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Guide to the Document

The Plan that follows is organized into the following chapters:

Chapter 1: Project & Process
Chapter One provides an introduction to the project, a description of the Plan area, a discussion of community livability as a concept and its specific application in the I-710 corridor in Long Beach, and a summary of the project process and components.

Chapter 2: Existing Conditions
Chapter Two summarizes the existing conditions within the Plan area, including land use, mobility options, transit and traffic. This chapter also includes summaries of the key existing state, regional, subregional and City planning efforts related to the corridor with the potential to impact community livability.

Chapter 3: Cultural Needs Assessment
Chapter Three summarizes the Corridor Plan area demographics. In addition to describing "who" the corridor is, it also describes "what" the needs and priorities are of corridor residents, with regard to livability issues, by category of issue, as expressed to the project team in the outreach conducted as part of this planning process.

Chapter 4: The Community Livability Plan
The Plan chapter includes a compilation of community assets identified in the corridor area, as well as a set of recommendations relating to livability improvements that should be made corridor wide, and those that apply specifically to corridor neighborhoods. The regional context for livability issues is also touched on in this chapter. Finally, the Plan includes 15 Livability Plan design concepts developed to illustrate livability improvements that may be made in specific locations in neighborhoods throughout the corridor.

Appendix
The Appendix, in a separate volume, incorporates the project schedule, Working Group meeting notes, comments from the Councilmember interviews, comments from the first round of community outreach presentations, a general list of comments as well as a categorized list residents made at the four Neighborhood Design Workshops, and a list of comments made at the three Design Review Meetings.
All Roads Lead Home
Committing to develop and implement a Community Livability Plan for the I-710 corridor neighborhoods in the City of Long Beach is a natural outgrowth of a single crucial realization: neighborhoods within the I-710 corridor bear a disproportionate share of the negative impacts resulting from the operation of the I-710 Freeway and the Ports. Further, they receive few of the benefits derived from the $3 billion in goods that arrive through the two Ports and are transported through their neighborhoods. This Plan seeks to bring a better balance between residents’ exposure to environmental and health hazards, and the benefits and investments they want and need in order to maintain a healthy environment in which to live, learn, work and play. The I-710 corridor is part of a network of pathways for goods arriving from international markets and distributed to the rest of the United States. This corridor includes some of the most heavily used freeways, roadways and railways that are a part of the nation’s goods movement system. Yet we cannot lose sight of the fact that in this more than 16 square mile area of our City, all roads lead home. This corridor is home to over 190,000 of our City’s residents – nearly 40% of our total population. Nineteen of our parks and recreation areas are here. Twenty four of our City’s schools are in this corridor. The Los Angeles River corridor is a prominent feature here as well, with its linkages to the rest of the Los Angeles basin upstream for water, wildlife, and recreation. It will be critical to maximize the quality of life benefits to corridor neighborhoods from the developing network of RiverLink parks and greenbelts. We must be mindful that this corridor is a place for people – a place where people want a high quality of life and a healthy, prosperous and livable future. This is a future that the residents who call this corridor home deserve.
Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

In 2006 the City of Long Beach received a Caltrans Environmental Justice Planning Grant to develop a Community Livability Plan, an initiative to address quality of life issues for City neighborhoods that are affected by the I-710 freeway. A variety of public agencies, including the Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the South Coast Air Quality Management District and the Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services, have documented the impacts the I-710 has had on individuals who live adjacent to this active goods movement corridor. These impacts—including traffic, noise, emissions, air quality, as well as associated public health implications—are of considerable concern to the community and its leadership. The City therefore conceived of this project to identify and prioritize the community’s collective vision for livability improvements that can and should be made in I-710 corridor neighborhoods.

With a focus on community involvement as a foundation for this effort, the City developed two primary goals for the Community Livability Plan:

- To work with the I-710 corridor neighborhoods to identify and develop plans to address the impacts they are experiencing from the operation of the I-710 freeway, and
- To develop a series of action strategies and design solutions to improve the physical environment for residents in those neighborhoods

PLAN AREA

The planning area for the Community Livability Plan is a 16.88 square mile zone that incorporates all public and private parcels and public rights of way located roughly within one mile of the I-710. The boundaries of the planning area are roughly Atlantic Avenue to the east, the Pacific Ocean to the south, and the City boundary line to the west and to the north. All or portions of twenty-nine different City neighborhoods fall within the Community Livability Plan planning area, as shown in Figure 1-1. Notable landmarks include the Los Angeles River, the Metro Blue Line, the western end of downtown Long Beach, the Port of Long Beach, and the 405, 91 and I-710 freeways. Figure 1-2 shows the City of Long Beach vicinity.
HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The City of Long Beach Department of Public Works initiated the Community Livability Plan as an initial response to the outcomes of the I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS) and the I-710 Locally Preferred Strategy (LPS). During the planning process for the MCS, extensive community outreach efforts enabled residents to explore and voice specific areas of concern in their communities. In these meetings, the community overwhelmingly emphasized their two primary issues were health and air quality, as well as concerns with noise, safety, congestion and the expansion of the Port.

Because of the community concerns that emerged from the outreach process for the MCS, the City decided to develop a plan that would build on the results from the community workshops, in order to address quality of life issues that can make impacted Long Beach neighborhoods more livable. The Department of Public Works sought and successfully obtained a Caltrans Environmental Justice Planning Grant, to develop the plan. The project was initiated in February of 2007, and was completed by January of 2008.

It is important to note the Community Livability Plan is not a part of the I-710 MCS or the LPS for the I-710 Major Improvements Project. Current planning efforts related to the I-710 have been summarized and evaluated, and every effort was made to understand the overall impact that these plans and their affiliated objectives and policies could potentially have on neighborhoods within the Community Livability Plan area. However, the ultimate focus was directed to understanding the current strengths, weaknesses and priorities for change that are unique to every neighborhood that is located adjacent to the I-710, and the findings within this planning effort will be forwarded for consideration in the development of the EIR/EIS for the I-710 Corridor.

APPROACH

The approach to this project was to identify the most important community assets that help build and maintain healthy neighborhoods, and to then use these assets as a framework for neighborhood design and planning. The team worked with community residents to understand their most important neighborhood issues and concerns, and correlated those issues with existing and proposed City projects and plans. This information was then used as a foundation for identifying possible future improvement projects and recommendations which can be implemented in the short-medium- and long-term future.
DEFINING COMMUNITY LIVABILITY

A community can be perceived as livable based on the quality of its environment, social interactions, and its economy. Elements that affect livability, or quality of life, health and well-being in Long Beach neighborhoods include:

- Public safety and health (physical security, presence of environmental contaminants)
- Physical elements (supportive land uses, open space, connections, comfort)
- Environmental elements (noise, air quality, water quality)
- Social elements (community networks, organizations, services, pride)
- Cultural and environmental resources (historic, trees, architectural)
- Economic elements (financial stability, jobs, prosperity)

A variety of benefits result from highly livable communities. These benefits include healthier people, less crime, a more aesthetically pleasing, functional and comfortable built environment, potential increase in property values and business activity, and strong community ties and social bonds among neighbors.

Community Livability at Multiple Scales

The team identified a range of community livability components that affect the quality of life in the neighborhoods adjacent to the I-710 and that are tied to the health and well-being of their residents. Some community livability elements are more regional in scope and scale, and have an impact over a very wide area. Others are more local in scale and scope, and impact people within a relatively small geographic area.

The diagram shown in Figure 1-3 illustrates the breadth and complexity of the issues encompassed in community livability planning in this particular southern California corridor. The outer rings of the circle represent issues that are very broad, even global in scope, impacting the entire planning area and beyond. Moving toward the center of the circle, the next ring impacts at the scale of several neighborhoods, a slightly smaller area than the outer rings. And at the center of the diagram, neighborhood design itself has the most localized impact.

This planning effort has focused on neighborhood design. At the local and neighborhood scales, the Community Livability Plan can make the most immediate impact on Long Beach neighborhoods. Efforts throughout this planning process focused on creating community design strategies that improve quality of life and livability at the local scale, such as improving open space and the environment, the local transportation system and public safety. Those issues that are more regional in scope have also been detailed and mapped in Chapter Four which focuses on corridor-wide issues.
The Livability Plan process is comprised of four major project tasks, which commenced in January of 2007 and concluded thirteen months later in February of 2008. These four projects tasks and their major components are shown in Figure 1-4 and summarized below.

**Task One** was an information gathering and outreach phase that provided a foundation for the development of the Livability Plan. First, the project team collected and analyzed a variety of existing information—including GIS data, related planning documents, and other public documents—in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of the range of economic, cultural and environmental issues that were considered in the development of this plan. Second, the project team formed a Working Group made up of staff members from City departments and City Council offices, as well as representatives from other public agencies. The Working Group provided an advisory role to the project team throughout the entire planning process. Finally, the project team met with community groups and City Council offices in order to introduce the plan and obtain input. The information gathered in the task to develop a summary of existing conditions, in Chapter Two of this document.

**Task Two** was a community outreach and assessment phase focused on understanding the major concerns and future opportunities for change that community residents envision for I-710 corridor neighborhoods. The project team organized and then conducted four Neighborhood Design Workshops throughout the corridor in order to solicit input regarding major neighborhood design issues. The Cultural Needs Assessment was developed using input from community and Working Group advising process. This included an analysis of community design and cultural needs, and ultimately used in the development of the Cultural Needs Assessment, in Chapter Three of this document.

**Task Three** was a plan development phase in which a series of proposed corridor and neighborhood improvements was created. Using information from the existing conditions and cultural needs assessment as a guide, the project team came up with proposed projects at the corridor and neighborhood scales, and a set of site scale conceptual plans. These projects were then presented to the community at three separate Design Review Meetings. The proposed corridor and neighborhood recommendations, as well as a series of conceptual plans, were ultimately adopted as the Livability Plan recommendations summarized in Chapter Four.

**Task Four** was a plan development phase that involved compiling and organizing information into a unified plan. After the final Livability Plan was developed, the project team presented it to the Working Group, the I-710 Council Oversight Committee, and the City Council.
PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH

One of the City’s purposes in developing this plan was to work with the corridor neighborhoods to identify and develop plans to address the impacts that community members experience from the operation of the I-710 freeway. Because the goal of the plan was to identify community assets in different neighborhoods, and to then build on those assets, the project team sought to maximize the level of community and stakeholder involvement in the planning process.

