not located within or adjacent to wetlands. Based on the USFWS wetland mapper and aerial photograph review, there are no previously identified wetlands within 0.25-mile of the project site. In addition, the project site is already heavily disturbed, urban in nature, and the project will not affect any coastal or riparian wetlands.</p> <p>Source Document: 22 and Attachment 13</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
<p><b>Wild and Scenic Rivers</b>  Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>There are no waterways on the project site and there are no wild and scenic rivers in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the project would have no effect on any scenic rivers as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.</p> <p>Source Document: 23 and Attachment: 14</p>
<p><b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b></p>		
<p><b>Environmental Justice</b>  Executive Order 12898</p>	<p>Yes    No <input type="checkbox"/>   <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project site is currently vacant and does not house any populations. The project site has an environmental justice population based on 2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.</p> <p>The project would provide new affordable housing, thereby adding to the environmental justice population of the area. The commercial space, medical clinic, and resident amenity space on the ground floor would provide job opportunities for residents, and the development of the project site would provide low-income families with affordable housing opportunities, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. This analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the projects introduced environmental justice population.</p> <p><u>Project Impacts</u></p> <p>From the consideration of regulatory factors in this EA, a number of environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, because impacts would be shared by neighboring, non-environmental justice populations, thus the following impacts with their mitigation summarized below do not represent impacts</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>with potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population.</p> <p><i>Air Quality:</i> While construction and operation of the project would result in criteria pollutant emissions below threshold levels, with respect to federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels and SCAQMD's threshold of significance, construction would result in fugitive dust. However, through implementation of <b>Mitigation Measure AQ-1</b>, measures would be implemented to ensure that construction would not result in fugitive dust.</p> <p><i>Contamination and Toxic Substances:</i> The Phase I and Phase II ESAs prepared for the project identified lead and arsenic in soil samples. Lead and arsenic were the only constituents of concern that require mitigation. <b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1</b> would be implemented to achieve acceptable levels of risk suitable for residential development.</p> <p><i>Historic Preservation:</i> The project site has previously been disturbed and the new building does not propose subterranean levels. Record searches indicate there are no historic properties in the APE that would be adversely affected.</p> <p><i>Construction Noise:</i> The project would introduce new noise sources to the neighborhood from vehicle use on adjacent and nearby roadways by new residents and visitors. The project would also introduce short-term noises during the construction of the new building. The nearest sensitive land uses to the project include residences and a short-term healthcare facility. However, <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-1</b> would restrict construction hours and includes best</p>

<p><b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6</p>	<p>Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?</p>	<p>Compliance determinations</p>
		<p>management practices to reduce effects on nearby sensitive receptors.</p> <p><i>Operational Noise:</i> HUD DNL Calculator estimates that exterior noise levels at the project site would be within HUD’s “normally acceptable” range, thus indicating low-income residents would be exposed to excess noise. <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-2</b> requires windows and doors with a Sound Transmission Class of 32 or higher be installed. Therefore, exterior noise exposure would be reduced for environmental justice populations.</p> <p><i>Geology and Soils:</i> The project site is outside of an Earthquake Fault Zone, the principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along one of several major active or potentially active faults in Southern California. The site does have the potential to be exposed to strong seismic shaking; however, the project facilities would be designed consistent with the California Building Code in order to minimize hazards during a seismic event. The California Building Code includes standards related to soils and foundations, structure design, building materials, and structural testing and inspections.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>Overall, the project is not anticipated to create permanent adverse effects in the project area existing populations, or to an introduced environmental justice population.</p> <p>Source Document: 24, 25, 26 and Attachment 15</p>

**Environmental Assessment Factors** [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]:

Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features, and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

**Impact Codes:** Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The project site is located within the heavily urbanized community of the Central Neighborhood. The project is in an infill development on parcels that were previously developed. The project would not physically divide an established community. The project consists of the construction of a new mixed-use building with a maximum of five stories and an attached three-story parking structure. The project site is not located in a coastal zone and is not subject to the Local Coastal Program. The project would require discretionary actions, including Zone Changes of three existing parcels, the northern portion of a large parcel on East Anaheim Street and one parcel on Walnut Avenue from Community Commercial Pedestrian-Oriented (CCP) District to Community R-4-N Commercial (CCN) District; two existing parcels on Walnut Avenue and the southern portion of the large parcel on East Anaheim Street from R-2-N Two-Family Residential to CCN; and parking requirements to allow for reduced number of parking spots provided for residents, along with greater allowed housing density. The project would consist of 100 percent affordable housing units and would take advantage of the density bonus