A variety of measures were implemented to maximize stakeholder involvement in this planning process. These measures included Working Group meetings, Community Stakeholder Presentations, Council District Presentations, Neighborhood Design Workshops, and Design Review Meetings.

Working Group Meetings

In order to ensure all relevant and interested City departments’ expertise and resources were brought to the table in this planning process, a working group comprised of key members of a wide range of City departments was formed. The working group met regularly throughout the planning process to share project-related news and information, review working documents, and plan future events.

Project team members included representatives of Public Works, Planning, Parks, Recreation and Marine, Redevelopment, the Harbor Department, the Police Department, Neighborhood Services, Health and Human Services, Long Beach Unified School District and staff members from Council Districts One, Seven, Eight and Nine. The project team also included representatives from other public agencies, including Long Beach Transit, Metro and the Gateway Cities Council of Governments.

The project Working Group met seven times throughout the course of this process. In addition, working group members participated in project activities such as a project site tour and the Neighborhood Design Workshops.

Community Stakeholder Presentations

During the first phase of this project, in the spring and summer of 2007, the project team made nearly thirty presentations to active community groups that operate within the Plan area, as shown in Figure 1-5. The project team used these presentations to introduce the Community Livability Plan to the community, take initial comments about livability issues, and invite participation in future workshops. These presentations also gave the project team an opportunity to differentiate the plan from the I-710 Major Improvements Project and EIR, from Port of Long Beach and Los Angeles plans and projects, and from the City’s Long Beach 2030 Plan.

During the community outreach presentations, the project team also had an opportunity to record some of the preliminary concerns that residents have about the...
I-710 Freeway and their neighborhoods. Some of the issues residents spoke about during these meetings included better pedestrian and bicycle connections to the LA River, a need to improve public safety particularly in the River corridor, improving the aesthetic throughout the Corridor and particularly along freeway corridors, making neighborhoods and RiverLink projects greener by planting trees, and establishing safe paths of travel across the freeway bridges.

**Council District Presentations**

In addition to the Community Stakeholder Presentations, in March of 2007 members of the project team made brief introductory presentations to Council Members Bonnie Lowenthal, Tonia Reyes Uranga, Val Lerch, and staff members of Rae Gabelich. The purpose of these presentations was to introduce the project to the Council and to broaden awareness of the project while discussing opportunities for Council Member involvement. Council Members were invited to ask questions and make comments during these initial sessions. Some of the issues mentioned included concerns about freeway on-ramps and off-ramps, the need to connect communities together, problems with truck noise on the I-710 and big rig parking in residential neighborhoods, the importance of planting trees along the freeway corridor and greening roadway corridors, and problems with having to cross the freeway to get to schools and parks.

Council districts within the Plan area are shown in Figure 1-6.
Site Tour

At the beginning of June, 2007, a site tour of the planning area was organized for working group members. The purpose of the site tour was to provide team members with a direct opportunity to observe, discuss and share their knowledge of existing conditions within the study area. A map of the site tour route is shown in Figure 1-7.

Working Group members tour the LA River near the Wrigley Greenbelt (top) and tour the Cerritos Bridge pedestrian undercrossing (bottom).
Neighborhood Design Workshops

After concluding the Community Stakeholder and Council District presentations, the project team organized four public Neighborhood Design Workshops, which took place in August of 2007. A total of 203 Long Beach residents attended these workshops.

During each workshop, the project team worked with the community to understand stakeholders’ most important issues and concerns, as well as major strengths in corridor neighborhoods. Participants in the workshops had an opportunity to propose community enhancements, as well as to participate in a larger dialogue focused on how to improve the entire I-710 corridor.

In the first half of each workshop, the team described current conditions and facilities in the corridor neighborhoods, including schools, parks, green corridors, the river corridor, streets, bridges and freeway edges. During the second half of each workshop, residents worked in small groups to first identify their most important community livability concerns, and to then discuss the major strengths and changes they desire for specific neighborhoods within the planning area. Information generated in the Neighborhood Design Workshops was used to develop the Cultural Needs Assessment, which is discussed in Chapter Two.

Design Review Meetings

In November and December of 2007 the project team met with the public again to review the conceptual maps, plans and designs that were developed after the Neighborhood Design Workshops, as well as to discuss the methodology that was used in translating the information from the workshops into a set of proposed plans and projects. Three meetings were held at different locations within the planning area and were attended by 80 residents. Residents who attended these meetings had an opportunity to review the proposed maps and plans, and to then provide their feedback on comment cards. The information generated in these meetings was used to revise and edit the proposed community livability improvements maps.
Chapter Two

EXISTING PROJECTS AND CONDITIONS

The team documented existing projects and conditions within the Community Livability Plan area using a variety of different strategies. These included review of City General Plan documents, other planning documents, conversation with project team members, and analysis of City GIS data. Using information from these sources, a variety of existing conditions maps were developed and disseminated to project team members. These maps include the following:

General Plan Land Use

The City’s General Plan land use designations, shown in Figure 2-1, date back to 1989, and are in the process of being updated as part of the Long Beach 2030 Plan process. The land use makeup within the Community Livability Plan area ranges from single-family residential neighborhoods to downtown mixed-use environments. The downtown area is generally a high-density mixed-use zone, with pockets of industrial land near the port. To the north of downtown, the Plan area is generally characterized by large tracts of single-family residential with schools and open space embedded in the neighborhoods and commercial uses along major corridors.

Existing Land Uses

Existing land uses within the Community Livability Plan area, shown in Figure 2-2, are predominantly single-family residential in the northern, central and western portions of the plan. Within these areas there are also linear tracts of retail and commercial uses along major corridors, such as Long Beach Boulevard. In the southern area of the plan, near downtown and the port, predominant land uses include light and heavy industry, multiple-family housing, and general office. Within the entire Plan area there are a variety of educational and public uses, including parks and recreational facilities.
FIGURE 2-1: GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP

FIGURE 2-2: EXISTING LAND USE MAP

LEGEND
- Single Family Residential
- Multi-Family Residential
- Mobile Homes & Trailer Parks
- Mixed Residential
- General Office Use
- Retail Stores & Other Commercial
- Educational & Public Facilities
- Light Industrial
- Heavy Industrial
- Extraction
- Wholesaling & Warehousing
- Transportation & Utilities
- Mixed Commercial & Industrial
- Under Construction (2001)
- Golf Courses
- Parks & Recreation
- Cemeteries
- Wildlife Preserves & Sanctuaries
- Beach
- Agriculture/Nurseries
- Vacant Land
- Water

SOURCE: CITY OF LONG BEACH GIS DATA
Mobility Options

Alternative transit opportunities within the Community Livability Plan area include the Metro Blue Line, bus routes, and bikeways, and are shown in Figure 2-3, Existing and Proposed Mobility Options.

The Blue Line extends north-south along the Long Beach Boulevard corridor in its southern most stretch. Seven different Metro stations serve local neighborhoods within the planning area. The Community Livability Plan area is served by bus as well. Major bus routes run on nearly all of the major arterials. These routes help increase the overall level of accessibility and connectivity within the Community Livability Plan area. The routes are also an important factor in increasing opportunities for intermodal access, particular with regard to the relationship between bus and rail service.

In addition to light rail and bus transit, the City is creating additional opportunities for bicycle transit. The Community Livability Plan area has a Class I bikeway that extends along the Los Angeles River, as well as Class II and III bikeways. Through the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, new bikeways are being targeted for several major arterials, including Magnolia Avenue, Wardlow Road, Willow Street, and several others.

Transit Ridership

As shown in Figure 2-4, Transit Ridership, boarding statistics within the Plan area reflect a high overall level of transit ridership, particularly along major north-south corridors such as Atlantic Avenue, Long Beach Boulevard, Pacific Avenue, Magnolia Avenue, Easy Street and Santa Fe Avenue. At many bus stops along these corridors, ridership is between 300-900 weekday boardings, which is the highest category for ridership established by Long Beach Transit.

In addition to local bus lines, Metro rail service along the Blue Line also demonstrates a high level of ridership within the study area. All of the individual Blue Line Stations have average weekday boardings between 300-900 transit users.

Traffic Flow

Traffic volumes within the Community Livability Plan area are measured by average daily traffic flow. The number of vehicles is broken down into 5,000 vehicle increments, with zero being the lower limit and 55,000 being the upper limit. As observed in Figure 2-5, Average Daily Traffic Flow, traffic volumes are greatest at several major arterials within the study area, including Ocean Boulevard, Pacific Coast Highway, Willow Street and Anaheim Street.
PLANNING CONTEXT

Key regional and local planning efforts that have the potential to positively impact livability in the corridor neighborhoods in Long Beach are summarized below. Specific projects identified in these planning efforts have been incorporated into the mapping and design work included in this livability plan.

I-710 Major Corridor Study and Locally Preferred Strategy

The I-710 Major Corridor Study (MCS) is a multi-agency regional study initiated in 2001 to analyze the traffic congestion, safety, and mobility problems along the I-710 travel corridor and to develop transportation solutions to address these problems. Due to the demands of residents throughout the corridor, efforts were also made to identify some of the quality of life concerns experienced in the I-710 Corridor. Throughout the development of the MCS, Metro worked with the individual cities that front the I-710 freeway to develop a Locally Preferred Strategy for the I-710 freeway expansion. The Locally Preferred Strategy was developed through an extensive community outreach process managed by the I-710 Oversight Policy Committee, which was made up of elected officials and agency representatives from fourteen cities and the County of Los Angeles.

Long Beach, which contains the first eight of the total 18 miles of the I-710 Freeway, handled the development of the Locally Preferred Strategy a little differently. After initial plans from the corridor study recommended taking hundreds of homes in Long Beach for freeway expansion, the Long Beach City Council, chaired by councilmembers Tonia Reyes Uranga, Bonnie Lowenthal, and Val Lerch, appointed its own I-710 Oversight Committee to address the significant policy issues that the City of Long Beach faces regarding the improvements to the I-710 Freeway. The City hired its own engineering firm and outreach firm to develop its own Locally Preferred Strategy for Long Beach. This Committee, composed of council members whose districts include the I-710 Freeway, began working with residents and businesses along the I-710 Corridor to develop a solution for improving the I-710 Freeway that serves both the traveling public and the residents and businesses that are most impacted by the I-710 Freeway.

At its initial meeting, the Committee and the City Council approved a number of actions, including a set of Guiding Principles, which ultimately provided a framework for the development of a Locally Preferred Strategy for the eight mile portion of the I-710 freeway that extends through the City. After hosting several community meetings, it became clear that the design of freeway improvements was just a part of a larger set of concerns residents have concerning the corridor. In 2003 the Committee therefore adopted the recommendation to hold four Community Roundtable Workshops, which took place in 2004. Each of these workshops addressed the four key community concerns that emerged from the first set of community meetings:

1. Loss of Property and Neighborhood Impacts
2. Health, Environment and Noise
3. Truck Congestion, Safety and Impacts

4. Port Issues

All four workshops were moderated by a local resident, with participation from community leaders and experts from various agencies, including the California Air Resources Board, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, Caltrans, Gateway Cities Council of Governments, the Army Corp of Engineers, and the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority. Each workshop generated a list of recommendations for the Long Beach I-710 Oversight Committee to consider as part of the planning process. The recommendations were considered by all of the community in attendance, and only those issues that received a consensus vote were included on the list to be brought forward to this committee.

In addition to the Roundtable Workshops, the Committee continued to hold community meetings to seek community input on the development of design concepts for the I-710. The intent in developing these design concepts was to provide guidance to the engineering consultant hired by the City in the development of the Long Beach Locally Preferred Strategy. A series of six design concepts were approved by the Committee in 2004.

The overarching policy of the Oversight Committee has been that any physical improvements to the I-710 Freeway must also address the key issues and concerns that have been raised by the Long Beach community, and should also incorporate a systems approach that includes:

- Port diesel emission improvements
- Truck diesel emission improvements
- Enhanced Alameda Corridor
- On-dock rail
- Local street improvements
- Traffic signal enhancements
- Improved transit
- Fees to offset local impacts

On March 18, 2004, a draft Locally Preferred Strategy for Long Beach was presented to the I-710 Committee and released for comment. The Locally Preferred Strategy was developed using the systems approach that addressed the issues and concerns of local residents as a condition of any physical improvements to the I-710 Freeway. Numerous comments were received regarding the physical improvements proposed in the draft plan, which has subsequently been revised, as well as continuing concerns expressed regarding air quality, the impacts from Port operations and safety.

The Long Beach Locally Preferred Strategy was ultimately approved by the City Council I-710 Oversight Committee on June 16, 2004 and by the City Council on June 22, 2004. It was then forwarded to the regional I-710 Oversight Policy Committee and its subcommittees for incorporation into the Locally Preferred Strategy for the full 18-mile I-710 Freeway Corridor. On June 22, 2006 the MTA Board adopted the I-710 Major Corridor Study and authorized the CEO to proceed with the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS and execute funding agreements with the various funding partners.

In 2007, a consultant team was hired to complete the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS. The results of this community Livability Plan will inform the EIR/EIS of the needs and priorities of Long Beach neighborhoods.

Port of Long Beach Green Port Policy

In 2005 the Port of Long Beach adopted a comprehensive set of guidelines for improving air, water and soil quality, protecting wildlife habitat, and enhancing the quality of life for the neighborhoods that surround the port. This set of guidelines, collectively titled the Green Port Policy, outline an environmental protection and sustainability ethic that the Port is currently working to incorporate into all of its existing operations.

The Green Port Policy could help usher in a new era of environmental stewardship for the port. Because of the proximity of the port to many Long Beach districts and neighborhoods, the policy could potentially have a broad influence on the overall quality of life for individuals who live in port-impacted areas.

San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan

In order to effectively integrate common goals for air quality in the South Coast Air Basin, the staff of the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) and the Port of Long Beach (POLB) developed the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan. The first of its kind in the United States, this joint Clean Air Action Plan describes various measures that the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach will take toward reducing emissions related to port operations. The Plan also links the emissions reduction efforts of the two largest ports in the United States with similar efforts and goals established by the regulatory agencies in charge of ensuring compliance with air quality standards.

The Plan proposes hundreds of millions of dollars in investment by the ports, the local air district, the state, and port-related industry. Measures to be implemented under the Plan will reduce smog forming nitrogen oxide (NOx) by more than 45%, sulfur oxide (SOx) by at least 52% and particulate matter (PM) by at least 47% within the next five years. In addition, the ports propose to eliminate all “dirty” diesel trucks from San Pedro Bay cargo terminals within five years by helping to secure the financing for a new generation of clean or retrofitted vehicles. Under the plan, NOx from all port operations would be reduced by 12,000 tons a year, SOx by 8,900 tons a year, and diesel PM from by 1,200 tons a year.

This joint Clean Air Action Plan is one of several significant steps being taken to improve air quality in the South Bay region. If the ports are able to successfully implement the plan, it could potentially have an important role in improving air quality within the neighborhoods that are part of the Community Livability Plan.

For more information:

Port of Long Beach Green Port Policy
http://www.polb.com/environment/green_port_policy.asp

San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan
http://www.cleanairactionplan.org
Gateway Cities Council of Governments

Clean Air Action Plan

The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCCOG) was assigned with the task of preparing an Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) to address the issue of improving the air quality along the I-710 Corridor. This Plan is being prepared as part of the GCCCOG Air Quality Action Program, which was created to provide financial incentives to help reduce air pollution in Southern California. The purpose of the Air Quality Action Plan is to address the following community concerns and requests:

- Develop a corridor level work plan to improve air quality.
- Implement corridor level work plan to improve air quality.
- Develop alternative fuels/electrification and/or hydrogen policies and programs to reduce diesel emissions.
- Pursue opportunities for incremental improvements.
- Implement corridor level work plan to improve air quality.

The Gateway Cities COG has completed the Air Quality Action Plan Phase 1, which involved engaging major stakeholders from corridor cities, the environmental community, and air quality regulatory agencies to secure ideas, concerns, comments and directions for the AQAP.

Because of its overall emphasis on air quality along the I-710 corridor, the Air Quality Action Plan is an important document for this planning effort. The information developed in the AQAP could therefore help guide projects and strategies that are ultimately implemented by the Community Livability Plan.

South Coast Air Quality Management Plan

The Air Quality Management Plan is a regional and multi-agency effort of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) Governing Board, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Every three years the AQMD prepares an overall plan for air quality improvements within the south coast region. Each new version of the Plan is an update of the previous plan. The final 2007 Air Quality Management Plan was adopted by the AQMD Governing Board on June 1, 2007.

Every action plan released by the AQMD is an effort to meet air pollution standards and reduce public health risks from air pollution. The 2007 update contains aggressive measures to achieve federal clean air standards in the South Coast Region, one of only two regions in the state out of compliance with federal standards. The 2007 Plan shows that emissions of smog-forming nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds will have to be cut beyond the requirements in existing programs by an additional 50% by 2020 to meet these standards.

Goods Movement Action Plan

The Goods Movement Action Plan, an initiative of the state Business, Transportation and Housing Agency and CARB, addresses the economic and environmental issues associated with moving goods through the state’s highways, railways and ports. The Plan was developed to promote economic growth, encourage the creation of new high-paying jobs, and address the environmental challenges of the goods movement industry. The Plan was developed in two phases. Phase I focused on the “why” and the “what” of goods movement in California. Phase II employed a stakeholder-driven process to identify the “how,” “when,” and “who” aspects to deal with these wide-ranging issues related to goods movement.

The Plan includes approximately two-hundred possible projects covering infrastructure, public health and environmental impact mitigation, community impact mitigation, homeland security, public safety and workforce training. It recommends investments in congestion relief, infrastructure expansion, air quality improvements and increased security at the ports. Implementation of the Plan will help California have a more “green,” efficient, and safe goods movement system.

A variety of goods movement-related issues within the Community Livability Plan affect the corridor area as a result of vehicles coming in and out of the San Pedro Bay ports via the I-710 and on rail via the Alameda Corridor. The Goods Movement Action Plan can therefore play an important role in improving the interface between freight operations and Long Beach neighborhoods.

The Impact Project

The Impact Project is a collaboration of community and university partners dedicated to reducing the impacts of trade, ports and goods movement activities on health and community life. The collaborative uses science-based information to inform public policy decision-making, and ultimately encourages the development of healthy solutions for communities that are impacted by ports, rail yards, intermodal facilities, distribution centers, trucking routes and other goods movement expansion activities.

One of the primary goals of The Impact Project is to ensure that the reduction of health, environmental and community impacts becomes central to the transportation and goods movement planning and policy process. The collaborative also works toward shifting the debate about ports and freight movement so that impacted communities have a stronger voice in the arena of public policy. The collaborative uses science and policy work of its academic partners to strengthen those voices.

In November of 2007 The Impact Project organized the Moving Forward Conference, which brought together a wide range of people who are impacted by or work in the realm of ports and goods movement issues. The conference provided an opportunity to learn about current health research related to air pollution and ports/ goods movement, as well as to hear from communities about their specific health-related concerns and efforts. Conference participants had an opportunity to work together to develop strategies for preventing and reducing those health impacts. More
This planning effort restarts a General Plan update that began in 2004. During the update process, the City organized a series of meetings around land use policy for the City’s separate neighborhoods, each of which was divided into five community cluster areas. The purpose of these meetings was to gather input from community representatives related to the assets and issues present in their neighborhood, as well as to discuss what they would like to have changed in specific community clusters. The comments from these meetings were shown graphically on maps of each community cluster area. A series of three maps were created for each community cluster, including Problems/Issues, Assets, and Areas for Future Development.

The community cluster process maps are a good resource for the Community Livability Plan because they sought citizen comment on the assets, needs and opportunities within specific areas of Long Beach. The cluster maps that are part of this plan’s study area have been evaluated and included as an appendix to this document.

Los Angeles River Master Plan

In 1991 the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors directed the Departments of Public Works, Parks and Recreation, and Regional Planning to develop the Los Angeles River Master Plan. The Plan was completed and adopted by the Board in 1996. An Advisory Committee of 50 members representing federal, state, city, and local agencies, and environmental and community groups steward the Plan. The committee meets on a regular basis, and members are given the opportunity to review proposed projects.