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>offered by state law (California Government Code §65915) for such project.</p> <p>The project also would take advantage of the provisions of state law that require local government to grant development standards waivers and additional development standards concessions for affordable housing projects (§65915) and commercial development partnered with affordable housing project (§65917.5) if the strict application of normal development standards would preclude the project from being feasible. The applicant is requesting waivers and concessions in the following areas (i.e., the project does not comply with the city’s established development standards in these areas):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building setbacks (front, side, street side, and rear)</li> <li>• Building step-backs for 2nd, 3rd, and 4th+ stories (rear)</li> <li>• Required private open space area/amounts</li> <li>• Screening standards for private open space</li> <li>• Privacy standards between facing windows of separate dwelling units (interior courtyard-facing units)</li> <li>• Residential parking count (110 required, 96 provided)</li> <li>• Commercial parking count (36 required, 60 provided)</li> </ul> <p>The required entitlements are site-specific and an allowable discretionary action and would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations; as they would not result in broader changes to the goals, policies and programs.</p> <p>Source Document: 27, 28, 29</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	2	<p><u>Geology/Soil Stability</u></p> <p>Due to the relatively flat topography and the lack of exposed slopes, the risk of substantial erosion or loss of topsoil is considered low. According to the <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Report</i> prepared for the project the project site is located outside, but relatively close to an area mapped as liquefiable. Due to relatively shallow groundwater and deep alluvial soil deposits, the site is considered moderately susceptible to liquefaction. A liquefaction analysis should be performed during final design to confirm whether or not the site is susceptible to liquefaction. Additionally, the project site is not known to contain expansive or collapsible soils; however, testing of samples obtained from the site should be performed to confirm that these hazards are not present on the site. <b>Mitigation</b></p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p><b>Measure GEO-1</b> would be implemented, which would require all geotechnical requirements to be carried forward.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>Construction of the project would disturb more than one acre of soil, therefore the project would be required to obtain coverage under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit, which requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and implementation of construction best management practices. Additionally, the project would comply with all requirements of the Long Beach Municipal Code related to stormwater management, the city's Stormwater Management Plan and the city's Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Discharges from the City of Long Beach (City of Long Beach MS4 Permit).</p> <p>Due to the increase in impervious surfaces, the project would be required to implement post-construction best management practices to mitigate stormwater pollution during operation and prepare a Low Impact Development Plan or equivalent, in compliance with the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development Best Management Practice Design Manual.</p> <p>Source Document: 30, 31, 32, 33 and Attachment 16</p>
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	3	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>The project would involve the construction of a mixed-use building and attached parking structure, which would not typically involve the use or storage of large quantities of hazardous materials. During construction, the use of potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents would occur. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. The city is an urbanized community and there are no wild lands in the project site vicinity. There would be no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>Construction noise as discussed above in “Noise and Abatement Control” would be temporary and mitigated by <b>Mitigation Measure NOI-1</b>. Noise generated by the project would consist of short duration noise resulting from construction activities and long-term noise from on-site stationary sources and off-site traffic noise from vehicles operated by employees using the proposed industrial buildings.</p> <p>Airborne noise dissipates with increasing distance from the noise source. Project-related long-term (year 2040) vehicular trip increases are anticipated to be minimal when distributed to adjacent street segments. The Federal Highway Administration highway traffic noise prediction model (Federal Highway Administration RD-77-108) was used to evaluate highway traffic-related noise conditions along the roadway segments in the project vicinity. The typical vehicle mix for Southern California was used. An increase of 3 dBA is considered to be the threshold for off-site traffic noise impact requiring mitigation. The project would only raise noise levels of 0.1 dBA.</p> <p>Source Documents: 11, 20</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Construction activities would consume electricity and fossil fuels but would not require consumption of natural gas. The use of construction vehicles and equipment would consume fossil fuels, such as diesel, gasoline, and oil. Water consumption during construction activities would indirectly consume electricity.</p> <p>When not in use, electric equipment would be shut off to avoid unnecessary consumption of electricity. Energy consumption during construction would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. Because of the high cost of fuel, construction and maintenance activities would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy, as construction contractors would purchase fuel from local suppliers and would conserve the use of their supplies to minimize the cost of constructing the project. Therefore, construction impacts would not result in adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Operation</u></p> <p>Operation of the mixed use building would involve consumption of electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels related to automobile use. During ongoing operation of the project, the project would consume electricity in the form of building energy use, outdoor</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>electricity use, and electricity consumption related to indoor and outdoor water consumption. The project would comply with building energy efficiency standards, including the 2016 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6), effective January 1, 2017, which is mandatory statewide for new residential and nonresidential buildings. The 2016 Title 24 standards align the lighting and efficiency improvements to the residential standards with the American Society of Heating and Air-Conditioning Engineers national standards.</p> <p>The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), also called the CALGreen Code, went into effect on January 1, 2017, and includes mandatory standards for low rise residential buildings. The project would comply with the CALGreen Code, which includes measures to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from buildings through site development and reducing energy and water consumption.</p> <p>As the project site is currently vacant, when compared to existing conditions, the project would increase overall energy consumption. The project would include solar-ready roofs that can be equipped with solar panels that would provide a source of on-site renewable energy. In addition, the project would provide seven electric-vehicle parking spaces for the building and would thus promote alternative fuel consumption for vehicles operated by building tenants. Therefore, project operation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and would not result in adverse effects.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>		