The overall purpose of the Plan is to advocate for environmental enhancement of the river, increased recreational opportunities, and economic development. Projects that are part of planning efforts include pocket parks, landscaping enhancements, Earth Day events, the Adopt-a-Riverbank Program, and other community and environmental projects that have been reviewed, supported, and monitored by the Advisory Committee.

A section of the Plan refers to the portion of the LA River that lies within Long Beach city limits. In this section of the Plan there are a variety of recommended actions that can be taken to restore the LA River based on the goals of the Master Plan, such as:

- Creation of a greenway from Queensway Bay to Deforest Park
- Connecting Coolidge Park to the river via Artesia Boulevard
- Developing restoration, educational and interpretive sites at Dominguez Gap and schools

LA River Revitalization Master Plan

In 2007 the City of Los Angeles adopted a master plan that will guide the revitalization of the Los Angeles River. The Plan has been spearheaded by the Los Angeles City Council Ad Hoc Committee on the Los Angeles River, which was formed in 2002 to encourage community involvement in river improvements and to help coordinate river improvements projects within the City. This committee is made up of several LA City Council Members.
The River Revitalization Master Plan is the result of an eighteen month planning pro-
cess that looked at improvements that could be made along the river to strengthen resi-
dential neighborhoods, protect wildlife, promote the health of the river, and leverage economic development. The Plan outlines a vision and framework for the management of the Los Angeles River that will guide its development for the next twenty years. Although the portion of the LA River that flows through Long Beach is not part of the Revitalization Master Plan, this is an important effort for the City. Decisions regarding the health of the river upstream will have an effect on the river further downstream within the City of Long Beach. Furthermore, the Plan is an important example of how local municipalities can provide important leadership and steward-
ship of this important natural resource.

Long Beach RiverLink

The RiverLink project was developed by landscape architecture students at Cal Poly Pomona, in partnership with the City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Rec-
reation and Marine and the San Pedro Bay Estuary Project, in 2003. The primary

goals of the project are to establish a continuous greenway of parks and natural habi-
tats along the eastern bank of the LA River, while establishing linkages between the greenway and adjacent neighborhoods.

One of the cornerstones of the RiverLink concept is its designation of a system of

Gateways, Pathways, Connections, and Destinations to direct visitors to and from the Los Angeles River. These opportunities have been identified and proposed as a

series of distinct opportunity sites. They include the Golden Shore Wetlands, the

Drake Greenbelt, Magnolia Yards, the Wrigley Greenbelt, Wrigley Heights Park, the

Dominguez Gap Wetlands, the DeForest Wetlands, and Deforest Park.

The importance of RiverLink to the Community Livability Plan lies in the fact that every one of its proposed open space enhancement sites lies within the boundary of the plan. This creates an excellent opportunity to establish linkages between the Los Angeles River and the new RiverLink open spaces with neighborhood-based projects and initiatives that are part of this planning effort.

The County of Los Angeles recently awarded the City of Long Beach $5 million to finance components of the RiverLink vision. The money will be spent on four differ-

ent projects, including the Wrigley Greenbelt, development of the DeForest wet-

lands, Baker Mini-Park, and the Drake Greenbelt. These projects will add new green space while connecting residential neighborhoods to the Los Angeles River.

Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan

This Plan was developed in 2000 by the Public Works Department in partner-

ship with a Technical Advisory Committee made up of staff members from various

City departments and other public agencies. The goals of the Plan include making bicycling safer, more convenient and more enjoyable for all types of bicyclists, and encouraging more people to use bicycles as a means of reducing traffic congestion, air pollution and noise pollution. The Plan was developed with an overall goal of in-
creasing bicycle use by 5% by the year 2020. The completed Plan is an implementation component of the Transportation Element of the General Plan. It has a comprehensive scope and authority required to coordi-

nate and guide the provisions of all bicycle-related plans, programs and projects.

Recommended improvements to the Long Beach bikeway system focus on connect-
ing existing segments of bike lanes, addressing routes used by bicyclists, and analyz-
ing specific opportunities and constraints within the City. Notable recommenda-
tions that pertain to the Community Livability Plan include a series of proposed improve-
ments to access spots along the existing LA River Class I bikeway, a proposed Class II bikeway along Pacific Avenue, and a proposed Class III bikeway along Santa Fe Avenue. These recommendations will be incorporated in the update of the Long Beach Bicycle Master Plan that is currently underway as a part of Long Beach 2030.

Long Beach Parks, Open Space and Recreation Element

The most recent update to the City’s Open Space and Recreation Element was com-
pleted in 2002 and reprinted in 2005. The updated Open Space and Recreation Element includes four topical areas required to be covered by Open Space Elements: open space for the preservation of natural resources, open space for the managed production of resources, open space for public health and safety, and open space for outdoor recreation. The new element emphasizes policy and implementation mea-

sures that are directed at addressing the community’s primary open space and recre-

ation issues.

One of the important components of the element is that it addresses the issues of

existing open space within the City and acknowledges that the current level of open space has not kept pace with the growth of the City. In 1973 the level of recreation-
al open space was estimated to be 2,500 acres, or 7.0 acres per 1,000 population. In 2001 there was an estimated 2,600 acres of recreational open space. Because of population growth, this amounts to 5.6 acres per 1,000 residents. Thus, there is pro-
gressively less recreational open space available to citizens of Long Beach. Of equal concern is the reality that open space within the City is not distributed evenly. Most of the recreational open space is located on the eastern and coastal areas of the City, while most of the population growth has occurred in the central, western and north-

ern sections.

A potentially important component of the Community Livability Plan is its abil-
ity to propose new open space, or linkages to existing or planned open spaces, in the western and northern sections of the city where it is most needed.

BIKEWAY DEFINITIONS

Class I bikeways, such as a bike path, provide a completely separated right-of-

way designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflows by motorists minimized.

Class II bikeways, such as a bike lane, provide a restricted right-of-way desig-
nated for the exclusive or semi-exclusive use of bicycles with through travel by motor vehicles or pedestrians prohibited, but with vehicle parking and crossflows by pedestrians and motorists permitted.

Class III bikeways, such as a bike route, provide a right-of-way designated by

signs or permanent markings and shared with pedestrians or motorists.

Source: Streets and Highway Code of the State of California, Section 890.4.
The SCAQMD recently released MATES III, a report on air quality measurements taken over a two year period at ten fixed and five mobile monitoring stations, including the station in Bixby Knolls. The air quality measurements taken from the Bixby Knolls station, as well as a second station located in Wilmington, found that residents’ cancer risk from exposure to toxic air pollutants is lower than at other air quality monitoring sites, but still reflects an increased risk for cancer due to exposure to toxic air pollutants. The MATES III study also found that diesel exhaust makes an 84% contribution to this increase in cancer risk.

**Air Quality and Noise Health Risk Assessment**

The Long Beach City Council directed the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to conduct a comprehensive assessment in order to determine the extent to which Long Beach residents experience adverse health effects from environmental pollution. As an initial step in this process, the DHHS commissioned a study that evaluated whether or not there is sufficient information that directly links air quality conditions to increased health impacts, and then determined if this information could be used to relate current conditions within the city to a potential increase in health impacts. The results of the study were incorporated into a Baseline Health Risk Assessment (HRA).

A major component of the HRA was air quality monitoring. DHHS identified monitored data as the most direct method of evaluating exposure and baseline risk. Within Long Beach, the only air quality monitoring station that measures ambient air quality for regulatory purposes is located in Bixby Knolls approximately one mile east of the I-710 and one half mile north of the 405. This monitoring station is operated by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD), and is used to collect air quality data for their ongoing Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study (MATES). Because this air quality monitoring station represents the most comprehensive data available in the city, the HRA relied heavily on data from MATES II, the second iteration of this study.

Because of the reliance on only one air quality monitoring station within the city, several important conclusions were made. First, it was acknowledged that sufficient measured data was lacking to provide a definitive health risk for the entire city. Only one single data source to define relative cancer risks within the City is not sufficient to determine overall risk because of the high degree of variability of air toxic emissions that occur. Furthermore, much of the available information used in the study was based on theoretical estimations or analyses that either aren’t supported by empirical data or cannot be used as a statistical means to assess health effects within the city.

**North Long Beach Strategic Guide for Redevelopment**

The Long Beach Strategic Guide for Redevelopment provides a strategic framework that the City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency can use to make decisions about redevelopment opportunities within the North Long Beach Redevelopment Area, shown in Figure 2-7. One of the most important aspects of the guide is that it identifies strategies for the overall revitalization and redevelopment of the North Long Beach Project Area. These strategies suggest changes in land use, specific development projects, regulatory controls, and public services, all of which can be used as revitalization tools for the North Long Beach Project Area.

The strategies outlined in the guide serve as an important reference for the Community Livability Plan because they help provide an overall framework. Projects proposed in the North Long Beach project area that area part of the Community Livability Plan should ultimately conform to the strategies outlined in the Strategic Guide.

**North Long Beach Street Enhancement Master Plan**

The Long Beach Street Enhancement Master Plan serves as a guide that the Public Works Department and the Redevelopment Agency follow in making improvements to the public rights-of-way in the North Long Beach Redevelopment Agency Project Area. The Plan was written to complement the North Long Beach Strategic Guide for Redevelopment, and was developed in cooperation with the Strategic Guide Steering Committee. The primary intent of the Street Enhancement Plan is to address the following:

- Infrastructure improvements, (pavement construction/restructuring and storm drains)
- Streetscape improvements (street trees, medians, traffic calming and pedestrian amenities)

A Three Year Specific Action Plan that set forth paving improvement to streets and alleys was incorporated into the Master Plan, and is now complete. The Redevelopment Agency is working on paving additional streets, and will soon complete median planting projects on Del Amo, Atlantic and Atresia.
Due to its emphasis on enhancements to the public corridors in North Long Beach, the Street Enhancement Plan is an important reference for the Community Livability Plan regarding improvements that are proposed in North Long Beach neighborhoods. Like the Central Strategic Guide, projects proposed in this planning effort should ultimately conform to the guidelines presented in the Street Enhancement Plan.

**Central Long Beach Strategic Guide for Development**

Like its North Long Beach counterpart, the Central Long Beach Strategic Guide for Development is a planning tool that provides a strategic framework used to make decisions about redevelopment opportunities in Central Long Beach, shown in Figure 2-7. The City of Long Beach Redevelopment Agency uses the guide to facilitate the transformation of specific Central Long Beach corridors and neighborhoods.

Projects proposed in the Central Long Beach project area that are part of the Community Livability Plan should ultimately conform to the strategies outlined in the Strategic Guide.

**Community-Oriented Public Safety (COPS)**

Community-Oriented Public Safety is a program coordinated by the Police Department that promotes partnerships between the community and city departments to solve neighborhood problems and improve the quality of life. The Police Department collaborates with the City Prosecutor’s Office, individual Council District offices, the Commercial Services Bureau, the Fire Department, and the Department of Health and Human Services, to focus resources on chronic problem locations in each of the four patrol divisions. To date, community partnerships have been developed with participants from Community Code Enforcement, Neighborhood Watch, and business and neighborhood associations.
Project IMPACT

Project IMPACT is a community-based law enforcement program organized and managed by the Long Beach City Prosecutor’s Office. The program was created through a two-year Federal grant focused on reducing problems with gangs, drugs and other quality of life crimes that afflict one of the most troubled areas of Long Beach. The City Prosecutor’s Office created Project IMPACT to work with the police, code enforcement officers and local residents to better identify potential problem areas and to target criminal activity. The project has successfully helped reduce street-level nuisance crimes and rehabilitate blighted properties that attract drugs and other criminal activities.

The project was recently expanded to include the entire city, and a deputy city prosecutor has been assigned to work in each police substation. This expansion is helping the City respond to the specific resident concerns throughout the entire city.

Locations of Project IMPACT Neighborhood Organization Participants are shown in Figure 2-8.
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Chapter Three

CULTURAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Different neighborhoods within the Livability Plan area have different needs. These needs are influenced by the neighborhoods’ assets as well as their socioeconomic characteristics. In order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the unique issues, concerns and character of neighborhoods along the I-710 corridor in Long Beach, the project team developed a Cultural Needs Assessment.

The Cultural Needs Assessment has two sections. The first section is a comparative analysis of the demographic characteristics of the Plan area with those of the City of Long Beach as a whole. The second section is a summary of the major issues, concerns and opportunities for change within the Plan area. In both of these areas, the project team first looked at a more general set of demographic characteristics and community issues within the entire Plan area. Then the project team conducted a more detailed analysis of the demographic characteristics within four different corridor subareas, which are shown in Figure 3-1.

FIGURE 3-1: CORRIDOR SUBAREAS
COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN for the I-710 CORRIDOR NEIGHBORHOODS    >    LONG BEACH CALIFORNIA

CORRIDOR DEMOGRAPHICS

According to the 2000 census, the population of the entire city of Long Beach is 461,522 and the City has a total area of 52.3 square miles. The population of 194,900 within the Plan area represents nearly 40% of the city’s total population. The Plan area is 16.88 square miles, or 32% of the total land area of the City.

The planning area differs from the rest of the city in its ethnic makeup. For example, of the roughly 165,200 individuals (35.8%) of Hispanic descent who live in Long Beach, roughly 92,000, or 55.7% of these individuals live within the Plan area. The Hispanic population within the Plan area comprises 47.2% of the total ethnic makeup along the corridor, significantly higher than the City as a whole.

While the Hispanic population with the Plan area is high, the white population is much lower than the entire city. Of the roughly 152,700 of white individuals who live in the City of Long Beach, 31,400, or 20.6% live within the Plan area. White individuals comprise 16.1% of the total ethnic makeup along the corridor, though they make up 33% of the total City population.

The African American population makes up 14.8% of the City and 19.2% of the Plan area. The Asian population is nearly equal. The Asian population within the City is 12%, and 12.5% within the Plan area. There is a similar consistency between the remaining ethnic groups within the corridor and in the City as a whole, as shown in Tables 3-1 through 3-4.

Corridor Subareas

The project team tracked Neighborhood Design Workshop attendees by their place of residence within the corridor and created a graphic record of the overall meeting attendance for each of the four workshops, shown in Figure 3-2. Workshop attendees’ place of residence most often was in relatively close proximity to the location of the workshop they chose to attend. The project team used the attendance clusters to guide the development of the four Corridor subareas, and then clustered the comments generated in each of those subareas as well.
North Corridor

The Neighborhood Design Workshop for the North Corridor Subarea took place at Jordan High School in August of 2007. The boundaries of this Subarea are the City limit to the north, the Los Angeles River to the west, the Livability Plan area boundary to the east, and the Union Pacific railroad line to the south. The subarea incorporates all or portions of twelve different Long Beach neighborhoods, including Adams, Sutter, Dairy, Lindbergh, DeForest Park, Jordan, Hamilton, Artesia, Freeway Circle, College Square, Coolidge Triangle and Longwood.

The population in the North Corridor makes up 14% of the entire population of the City of Long Beach, and 33.3% of the Livability Plan area. The average median household income for the North Corridor is $35,900, which is similar to the median income of $37,270 for the entire City of Long Beach. The average median age is 27 years old, which is slightly younger than the City’s median age of 30.8.

Table 3-1 is a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the City of Long Beach, the Livability Plan area and the North Corridor subarea. The most notable differences within the North Corridor are with the Hispanic and white populations. Roughly 49% of the population within the North Corridor is Hispanic, which is much higher than the entire City (35.8%) and similar to the Plan area (47.2%). While 33.1% of the entire City is white, within the North Corridor only 14.1% of the population is white.

There are fewer differences in the North Corridor for the remaining ethnic groups. The African American population is 22.5% within the North Corridor but falls to 19.2% within the Plan area and 14.5% for the entire City. Similarly, the Asian population is lower within the North Corridor than within the Plan area and the entire City.

Central Corridor

The Neighborhood Design Workshop for the Central Corridor took place at Los Cerritos Elementary School in August of 2007. The boundaries of the Central Corridor are the Union Pacific railroad corridor to the north, Willow Street to the south, the Los Angeles River to the west, and Atlantic Avenue to the east. The subarea incorporates all or portions of six different Long Beach neighborhoods, including Bixby Knolls, Los Cerritos, California Heights, Wrigley Heights, North Wrigley, and Memorial Heights.

The population in the Central Corridor makes up roughly 11.6% of the entire population of the City of Long Beach, and 27.4% of the Livability Plan area. The average median household income for the Central Corridor is $45,370, which is higher than the median income of $37,270 for the entire City of Long Beach. The average median age is 33.3 years old, which is slightly older than the City’s median age of 30.8.

Table 3-2 is a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the City of Long Beach, the Livability Plan area and the Central Corridor subarea. Of the four different subareas, the Central Corridor is most similar to the Plan area and the City as a whole. The most notable differences within the corridor are with the Hispanic and African American populations. The Hispanic population within the Central Corridor is 37.3%, which is significantly lower than the population within the Plan area (47.2%), yet similar to the entire City (35.8%). The African American population in the Central Corridor is 19.7%, which is only slightly higher than the Plan area (19.2%) and higher than the City (14.5%).
South Corridor

The Neighborhood Design Workshop for the South Corridor took place at Chavez Park Community Center in August of 2007. The boundaries of the South Corridor subarea are Willow Street to the north, the Pacific Ocean to the south, the Los Angeles River to the west, and Atlantic Ave to the east. The subarea incorporates all or portions of six different Long Beach neighborhoods, including West Village, East Village, St. Mary’s, South Wrigley, Washington School, and the Central Area of Long Beach north of downtown.

The population in the South Corridor makes up roughly 10.5% of the entire population of the City of Long Beach, and 24.9% of the Livability Plan area. The average median household income for the South Corridor is $22,281, which is significantly lower than the median income of $37,270 for the entire City of Long Beach. The average median age is 29.9 years old, similar to the City’s median age of 30.8.

Table 3-3 is a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the City of Long Beach, the Livability Plan area and the South Corridor subarea. The South Corridor shows a high degree of variation between the City of Long Beach and the Plan area, particularly with regard to the Hispanic population, which makes up 58.5% of the population within the South Corridor. Of the roughly 92,000 individuals of Hispanic descent who live within the Livability Plan area, roughly 28,300 (30.8%) live within the South Corridor.

While the Hispanic population within the South Corridor is very high, the Asian population is very low compared to the City and the Livability Plan area. Of the roughly 152,700 people of Caucasian descent who live in West Long Beach, only 2,100 of these individuals, or 1.4%, live in West Long Beach. The West Corridor stands out from the other corridor subareas in its substantial Asian population. While 11.9% of the population in the entire City is Asian, within the West Corridor the Asian population climbs to 25.5%. Of the roughly 55,900 individuals of Asian descent who live in Long Beach, roughly 12.8% live in the West Corridor.

West Corridor

The Neighborhood Design Workshop for the West Corridor subarea took place at Cabrillo High School in August of 2007. The boundaries of the West Corridor include the City boundary to the north and to the west, the I-710 freeway to the east, and the Port of Long Beach to the south. The subarea includes four different Long Beach neighborhoods, including West Side, Lower West Side, Upper West Side and Arlington.

The population in the West Corridor makes up roughly 6.1% of the entire population of the City of Long Beach, and 14.4% of the Livability Plan area. The average median household income for the West Corridor is $38,162, which is similar to the median income of $37,270 for the entire City of Long Beach. The average median age is 30.5 years old, which is almost exactly the City’s median age of 30.8.