Employment and Income Patterns	1	Currently, the site is undeveloped and has no economic impact on the surrounding area. The project would increase available commercial real estate, and provide an additional 50 work opportunities in the clinic and offices in the first floor of the building. It is expected that construction work and ongoing work within the constructed commercial space and resident amenity space would be accommodated by the existing employment pool.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		No adverse impacts are anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	<p>The project is expected to provide 88 units to serve low income residents in the area. The project would be consistent with the Long Beach Housing element and help provide affordable housing to residents within the city. No displacement is expected to occur. The project will bring in additional housing units for the area and provide additional low income housing for residents in the area. Currently the City of Long Beach has an estimated 19.1 percent of its population living under the poverty line. With the project site currently being vacant, no residents would be displaced during the construction of the project.</p> <p>Source document: 25, 26, 34</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The project does include housing that would directly add students to the Long Beach Unified School District. The applicant would be required to pay school impact fees pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998). The closest schools include Lincoln Elementary School, Franklin Middle School, and Long Beach Poly High School, which would all serve the residents of the project. The closest public library branch is the Long Beach Public Library – Mark Twain Branch, approximately 500 feet away, located at 1400 East Anaheim Street. The project would develop a mixed use building with apartments, which would not generate a significant demand for libraries. Primary users of the library system are residents of the City of Long Beach. Currently the Mark Twain branch would be able to adequately serve the additional residents from the proposed project.</p> <p>Cultural facilities within the City of Long Beach are accessible within walking distance or via public transportation. The Homeland Cultural Arts Center is located at 1321 East Anaheim Street and the Long Beach Firefighter’s Museum is located at 1445 North Peterson Avenue. Other cultural facilities are accessible via public transportation.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		Source Document: 35, 36
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The Central Neighborhood around the project site consists of various land uses including commercial, residential, and public space. For example, Los Angeles Super Marketplace is located 2 blocks south of the project site, and Riverside Supermarket located 3 blocks east. Additionally, Galaxy Pharmacy is located 3 blocks to the west of the project site.</p> <p>The project is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks, and other convenience shopping. The project residents would contribute to the ongoing vitality of these types of commercial facilities.</p>
Health Care and Social Services	1	<p>The project includes an 18,136 square-foot medical clinic to help disadvantaged populations in the area. The closest hospital to the project is Dignity Health – St. Mary Medical Center and is located approximately 1 mile east of the project site at 1050 Linden Ave. Additional health facilities include Memorial Care Health System (2801 Atlantic Avenue) 2.5 miles away, and the VA Long Beach Healthcare System (5901 East 7th Street), 3.5 miles away.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>The project involves construction of a mixed use building with attached parking structure. Approximately 50 individuals are assumed to be employed in the building, and 250 individuals are assumed to live in the building. CalRecycle maintains a waste characterization list of waste generation rates. The most recent information for employee disposal rates indicates a waste generation rate of 10.5 pounds of waste per employee per day, and 12.2 pounds of waste per household per day. Based on this rate, the 50 employees would generate approximately 525 pounds of solid waste per day along with 3,050 pounds of solid waste produced by the units per day. This increase would be within the capacity of Scholl Canyon Landfill, which currently receives 1,400 tons per day, with 2,000 tons per day of capacity available. Based on the disposal capacity of landfills serving the project site, this incremental increase in solid waste generation would not affect the availability of solid waste disposal capacity.</p> <p>Source Document: 37, 38</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The project would require standard utilities for supporting the facilities that would be on site. The Los Angeles County Sanitation District, Joint Water Pollution Control Plant receives the city's wastewater. The Joint Water Pollution Control Plant provides advanced primary and partial secondary treatment for 261.1 million gallons of wastewater per day, with a permitted capacity for 400 million gallons of wastewater per day of wastewater.</p> <p>Generation rates based on the project uses is based on wastewater generation rates developed by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, the project would generate an estimated net total of 18,268 gallons of wastewater per day. The project's contribution to the wastewater capacity would be less than 0.1 percent. The increase associated with the percent of the available daily capacity would not cause the wastewater treatment limits to be exceeded.</p> <p>Source Document: 39, 40</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>According to the City of Long Beach's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the total citywide water demand for 2015 was 55,206 acre feet and would increase by 3,900 acre feet in 2040. The Urban Water Management Plan identifies water supply as adequate to meet these needs. Efforts for water conservation in California localities remain. In June 2016, the Long Beach Board of Water Commissioners declared a Stage 1 Water Supply Shortage for the City of Long Beach. This declaration put into place regulations that limit the use of water in the city including when outdoor watering can occur, and limits to use and practice for residential, business and commercial facilities. The project's incremental contribution to the future demand and new sources of water supply would not be required to meet the anticipated project water needs.</p> <p>Source Document: 41</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p>The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Long Beach Fire Department, which would provide fire protection, medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue services. The Long Beach Fire Department fire station nearest to the site is Fire Station 10, located at 1417 North Peterson Avenue, approximately 0.17 mile from the site. Police protection is provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Long Beach Police Department nearest to the project site is Long Beach Police South Division, located at</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>3800 East Willow Street, approximately 1.68 mile from the project site. Ambulance services are provided by the Long Beach Fire department, and provide services to the hospitals within the city limits. The closest hospital to the project is Dignity Health – St. Mary Medical Center, and is located approximately 1 mile east of the project site at 1050 Linden Ave. Additional health facilities include Memorial Care Health System (2801 Atlantic Avenue), 2.5 miles away, and the VA Long Beach Healthcare System (5901 East 7th Street), 3.5 miles away. Although the project would increase the number of buildings and individuals on site, it would be an incremental increase that would not require additional police presence or demand on site. As part of the project, police and fire impact fees would be required to be paid by the developer to offset the increase in population.</p>
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>The project consists of offices, apartments, and parking structures, which would not add a significant amount residents to the area and increase the demand for parks. The closest park to the project site includes MacArthur Park, which is located 0.1 mile away at 1321 East Anaheim Street. A parks and recreational facilities fee would be required to offset the increase in residential units.</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	3	<p>During construction, construction-related traffic, such as deliveries of equipment and materials and construction worker traffic, would be generated. However, construction traffic would be temporary and would not substantially interfere with the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system. The increase in users after completion of the project would be considered minimal and not cause additional stress on the local street and transportation systems. Implementation of the project would result in a dangerous intersection at Peterson Avenue-Alley and Anaheim Street, because the intersection would experience significant delays. The westbound left turn movements would eliminate the possibility of two-stage gap acceptance that is currently available for southbound left turning traffic, which would result in added delay as well as increased turn-movement conflict, resulting in reduced safety. The increase in delays for northbound left turn movements from the alley may cause drivers to make unsafe decisions under time pressure. Implementation of <b>Mitigation Measure TR-1</b>, which requires construction of a median on Anaheim Street would be required to reduce impacts from the dangerous intersection.</p> <p>Attachment 17</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>Review of the California Geological Survey map of the region indicates that sediment in the project site consists of artificial fill underlain by <i>Qom - Old shallow marine deposits on wave-cut surface, undivided (late to middle Pleistocene)</i>. These poorly consolidated marine deposits are composed mostly of fine- to coarse-grained sand and may locally carry common late Pleistocene molluscan fauna. Following Caltrans' paleontological sensitivity scale, these units are considered to have low potential to contain significant vertebrate, significant invertebrate, or significant plant fossils. Rock units designated as having low potential generally do not require monitoring and mitigation. Based on review of previous studies, the project would not impact any unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.</p> <p>The City of Long Beach Water Department would provide water service to the project site and the project would not deplete groundwater supplies. According to the <i>Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Report</i> prepared for the project, 3 groundwater wells exist within approximately 1 mile of the site, with depths to groundwater ranging from about 20 to 30 feet below the ground surface. Therefore, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge.</p> <p>Source Document: 30, 42, 43, 44, 45 and Attachment 16</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	<p>The project site is disturbed and surrounded by urban development. Database searches of California Natural Diversity Database, Information for Planning and Consultation, and the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California indicate no species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status have the potential to occur on the project site.</p> <p>Source Document: 13, 14, 15</p>
Other Factors	2	<p><u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></p> <p>In lieu of any federal guidance for assessing GHG emissions, this analysis applies the methodology of SCAQMD. The analysis is based on the <i>Anaheim Street and Walnut Avenue Development Project Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum</i> prepared for the project.</p> <p>For the purposes of determining whether or not GHG emissions from affected projects are adverse, SCAQMD specifies that</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>project emissions must include direct, indirect, and, to the extent information is available, life cycle emissions during construction and operation. Based on this direction, construction emissions were amortized over the life of the project (defined as 30 years), added to the operational emissions, and compared to the applicable GHG significance thresholds.</p> <p>The SCAQMD's interim thresholds for commercial, residential, mixed use, and industrial development projects are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Industrial projects</b> – 10,000 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) per year</li> <li>• <b>Residential, commercial, and mixed use projects</b> (including parks, warehouses, etc.) – 3,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year</li> </ul> <p>The project is a mixed use building with attached parking structure. For purposes of this analysis, both direct and indirect GHG emissions from the project are discussed in the context of the 3,000 MT threshold levels.</p> <p><u>Construction Emissions</u></p> <p>Construction of the project would result in temporary emissions associated with diesel engine combustion from mass grading, and site preparation construction equipment would be assumed to occur for engines running at the correct fuel-to-air ratios (the ratio whereby complete combustion of the diesel fuel occurs). Construction-related GHG emissions include site preparation, excavation, and associated construction of the proposed mixed use building.</p> <p>The most recent version of the CalEEMod model (Version 2016.3.2) was used to calculate the construction emissions. Construction of the proposed project would generate 534 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e. Amortized over a 30-year period, the approximate life of the project, the yearly contribution to GHG from the construction of the build alternatives with an at-grade concourse would be 16.5 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.</p> <p><u>Operational Emissions</u></p> <p>The operational GHG emission estimates were also calculated using CalEEMod. The following activities associated with the project could directly or indirectly contribute to the generation of GHG emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gas, Electricity, and Water Use:</b> Natural gas use results in the emissions of two GHGs: methane (CH<sub>4</sub>; the major</li> </ul>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>component of natural gas) and carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) from the combustion of natural gas. Electricity use can result in GHG production if the electricity is generated by combusting fossil fuel. Annual electricity emissions were estimated using the reported GHG emissions per kilowatt-hour for Southern California Edison; the supplier would provide electricity for the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Solid Waste Disposal:</b> Solid waste generated by the project could contribute to GHG emissions in a variety of ways. Landfilling and other methods of disposal use energy for transporting and managing the waste, and they produce additional GHGs to varying degrees. Landfilling, the most common waste management practice, results in the release of CH<sub>4</sub> from the anaerobic decomposition of organic materials. CH<sub>4</sub> is 21 times more potent a GHG than CO<sub>2</sub>. However, landfill CH<sub>4</sub> can also be a source of energy. In addition, many materials in landfills do not decompose fully, and the carbon that remains is sequestered in the landfill and not released into the atmosphere.</li> <li>• <b>Motor Vehicle Use:</b> Transportation associated with the project would result in GHG emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels in vehicle trips. The project would result in GHG emissions through the vehicular traffic generated.</li> <li>• <b>Combined Emissions:</b> Appendix B of the <i>Anaheim Street and Walnut Avenue Development Project Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas Technical Memorandum</i> includes the annual CalEEMod calculations for GHG emissions. Project operations would result in average annual emissions of 1,997 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year.</li> </ul> <p>The total annual GHG emissions of 1,997 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e is less than the county's screening threshold of 3,000 MT of CO<sub>2</sub>e per year. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in individual or cumulative adverse effects from GHG emissions.</p> <p>Attachment: 3a</p>