Table 3-4 is a comparison of the demographic characteristics of the City of Long Beach, the Livability Plan area and the West Corridor subarea. The West Corridor differs from the City and the Plan area in several ways. The most notable difference is the small white population that lives in West Long Beach. Of the roughly 152,700 people of Caucasian descent who live in Long Beach, only 2,100 of these individuals, or 1.4%, live in West Long Beach. The West Corridor stands out from the other corridor subareas in its substantial Asian population. While 11.9% of the population in the entire City is Asian, within the West Corridor the Asian population climbs to 25.5%. Of the roughly 55,900 individuals of Asian descent who live in Long Beach, roughly 12.8% live in the West Corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-3: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS - SOUTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RACE/ETHNICITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian &amp; Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL POPULATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-4: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS - WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RACE/ETHNICITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Black | 14.5% | 19.2% | 18.%
| Hispanic | 35.8% | 47.2% | 42.5% |
| Asian | 11.9% | 12.5% | 25.5% |
| American Indian & Alaska Native | 0.8% | 0.4% | 0.42% |
| Native Hawaiian & Pacific Islander | 1.2% | 1.8% | 3.0% |
| Other | 0.6% | 0.2% | 0.18% |
| Two or more races | 2.6% | 2.8% |
| TOTAL POPULATION | 461,522 | 195,167 | 28,153 |
CORRIDOR WIDE SUMMARY: Livability Concerns, Neighborhood Strengths and Desired Changes

In each of the four Neighborhood Design Workshops, participants formed small groups and answered the following three questions:

1. What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?
2. What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?
3. What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

Participants in each small group first identified and recorded their overall livability concerns in their neighborhoods and corridor as a whole. Each participant also prioritized his or her top three livability concerns, so that an overall sense of priority could be determined among the concerns. Participants then identified and recorded neighborhood strengths and desired changes on a map of the Plan area. The goal of this exercise was to connect the specific neighborhood strengths and changes to physical locations within the study area.

In completing these exercises, residents generated hundreds of comments. The project team then organized and grouped residents comments into thirteen different categories, as shown in Table 3-5, Resident Comment Categories. Table 3-6 summarizes the categories of workshop responses about overall livability concerns that were prioritized as “top three issues” by participants in the workshops. The highest volume of comments was recorded in the corridor as a whole related to 1-710 concerns, including air quality and noise. Other often cited areas of concern include pedestrian and bicycle improvements that need to be made along the corridor, a range of public safety issues, and concerns related to the quality of trees and streetscapes. Participants’ identified neighborhood strengths and desires for change were also grouped into the same categories.

Table 3-7, summarizes the workshop responses relating to major identified strengths along the corridor. The volume of comments was highest relating to existing neighborhoods, including local services, facilities and amenities – 57 comments were made relating to this issue. Other strengths that were listed – 27 comments in all - related to existing parks, greenbelts and open spaces. 13 comments were made relating to the strengths of social networks of people, groups and organizations, followed by 12 comments about the strength in existing neighborhoods’ trees and streetscapes.

Table 3-8, summarizes the workshop responses relating to desired changes in the corridor. Interestingly, residents also indicated that the most significant opportunities for change are with the quality of the neighborhoods, including their services, facilities, and amenities. 73 comments were made relating to this category. Participants made 48 comments relating to changes to the quality and/or availability of parks, greenbelts, and open spaces, as well as 37 comments relating to constructing and enhancing pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and 28 comments addressing changes relating to trees and streetscapes. While it was not in the top five categories of change identified by participants, 24 comments were made about changes relating to the 710 freeway.

An assessment of overall priorities in the corridor can play an important role in future planning efforts, as City staff and policy makers seek to develop future plans and projects that are responsive to residents concerns and expectations. A complete list of community comments from the Neighborhood Design Workshops, organized by workshop, category, and question, is included in the Appendix to this document. Ultimately, these comments have informed the selection of individual projects included on the Neighborhood Improvements map included in Chapter Four.
In addition to categorizing and ranking residents' comments about corridor livability concerns, as well as neighborhood strengths and desired changes, for the corridor as a whole, the community priorities for change within the corridor subareas identified in Figure 3.1, were also compiled. In the sections below, and in Tables 3-9 through 3-12, residents' comments relating to priorities for change within the subareas are discussed and summarized by category. The categories of comments, and the number of comments made relating to each category, in each subarea, are summarized on the tables. Categories which received the most comments to those that received the least comments are shown in descending order on the tables. Although these desired changes were organized in a hierarchy, and categories which received the most comments during the workshops are identified, it is important to acknowledge that all of the categories were an important part of the assessment of community input that led to developing the Plan recommendations. Each of these categories and the comments associated with them informed the team in identifying a comprehensive range of neighborhood improvement projects and conceptual designs for the entire Plan area.

The I-710's impact on community livability was clearly recognized by participants in the Neighborhood Design Workshops. As noted above it was the top overall livability concern indicated by participants in the corridor as a whole. However, when the discussion with workshop participants turned specifically to residents' desired changes in the neighborhoods, they were encouraged to focus on improvements that could be made locally in the short term, and with or without the freeway and its impacts. Therefore, it is interesting to note that when looking at the comments relating to changes, the 710 category still ranked in the top five in two of the four workshops. For example, six comments relating to the 710 were made by south workshop participants, two thirds as many comments as in the north workshop. In the north, 11 comments were also made about changes desired in connection with the 710.
North Corridor Priorities

Table 3-9 identifies the categories of changes into which comments made by the participants in the Jordan High School workshop were organized. Most comments were made (21) in this workshop about potential changes within north Long Beach neighborhoods, including changes to services, programs, and facilities themselves, as well as neighborhood amenities. The fewest comments were made (2) about changes relating to people, groups and organizations. Comments which fell into the “uncategorized” category related to improving businesses and homes along Lime Street, and improving access to downtown Long Beach.

The North Corridor workshop was attended primarily by residents of North Long Beach, including many residents who are part of the Coolidge Triangle Neighborhood Association, the DeForest Neighborhood Association, and other community groups. Participants made many comments about the lack of services and amenities in north Long Beach, and cited the need for supermarkets, more recreational facilities and programs, better restaurants, and more retail stores. Residents also spoke about the maintenance of parks and recreation facilities in the community, as well as addressed the need for events and programs for youth, and better access to the LA River.

Central Corridor Priorities

Table 3-10, identifies the categories of changes into which comments made by the participants in the Los Cerritos Elementary School workshop were organized. Interestingly, as in the north corridor, the most comments were made, 21 as well, in this workshop about potential changes within central corridor Long Beach neighborhoods, including changes to services, programs, and facilities themselves, as well as neighborhood amenities. The fewest comments were made (2) about changes relating to streets and alleys. Comments which fell into the “uncategorized” category related to using better construction materials and improving water quality in the harbor.

The Central Corridor workshop was attended predominantly by residents of the Los Cerritos area. Many comments about the need for new services and retail stores reflect the fact that Los Cerritos is predominantly a single-family residential neighborhood, with evolving arterial commercial corridors. There were also many comments about the need for new recreational programs for kids. Los Cerritos Park is a passive park recreational facility that does not incorporate ball fields, courts or organized playgrounds. Finally, due to the close proximity of Los Cerritos to the LA River, there were a number of comments about improvements to enhance river access and safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-9: NORTH CORRIDOR CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods, Services, Facilities and Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Alleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Freeway: Air Quality, Health and Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA River Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, Groups and Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-10: CENTRAL CORRIDOR CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods, Services, Facilities and Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA River Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Freeway: Air Quality, Health and Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Alleys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
South Corridor Priorities

Table 3-11 identifies the categories of changes into which comments made by the participants in the Cesar Chavez Recreation Center workshop were organized. At this workshop, attendance was much lower than at others, and the most comments were made, in all, about potential changes relating to Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements. The fewest comments were made (2) about changes relating to trees and streetscapes. In all, comments focused more narrowly on pedestrian issues, as well as parks, greenbelts and open spaces for children, LA River Improvements, and the 710 Freeway. Comments which fell into the “uncategorized” category related to augmenting school services and improving the City’s rent control policy.

The Cesar Chavez Elementary School Mothers Brigade was strongly represented at the South Corridor workshop. This group was focused on the safety of children who cross Third Street, as well as the 710 on-ramp, in order to get to Chavez Elementary School and nearby Chavez Park. This group was interested in improved crosswalks, the possible construction of a pedestrian bridge, and other changes that will improve the safety for kids who walk across busy intersections and frequently participate in the recreational programs at Chavez Park. Residents of this part of the corridor are directly impacted by 710 freeway on ramps and off ramps. Freeway noise and air quality impacts, as well as direct traffic roadway interfaces are on their minds. Further, participants expressed concerns about harbor area odors and their impacts. Finally, these participants expressed awareness that they live in close proximity to the LA River, but unable to easily access it, and afraid of the homeless population within the river corridor.

West Corridor Priorities

Table 3-12 identifies the categories of changes into which comments made by the participants in the Cabrillo High School workshop were organized. At this workshop, in concert with the North and Central corridor residents, most comments were made, in all, about potential changes within west corridor Long Beach neighborhoods, including changes to services, programs, and facilities themselves, as well as additional neighborhood amenities (specifically banking institutions.) 16 comments were made about changes relating to Trees and Streetscapes, another major focus of the workshop attendees. The fewest comments were made (2) about changes relating to people, groups and organizations. Comments which fell into the “uncategorized” category related to public school regulations and City planning efforts.

The West Corridor workshop was attended by residents of West Long Beach, including members of the West Long Beach Neighborhood Association. Individuals who live in West Long Beach were primarily concerned with a general lack of amenities and services in the community, particularly supermarkets, banks, and a cultural center. They also commented on the need to improve safety for pedestrians, particularly on existing freeway and river overpasses. Residents of Wrigley Heights who are members of the Wrigley Neighborhood Association, also attended this workshop. These residents focused on the tree planting activities underway in the Wrigley area, and commented about the air quality and noise impacts from the I-710 freeway, and the importance of greening the neighborhood by planting new trees that will improve the environment.

TABLE 3-11: SOUTH CORRIDOR CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th># OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA River Improvements</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Freeway: Air Quality, Health and Noise</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods, Services, Facilities and Amenities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Goods Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Alleys</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscapes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3-12: WEST CORRIDOR CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th># OF COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods, Services, Facilities and Amenities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscapes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710 Freeway: Air Quality, Health and Noise</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA River Improvements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets and Alleys</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Goods Movement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Parking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, Groups and Organizations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Four

WHAT IS THE COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN’S MISSION?

Preparing a Community Livability Plan for the entire eight mile stretch of I-710 corridor in Long Beach is a significant undertaking, addressing over 29 individual neighborhoods, parts of four City Redevelopment Project Areas, parts of multiple City Council Districts, major freeway and river corridors, and all of the other key components so critical to neighborhoods. The mission for this work has multiple dimensions, and responds to issues from the global to local, in the same way that the livability issues impacting the corridor are broad ranging, from the global economy and goods movement systems to the design of local corridor neighborhood streets, schools, parks, trails and bikeways.