**Additional Studies Performed:**

1. HDR, Inc., Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Memorandum, May 2019
2. HDR, Inc., Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Report, January 2019
3. SCS Engineers, Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, February 2019
4. SCS Engineers, Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, March 2019
5. HDR, Inc., Noise and Vibration Technical Memorandum, May 2019
6. Translutions, Inc., Traffic Impact Analysis, May 2019

**Field Inspection** (Date and completed by):

1. January 15, 2019: SCS Engineers, site reconnaissance for Phase I ESA
2. February 13, 2019: Southwest Geophysics (subcontractor to SCS Engineers), geophysical survey for Phase II ESA
3. February 2019: Counts Unlimited (subcontractor to Translutions), traffic counts for Traffic Impact Analysis

**List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted** [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

Source List:

1. Los Angeles County. 2004. *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan*. Available at: [http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/data/pd\\_alup.pdf](http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/data/pd_alup.pdf). Accessed July 23, 2019
2. United States Fish and Wildlife. 2019. Coastal Barriers Resources System Mapper. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html>. Accessed July 17, 2019
3. Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2008. Flood Insurance Rate Map. Available at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=1500%20e%20anaheim%20st%2C%20long%20beach#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed July 18, 2019
4. Air Resources Board (ARB). 2016. *Ambient Air Quality Standards*. [www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf). Accessed July 24, 2019
5. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2016.3.2. Available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>. Accessed March 22, 2019
6. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-\(1993\)](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993))
7. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2018a. *Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants* (Green Book). Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/green-book>. Accessed July 24, 2019.
8. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2018b. General Conformity *De Minimis* Tables. Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables>. Accessed July 24, 2019.
9. Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 2000. *A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California—Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos*. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/ofr\\_2000-019.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/ofr_2000-019.pdf). Accessed July 24, 2019
10. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 2019. Coastal Zone Management Program. Available at: <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/>. Accessed July 24, 2019
11. California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2019. EnviroStor Database. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed July 24, 2019
12. California State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. Geotracker. Available at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed July 24, 2019
13. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2018. California Natural Diversity Database. Available at: <https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/data/cnddb> Accessed March 2019

14. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. *Information for Planning and Consultation*. Available at: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/> Accessed March 2019
15. California Native Plant Society. 2019. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Available at: <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org>. Accessed March 2019
16. California Environmental Protection Agency. 2019. CalEPA Regulated Site Portal. Available at: <https://siteportal.calepa.ca.gov/nsite>. Accessed July 27, 2019
17. California Department of Conservation. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed July 29, 2019
18. South Central Coastal Information Center. 2019. Record Search Results for the Walnut Residential Project. File No: 19846.5812, prepared February 1, 2019
19. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2009. HUD Noise Guidebook. Available at: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/>. Accessed July 24, 2019
20. Federal Highway Administration. 2006. FHWA Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available at: [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction\\_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf). Accessed July 24, 2019
21. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2017. Sole Source Aquifer Data. Available at: <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/national-sole-source-aquifer-gis-layer>. Accessed July 24, 2019
22. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>. Accessed July 24, 2019
23. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. 2019. *National Wild and Scenic River Systems in the U.S.* Available at: <https://www.rivers.gov/index.php>. Accessed July 24, 2019
24. California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2018. CalEnviroScreen 3.0. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data>. Accessed July 26, 2019
25. United States Census Bureau. 2000. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics. Available at: <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>. Accessed July 24, 2019
26. United States Census Bureau. 2018. Quick Facts: Long Beach city, California. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/longbeachcitycalifornia,US/PST045218>. Accessed July 24, 2019
27. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 1980. *Long Beach General Plan Program*, Local Coastal Program element. Available at: <http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/local-coastal-program>. Accessed July 27, 2019

28. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 1989. *City of Long Beach General Plan*, Land Use Element. Available at: [http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/land-use\\_part-1](http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/land-use_part-1) Accessed July 27, 2019
29. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 2018. City of Long Beach Zoning. Available at: <https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?layers=4c54ad877a704fab9add29b4bd07bbff> Accessed December 2018
30. Saucedo, George J., H. Gary Greene, Michael P. Kennedy, and Stephen P. Bezore. 2016. Geologic Map of the Long Beach 30' x 60' Quadrangle, California. Version 2.0. California Geological Survey, California Department of Conservation.
31. Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group. 2014. *Coordinated Integrated Monitoring Program for the Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group*. Available at: [https://www.lastormwater.org/wp-content/files\\_mf/dcdraftcimp2014.pdf](https://www.lastormwater.org/wp-content/files_mf/dcdraftcimp2014.pdf) (Accessed February 2019)
32. Long Beach Development Services. 2013. *Low Impact Development Best Management Practices Design Manual*, 2nd edition. Available at: <http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/orphans/lid/lid-bmp-manual---2nd-ed--final--121813> Accessed July 27, 2019
33. City of Long Beach. 2001. *Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan*. Available at: <http://www.longbeach.gov/pw/resources/stormwater-management/lb-stormwater-plan/> Accessed July 27, 2019
34. City of Long Beach. 2014. 2013-2021 Housing Element. Available at: [http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/orphans/adopted-2013-2021/adopted-housing-element\\_revised-cover-with-border-a](http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/orphans/adopted-2013-2021/adopted-housing-element_revised-cover-with-border-a). Accessed July 24, 2019
35. Long Beach Unified School District. 2019. School Finder. Available at: <http://www.lbschools.net/Schools/finder.cfm>. Accessed July 24, 2019
36. Long Beach Public Library. 2019. Library Locations. Available at: <http://longbeach.gov/library/visit/locations/>. Accessed July 24, 2019
37. California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2016. California's 2016 Per Capita Disposal Rate Estimate. Available at: <https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentral/goalmeasure/disposalrate/mostrecent> Accessed July 29, 2019
38. City of Glendale. 2014. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion*, Volume 1 of 2. March. Prepared by Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Whittier.
39. Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. 2016. Service Area. Available at: <https://www.lacsd.org/aboutus/gis/default.asp> Accessed January 2019

40. Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. N.d. Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use. Available at:  
<https://www.lacsd.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=3531> Accessed January 2019
41. City of Long Beach. 2015. City of Long Beach. *Urban Water Management Plan*. Available at: <http://www.lbwater.org/UWMP> Accessed December 2018
42. Addicott W. O. 1964. *Pleistocene Invertebrates from the Dume Terrace, Western Santa Monica Mountains, California*. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 63(3):141-150,
43. California Department of Transportation. 2017. "Paleontology." Standard Environmental Reference, Environmental Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 8. Available at:  
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/ser/vol1/sec3/physical/Ch08Paleo/chap08paleo.htm> Accessed December 2018
44. Delong, James H. 1939. *The Paleontology and Stratigraphy of the Pleistocene at Signal Hill, California*. Master's thesis, California Institute of Technology. Available at:  
<https://thesis.library.caltech.edu/5582/> Accessed July 29, 2019
45. Smith, Brooks. 2013. Paleontological Resources Assessment, California State University Long Beach Foundation Project. Prepared by LSA Associates for the City of Long Beach

**Attachments:**

1. Airport Hazards Worksheet
2. Flood Insurance Worksheet
3. Air Quality Worksheet
  - a. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Memorandum
  - b. Record of Non-Applicability for Clean Air Act Conformity
4. Coastal Zone Management Worksheet
5. Site Contamination Multi Family Worksheet
  - a. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
  - b. Phase II Environmental Site Assessment
  - c. 2006 Phase II Investigation Report
6. Endangered Species Worksheet
7. Explosive and Flammable Facilities Worksheet
8. Farmlands Protection Worksheet
9. Floodplain Management Worksheet
10. Historic Resources Worksheet
  - a. Office of Historic Preservation Concurrence Letter
11. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
  - a. Noise and Vibration Technical Memorandum
  - b. HUD DNL Calculator
12. Sole Source Aquifers Worksheet
13. Wetlands Protection Worksheet
14. Wild and Scenic River Worksheet
15. Environmental Justice Worksheet
16. Preliminary Geotechnical Report

## 17. Traffic Impact Analysis

### **List of Permits Obtained:**

The project requires the following entitlements and project approvals from the City of Long Beach:

- Zone change of three existing parcels and the northern portion of a large parcel on East Anaheim Street and one parcel on Walnut Avenue from CCP District to CCN District.
- Zone change of two existing parcels on Walnut Avenue and the southern portion of the large parcel on East Anaheim Street from R-2-N Two-family Residential to CCN.
- Site plan review of a 5-story, mixed-use building with a height of 61 feet, and attached parking structure containing 116,356 square feet of building area and 81,903 square feet of parking space area.
- Tentative Map for commercial or financing airspace subdivision (no individual residential condominiums).
- Density bonus/development standards waiver/concessions, per California Government Code §65915 and §65915.7.
- General Plan Amendment (Land Use District Map).

### **Public Outreach** [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

Public outreach meetings were held in the community on two dates. On March 27, 2019 a meeting was held at the Pacific Asian Counseling Services at 3530 Atlantic Avenue #210. The second meeting was organized in partnership with City of Long Beach Councilmember Andrew's office on May 2, 2019 at the Manazar Gamboa Community Theatre at 1323 Gundry Avenue.