Acknowledging this complex reality, the project team tackled the following tasks in developing the Community Livability Plan:

• Educate the community about the larger outside issues affecting livability inside the corridor neighborhoods.
• Provide information about initiatives already underway, regionally, and beyond, to address the global issues impacting livability inside the City’s corridor neighborhoods.
• Make recommendations about corridor-wide improvements which can be tied to the I-710 Major Improvements project, and its EIR. Set the bar high for the I-710 project and suggest components of those projects that must be considered, in order to mitigate project impacts on the corridor neighborhoods, and to enhance connectivity within the corridor – for more than just goods movement.
• Make recommendations about improvements that can be made on the ground in corridor neighborhoods, in order to improve livability and quality of life there, with or without the I-710 major improvements project.
• Make any and all recommendations, while being aware of the work already underway and planned in these neighborhoods, by City departments and agencies, and facilities and services in these neighborhoods that are already assets in them, and that support a high quality of life.

In order to respond to this mission, and each of these tasks, the team has prepared, and includes on the following pages: a community assets map; a summary of the plans and initiatives already responding to larger livability issues affecting the corridor neighborhoods, but outside the scope of the neighborhoods; a map and recommendations addressing corridor-wide issues; and a map, recommendations, and a series of conceptual designs addressing neighborhood issues.

COMMUNITY ASSETS

Various City departments and bureaus, including Public Works, Redevelopment, Neighborhood Services, and Parks, Recreation and Marine are stewards of a significant number of existing plans and initiatives within the corridor area. One of the first tasks in this project was to compile important projects and initiatives, facilities and strategy areas in a single corridor Community Assets Map, which is shown in Figure 4-1. This map has served as an important reference for the planning work of this project, provided context for the comments made by the community, and served as a jumping off point for our process.

Compiling a single map of significant facilities (parks, schools, libraries, social service centers), projects (RiverLink, streetscape, pedestrian and gateway improvements, open space connectors, neighborhood centers, neighborhood improvement strategy areas) helped the team to understand where improvements have already been made, or are planned. In reviewing and discussing this asset mapping, individual City departments, often understandably focused on their own separate responsibilities, gained a broader perspective of the City initiated activity – already contemplated or underway. Ideas about linkages between projects have then been a focus of the corridor wide and neighborhood recommendations. Further, this mapping has served as a reminder that the corridor neighborhoods are not a clean slate, that they are evolving now. Livability Plan initiatives should neither reinvent the wheel, nor duplicate existing activity, but complement and add to the City’s livability agenda. Finally, the mapping is an educational tool for community residents, shedding light on the City’s plans, actions and strategies already in place, and providing a solid foundation for the additional recommendations for action in this Plan.
REGIONAL POLICY FRAMEWORK

In addition to the activities and actions of the City and local agencies, regional state and even national entities’ actions and initiatives also have an impact on the I-710 corridor neighborhoods’ livability. The Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) published the first step toward an Air Quality Action Plan for the I-710 corridor in June of 2007. The following brief summary of broader regional policies impacting air quality in the I-710 corridor neighborhoods has largely been drawn from the information compiled and included in the GCCOG’s report, which describes the state, regional and subregional activities related to air quality and goods movement.

The Ports

Clearly, the I-710 Freeway and Ports and the associated goods movement systems, contribute significantly to air quality, health, traffic, noise and aesthetic impacts to the I-710 corridor neighborhoods. The Port of Long Beach, together with the Port of Los Angeles to the west of it, are the two busiest container seaports in the United States, and together are the fifth busiest in the world. The components of the goods movement systems in the port, including ships, marine and harbor equipment and vehicles, trains, trucks and land-side equipment that are powered by diesel fuels, all contribute to the air pollution impacting the residents of the I-710 corridor neighborhoods. Air pollutants at the ports include nitrogen oxides (NOx), which contribute to smog, and particulate matter (PM), which poses health risks. These pollutants exacerbate air quality impacts in this region, only one of two regions in the State of California not attaining air quality standards.

In response to this port-related air quality concern, new policy and action plans have been adopted by both Ports, and are in the process of being implemented. These actions include the Port of Long Beach Green Port Policy, the Port of Los Angeles Clean Air Program, and the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan, all of which are described in Chapter Two of this document. Changes that will result from the implementation of these policies and plans include: in-Port greening and equipment conversion to cleaner fuel sources and/or electric power, ship cold ironing (the ability for ships to plug in to electric power while in port, instead of burning diesel fuel), shipping/marine equipment conversions to cleaner fuel sources, and conversions to cleaner burning trucks.

The Rail Systems

Rail related air quality improvements measures being implemented in the Ports include upgrading locomotives and trains to the cleanest burning systems, as well as additional emphasis on developing on-dock rail facilities, which get goods directly from ships to rail without moving goods by trucks between the two modes of transportation. Further, advanced technologies are being considered and explored for goods movement, such as high speed magnetic levitation rail systems which use electric power. In fact, the Locally Preferred Strategy for the I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS mandates that advanced and alternative technologies are considered in the design of the improved facilities for both trucks and cargo, in addition to mandating that any improvement project to the freeway also improves air quality in the corridor.

Harbor Area Refineries

During this plan public outreach process, corridor neighborhood residents have commented on the noxious odors emanating from refineries in the Harbor area, which impact their quality of life. While refineries do pollute, they are tightly regulated, and their air quality impacts are substantially less than shipping, port and trucking impacts stemming from burning diesel fuel and resultant particulate matter air pollution. At this time there is little local, coordinated action to more closely monitor the operation of local refineries, accidental air releases from them, and their specific impacts on community livability. Should Long Beach consider this a priority going forward, the focus of action should likely be on the accidental release issue, instead of pollution stemming from their normal operation.

Subregional Air Quality Initiatives

At a subregional level, the Gateway Cities Council of Governments (GCCOG) Clean Air Program is also ongoing, and complements the work the Ports are doing directly. This program has been underway since 2002, and includes funding for trucking fleet modernization, and adding emission reduction devices to port trucks. Further, the GCCOG Air Quality Action Plan itself is intended to determine and quantify the existing air quality and public health setting for the subregion, determine the effectiveness of planned near-term air quality improvements, analyze and determine possible new air quality improvements or strategies for the subregion, develop a plan to implement and measure air quality improvements for the region, and work with Regional, State and Federal Agencies, industry stakeholders, local communities to develop consensus.

State Air Quality Initiatives

At the State level, the Governor’s office has spearheaded the California Goods Movement Action Plan, prepared by CARB and the Business, Housing and Transportation Department. This Plan is the first in the state to address goods movement as both an economic engine for the state, as well as an impact on the state’s environment. The Plan both identifies goods movement system improvements for the state to improve the flow of cargo and to mitigate air quality impacts.

CARB has also been implementing the Diesel Risk Reduction Plan since 2000. However, importantly, CARB has now introduced specific emissions standards and low sulfur fuel requirements as part of an Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Port of Long Beach Environmental Programs
http://www.polb.com/environment/default.asp

GCCOG Air Quality Action Plan
http://www.gatewaycog.org/gateway.html

California Goods Movement Action Plan
http://www.arb.ca.gov/gmp/gmp.htm

Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and Goods Movement in California
http://www.arb.ca.gov/planning/gmerp/gmerp.htm
**CORRIDOR-WIDE IMPROVEMENTS**

The City of Long Beach initiated this Community Livability Plan in part because of the many community concerns that emerged from the City’s outreach process for the I-710 Major Corridor Study. In order to follow through on, and continue the process of, community engagement around the I-710 corridor issues that began to emerge during the major corridor study, this planning process and its outreach component have been completed. The City recognizes that the community outreach around these issues to date has revealed significant community concerns about the scope, form and impacts of any I-710 corridor improvements project to come. The set of corridor wide recommendations to follow in this section have been catalogued in order to provide input that is intended to influence the I-710 Major Improvements Project EIR/EIS, which was initiated early in 2008, and the mitigation measures that must be completed as part of the project. Corridor-wide recommendations are listed in Table 4-1.

A number of categories of potential corridor-wide improvements have been identified and mapped in Figure 4-2. These categories of improvements are defined, described and in some cases conceptually illustrated below.

**Freeway Noise/Air Impact Zone**

Areas closest to the I-710 corridor, within a roughly 200 meter (650 ft.) distance from it, are most impacted by emissions and traffic noise from the corridor. Mitigation measures should respond to the needs of individuals who live, work and go to school within this impact zone. Measures which may be implemented within this zone include providing indoor air filtration devices, a program which is already being test-piloted at Hudson Elementary School in west Long Beach. This program could apply in some form to public facilities such as schools and other community facilities, as well as to private residences and businesses. Providing incentive or assistance programs to install double-pane windows in schools as well as in private residences and businesses could also mitigate noise and air quality impacts in this zone. Finally, soundwalls must be implemented as part of any I-710 improvements project in order to reduce the noise impacts of the freeway on adjacent residences, schools and other public gathering places. Public art on soundwalls facing the neighborhoods should also be included, along with greening, to enhance the view of such buffers.

**Hill Street Pedestrian Bridge**

Hill Street is home to several public schools and parks, as well as residential neighborhoods. It is bisected by the I-710 and the LA River corridor, and terminates at the Terminal Island Freeway. City plans have already identified Hill Street as an open space connector from east to west through the corridor area. In order to facilitate this east-west connection, a pedestrian and bicycle only bridge should be considered for construction at this location as part of the I-710 major improvements project. While other locations within the City may be appropriate for separated pedestrian and bicycle crossings of the I-710 and LA River, this opportunity stands out, given the right of way width existing on Hill Street, the opportunity it presents as a major linkage to several public schools on the east and west sides of the corridor, and the benefits of providing an alternative to pedestrian and bicycle traffic on both Pacific Coast Highway and Willow Street.