### California Assembly Bill 52 Tribal Consultation

Assembly Bill 52 consultation letters were sent to five tribes based on a list provided by the NAHC. The letters were sent via both email and certified mail on November 2, 2018. On February 14, 2019, letters were sent via certified mail to eight tribes. Copies of the letters are on file with the City of Long Beach Planning Bureau. A response letter was received from Andrew Salas of the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation on February 20, 2019 and March 1, 2019. The letter requested consultation under Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. The City of Long Beach responded by email on April 3, 2019 requesting a meeting to initiate consultation. A consultation meeting was held on April 30, 2019. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation was concerned about the potential for buried tribal cultural resources in the project area, which is located between two villages. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation sent revised mitigation measures following the meeting. The City of Long Beach reviewed the proposed measures and sent revised measures on May 9, 2019. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation agreed with the proposed measures on May 22, 2019.

A Notice of Intent was published for the California Environmental Quality Act Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration on May 24, 2019. Public comments on the MND were accepted for 30 days. Additionally, the public was invited to a Planning Commission meeting on

July 18, 2019, where the Planning Commission accepted public comments on the adoption of the MND.

The public was also invited to the City Council meeting on August 13, 2019, where the City Council accepted public comments on the approval of the MND.

A notice of the availability of the EA and Finding of No Significant Impacts will be published.

### **Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

A cumulative impact is the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor, but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. Projects within the vicinity of the project that would contribute to the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment were identified.

This analysis focuses on whether the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would result in adverse effects. The project would have no adverse impacts with respect to the following issues and thus would not contribute meaningfully to any potential cumulative impacts for these issues; therefore, the following issues are not discussed further: Airport Hazards, Coastal Resources/Coastal Zone, Flood Insurance/Floodplain, Endangered Species, Explosive and Flammable Hazards, Farmlands, Sole Source Aquifers, Wetland, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Land Use Planning, Community Facilities and Services, Energy Consumption, Socioeconomics and Natural Features. With respect to Contamination and Toxic Substances, Site Hazards and Soils, impacts related to these issues are limited to the project site itself and thus are not considered cumulative in nature. Measures to reduce potential adverse effects include Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.

As identified above under *Clean Air Act*, the project would not exceed the federal *de minimis* threshold pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act or local SCAQMD for construction or operation. These thresholds are designed with development of the entire air basin in mind and thus are not cumulative in nature. As the project is below these thresholds, the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be minimal.

Within the reasonably foreseeable cumulative environment, building construction would result in temporary increases to noise levels. The project would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure NOI-1, which requires the project to comply with City Noise Ordinances. There are no planned projects within 0.25 mile to contribute to noise levels at identified sensitive receptors.

With respect to *Historic Resources*, ground disturbance for the project would occur only in areas that have already been heavily disturbed by prior development and land use activities. A review of historic aerial photographs and topographic maps show that the proposed project area has been heavily developed with commercial buildings since at least the early 1920s. The west half of the project site was occupied by a warehouse or commercial building up until 2007. The east half of the project site has been vacant since 2003. The project is not anticipated to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

With respect to *Transportation and Accessibility*, implementation of the project would result in a dangerous intersection at Peterson Avenue-Alley and Anaheim Street, because the intersection would experience significant delays. Mitigation Measure TR-1 requires installation of a median between Walnut Avenue and Gundry Avenue. There are no planned projects on this city block, and therefore, the project would not result in adverse cumulative effects.

#### **Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]**

##### Offsite Alternative:

Consideration of an off-site alternative is not warranted because there are no substantial adverse effects that would result from the project, or if potentially adverse effects were identified, mitigation has been required to reduce those potentially adverse effects. The project would involve development of a mixed-use building on the specific site being studied that is currently vacant.

##### Reduced Project:

Reducing the number of apartment units or the square footage of non-residential space would provide less affordable public housing in the area. A reduced project with fewer units and a smaller residential population would have similar environmental impacts as the proposed project but would be slightly lower in magnitude. The magnitude of impacts would not decrease to a level that would mitigation would not be required for issue areas such as air quality or site contamination.

Reducing the number of affordable housing units would not meet the purpose of need of the project, which includes objectives to accommodate a portion of the citywide demand for new housing located near transit, jobs, retail services, and cultural institutions.

##### **No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]:**

If the proposed project were not implemented, the project site would continue to be underutilized as a vacant lot and would remain a source of visual blight in the area. The No Action Alternative would result in no adverse environmental effects because there would be no construction or operational changes. However, the No Action Alternative would not support the City's objectives of creating affordable housing.

##### **Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

For Clean Air Act, Contamination and Toxic Substances, Noise Control and Abatement, and Transportation and Accessibility, the project would result in minor adverse, but mitigable, impacts. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result primarily in less than significant impacts to the environment, with beneficial socioeconomic and health care impacts.

##### **Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]**

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into

project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
Clean Air Act	<p><b>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Fugitive Dust Control</b></p> <p>During clearing, grading, earthmoving, or excavation operations, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust preventive measures using the following procedures, as specified in the SCAQMD Rule 403. All material excavated or graded shall be sufficiently watered in sufficient quantities to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes. Watering will occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day. All material transported on-site or off-site shall be securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust. These control techniques shall be indicated in project specifications.</p> <p>In addition, where feasible, the following measures will be implemented to reduce construction emissions;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize land disturbance</li> <li>• Use watering trucks to minimize dust; watering should be sufficient to confine dust plumes to the project work areas</li> <li>• Suspend grading and earth moving when wind gusts exceed 25 miles per hour unless the soil is wet enough to prevent dust plumes</li> <li>• Cover trucks when hauling dirt</li> <li>• Stabilize the surface of dirt piles if not removed immediately</li> <li>• Limit vehicular paths on unpaved surfaces and stabilize any temporary roads</li> <li>• Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities</li> <li>• Sweep paved streets at least once per day where there is evidence of dirt that has been carried on to the roadway</li> <li>• Revegetate disturbed land, including vehicular paths created during construction to avoid future off-road vehicular activities</li> <li>• Ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained</li> <li>• Minimize idling time to 5 minutes, which saves fuel and reduces emissions</li> </ul>

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an operational water truck on-site at all times and use watering trucks to minimize dust; watering should be sufficient to confine dust plumes to the project work areas</li> <li>• Utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators rather than temporary power generators</li> </ul>
Contamination and Toxic Substances	<p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Contaminated Soil</b></p> <p>The Applicant shall follow the recommendations in the Phase II ESA, including: Lead- and arsenic-bearing soil that exceeds natural background concentrations and health risk screening criteria represented by sample SCS10-1 is recommended prior to or during the proposed development by excavating and properly segregating this material, and ultimately re-using/burying this material on-Site under a clean soil cap of 3 feet, or exporting this material as a regulated waste to an appropriately licensed facility.</p> <p>Note there are cost advantages to re-using the lead- and arsenic-bearing soil on-site; however there may be disclosure requirements that may be necessary. In addition, there may be engineering controls or land use covenants that may be necessary in order to ensure appropriate disclosure and controls in the future regarding the location and depth of the soil to lenders or future occupants or operations of the Site.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure HAZ-2: Exploratory Boreholes</b></p> <p>To identify any unknown or unreported USTs or other features of concern that might be located on the project site, exploratory boreholes and/or test pits shall be conducted by a qualified environmental professional prior to construction at locations identified as having anomalies in the Phase II ESA.</p> <p>If soils exceed established thresholds, the Applicant shall consult with a qualified hazardous materials specialist to identify proper remediation of contaminated soils.</p>
Noise Abatement and Control	<p><b>Mitigation Measure NOI-1: City Noise Construction Compliance</b></p> <p>Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturdays, between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., in accordance with City standards. No construction activities shall occur outside of these hours or on federal holidays. Construction work on Sundays is</p>

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<p>prohibited unless the City of Long Beach’s Noise Control Officer issues a permit. The permit may allow work on Sundays between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m.</p> <p>The following measures shall be implemented by the contractor to reduce potential construction noise impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During all site excavation and grading, the project contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers’ standards.</li> <li>• The project contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.</li> </ul> <p>The construction contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.</p> <p><b>Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Noise Reduction</b></p> <p>Windows and doors with a Sound Transmission Class of 32 or higher shall be installed in the residential uses facing Anaheim Street.</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	<p><b>Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Geotechnical Requirements</b></p> <p>A liquefaction analysis shall be performed during final design to confirm whether or not the site is susceptible to liquefaction. If the site is found to be susceptible to liquefaction, appropriate mitigation to its effects shall be incorporated during final design.</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	<p><b>Mitigation Measure TR-1: Intersection Improvements</b></p> <p>Left-turn movements at the intersection Anaheim Street and Peterson Avenue (north of Anaheim Street) and the Alley (south of Anaheim Street) shall be restricted by installing a raised median. To prevent U-turns at the unsignalized intersection of Hoffman Avenue, the median shall be installed between Walnut Avenue and Gundry Avenue. The City of Long Beach Department of Public Works is planning to install a median on Anaheim Street east of Walnut Avenue, and it will be more cost effective if the City extends the median project to install these recommended</p>

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
	<p>improvements for this subject development. Therefore, the project Applicant shall be responsible for payment of an in-lieu fee to the City for the recommended improvements, in the amount of one hundred fifteen thousand dollars (\$115,000). However, if the City-installed Anaheim Street median project will not begin construction on the street segment between Walnut Avenue and Gundry Avenue prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the project mixed-use building, then the Applicant shall be responsible for installation of the specified median, unless an alternate solution is reached to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works and Director of Development Services (including but not limited to posting of bonds by the applicant and temporary traffic movement restrictions) that maintains the turning movement restrictions specified by this mitigation measure until such time as the median is installed by the City.</p>

**Determination:**

**Finding of No Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

**Finding of Significant Impact** [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]

The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.



Preparer Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 9/9/19

Name/Title/Organization: Jenny Vick, Senior Environmental Planner, HDR Engineering, Inc.

Certifying Officer Signature:  \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 9/9/19

Name/Title: Christopher Koontz, Planning Bureau Manager

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

*This page is intentionally blank.*