**GOODS MOVEMENT IN CALIFORNIA**

Goods Movement in California, introduced in 2005 and 2006. The goals of the Plan are to:

- Reduce emissions to 2001 levels by 2010;
- Continue reducing emissions until attainment of applicable standards is achieved;
- Reduce diesel-related health risks 85% by 2020; and,
- Ensure sufficient localized risk reduction in each affected community.
I-710 Bridge and Overpass Improvements

Several I-710 bridges have been identified as “early action items” of the I-710 Major Corridor Study. These include the Shoemaker Bridge replacement, which is in design at this time. As bridge and overpass improvements and replacements are designed, and bridges are presumably widened, multiple modes of travel and transportation on them should be fairly considered, in order to facilitate residents’ travel from one side of the freeway and river to the other. Accessibility and safety for pedestrians and bicyclists must be a priority, with provision made for separated bike lanes, pedestrian lighting, wider and ADA compliant safe sidewalks and ramps, signage and possibly even public art elements.

RiverLink Open Spaces

The City of Long Beach is currently spearheading and securing funding for development of the RiverLink, a proposed system of open spaces, gateways and open space connectors that will strengthen the physical connections between the Los Angeles River and surrounding corridor neighborhoods and commercial and industrial districts. The RiverLink system is a vital part of the Los Angeles River corridor, and must be supported and enhanced by the I-710 Major Improvements Project. Future I-710 construction projects should be designed to avoid existing and future RiverLink plans and projects as well as avoid compromising access to and public enjoyment of the River itself at interchanges and other potential points of conflict.

LARIO Trail

The Class I bike path, known as the LARIO trail, under the jurisdiction of Los Angeles County, runs adjacent to the Los Angeles River from the terminus of the Rio Hondo near Lynwood, through Long Beach, to the Pacific ocean. Although the bike path is constructed, suggestions have been made, in the RiverLink plan, and in the outreach conducted as part of this Community Livability Plan, to improve the trail by adding landscaping, seating, shade, signage and other wayfinding measures, and by improving access to the trail from surrounding residential neighborhoods. Like the RiverLink park, greenway and connections system itself, the LARIO is a vital part of the Los Angeles River corridor in Long Beach, and access to it should be enhanced by the I-710 Major Improvements Project. However, in order to ensure that the LARIO trail is the community asset and recreation destination that it can and should be, it will also be critical to address the river corridor challenges and the homeless population that currently exists there. Residents have identified this issue as a serious safety concern in the Community Livability Plan outreach process, and described it as a major impediment to their use and enjoyment of the LARIO trail. In fact, it was noted at a public workshop that without this issue being addressed, RiverLink may be instead perceived as “crimelink,” and the access and connections it provides may be unwelcome in corridor neighborhoods.

I-710 Corridor Green Zone

As noted above, areas closest to the I-710 corridor, within a roughly 200 meter (650 ft.) distance from it, are most impacted by it. Green zone improvements in these areas should include tree and landscape planting. Tree planting efforts in this zone can play a role in reducing levels of ozone, PM10, nitrous oxide and sulfur dioxide, minimize the heat island effect, and provide visual and noise barriers between the freeway and neighborhoods. Other green mitigation measures, addressing capturing and cleaning storm water runoff, and groundwater recharge should also be considered in these areas.

I-710 Freeway Interchanges

New or redesigned freeway interchanges, which will be part of the I-710 Major Improvements project, should incorporate cutting edge design approaches to address multi-modal transportation systems operating on adjacent neighborhood roadways, and to improve safety for trucks, automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists.

I-710 Streetscape and Street Improvements

The I-710 Major Improvements Project will have an impact on the major streets that either bisect or run parallel to the freeway. Streetscape and street improvements include pedestrian and biking considerations that should be implemented as part of the I-710 freeway project. Street improvements should include, as appropriate, designated bikeways, landscaping, pedestrian lighting, ADA compliant sidewalks and ramps, signal and crosswalk improvements, public art, and comprehensive signage and wayfinding to facilitate all modes of travel and transportation.
### PROJECT DESCRIPTION RESPONSIBILITY TIMELINE IMPLEMENTATION/FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION/FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Freeway Noise/Air Impact Zone</td>
<td>Mitigation measures and programs to reduce the impact of the I-710, including double-paned glass, air conditioners, air purifiers, and sound walls</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, AQMD</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Metro, AQMD, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hill St. Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Construction of new pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Hill St. to strengthen neighborhood connectivity</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Safe Routes to Schools, Caltrans, Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I-710 Bridge and Overpass Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements to each of the I-710 overpasses as part of the I-710 Locally Preferred Strategy and EIR</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RiverLink Open Spaces</td>
<td>Implementation of multiple parks, open space connectors and gateways to improve access to LA River</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. LARIO TRAIL Improvements</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle improvements to the existing LARIO Trail to make it safer and more integrated with surrounding neighborhoods</td>
<td>LAC, DPW, DPRM, Metro</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>DPW, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I-710 Corridor Green Zone</td>
<td>Tree planting and other greening measures along public ROWs adjacent to the 710, 91, and the Terminal Island Freeway</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, DPW, CLB</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, Possible state and federal funding, Possible Port funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I-710 Freeway Interchanges</td>
<td>Improvements to freeway interchanges according to approved freeway expansion plans</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I-710 Streetscape and Street Improvements</td>
<td>Street and streetscape improvements along major corridors adjacent to the I-710</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro, DPW, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4-1: CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

**LEGEND**

- **Metro**: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- **Caltrans**: California Department of Transportation
- **DPW**: City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
- **DPRM**: City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine
- **LAC**: Los Angeles County
- **CLB**: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments
- **BNS**: City of Long Beach Bureau of Neighborhood Services
- **CLB**: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments

**All Roads Lead Home**

---
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SCREENING, SOUNDWALLS AND EDGES

PLANTING / REGIONAL BIKE PATH
NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVEMENTS

In order to propose the most relevant community design recommendations for the I-710 corridor neighborhoods, the categorized comments from the Neighborhood Design Workshops were linked to physical locations within the planning area. A broad list of fifty-eight neighborhood improvement projects that together make up the proposed Community Livability Plan improvements emerged from this process, and is shown in Figure 4-3 and Tables 4-2 through 4-5. This list of projects is further described and illustrated at the end of this section.

The City of Long Beach departments can use the Neighborhood Improvements Map to support and enhance planning within the I-710 corridor, based on the foundation of a community vision for change in the neighborhoods. Some proposed improvements that are recommended in this Plan are funded and will be implemented in the short term. Other projects are longer-term opportunities of which the City must remain aware as ongoing planning continues in the corridor neighborhoods over time.

A number of categories of community design improvements have been identified, based on the concerns and desires expressed by the community as explained in Chapter 3. These categories are defined and described below, and correspond to the legend on the map included as Figure 4-3, Neighborhood Improvements.

In addition to the wealth of input received from participants in this project that has been related to specific locations within the corridor, and mapped, other input was received that is important but more general. Complete lists of both the location-specific and non-location-specific livability concerns, strengths and suggested changes made by the community in relation all categories of improvements is included in the Appendix to this Plan, and should be referred to by staff as City services are planned and budgets are developed. In the descriptions of the key categories of improvements that follow, reference is made to both mapped (location specific) improvements as well as those suggested that were not location specific, and which may be applied in various locations within the corridor neighborhoods.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Pedestrian improvements include repairs to existing trails and sidewalks, pedestrian lighting, enhanced signalization, intersections and crossings, and ADA improvements to facilitate access for the disabled. Bicycle improvements include construction of new Class I, II and III bicycle routes, repair of existing bike paths, and additional signage along existing routes. While specific opportunities to target these improvements have been identified and mapped, it is important to note that residents have also made comments about generally improving pedestrian safety and walkability in the corridor neighborhoods, and specifically about repairing and repaving sidewalks.

Further, pedestrian and bicycle improvements in corridor neighborhoods can also be tied to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), which seeks to provide communities with transit options, decrease reliance on the automobile as the dominant mode of

WE CAN MEASURE QUALITY OF LIFE IN A NEIGHBORHOOD BY:

- Its physical condition; whether or not it is well connected by pathways for people, and comfortable to live and move around in
- Its physical safety and the health of its residents
- The presence of strong and active neighborhood groups and organizations, and residents taking advantage of local services and demonstrating community pride
- Cultural and environmental resources that are being preserved, such as historic buildings, trees, landscaping and open space, and real architectural character
- The prosperity of the neighborhood, its residents’ levels of employment, and the health of its businesses
community facility opportunities in that location. A complete list of community
facilities has been identified and refined.

Bridges/Overpasses I-710 and LA River bridges have been identified as part of the
Corridor Recommendations as a long term opportunity for replacement and im-
provement in connection with the I-710 Major Improvements Project. However, in
the shorter term, improvements can be considered as well. Working within the exist-
ing bridge and overpass right of way widths, opportunities should be explored for
improving sidewalks, providing some physical barrier between sidewalks and road-
ways, providing improved pedestrian and bicycle signage, adding pedestrian lighting,
and improving crosswalks on freeway on ramps and off ramps.

Pedestrian Bridges A few pedestrian bridges have been constructed in the corridor
area, primarily to link elementary schools to their surrounding neighborhoods. These
facilities have been identified on the Neighborhood Improvements map. Potential
improvements to them are identified in a single case study addressing the Los Cerri-
tos bridge, and included in this Plan. However, these improvements, including light-
ing, paint, access and sidewalk upgrades, fencing upgrades, and potentially public art,
can apply to all of the bridges in the corridor.

Each park located within the corridor is mapped as part of this cat-
egory. The category responds to an area of high ranking strength, as well as concern
and vision for change, based on Community Design Workshops input. Potential
improvements to them are identified in a single case study addressing the Los Cerri-
tos bridge, and included in this Plan. However, these improvements, including light-
ing, paint, access and sidewalk upgrades, fencing upgrades, and potentially public art,
can apply to all of the bridges in the corridor.

Existing Parks Each park located within the corridor is mapped as part of this cat-
egory. The category responds to an area of high ranking strength, as well as concern
and vision for change, based on Community Design Workshops input. Potential
improvements to them are identified in a single case study addressing the Los Cerri-
tos bridge, and included in this Plan. However, these improvements, including light-
ing, paint, access and sidewalk upgrades, fencing upgrades, and potentially public art,
can apply to all of the bridges in the corridor.

Livable Schools Each existing school within the corridor is mapped and identi-
fied as a candidate for potential Livable Schools improvements. Potential improve-
ments include: pedestrian and streetscape improvements adjacent to the campuses to
facilitate students' safe routes to school, greening on campuses by removing asphalt
on campus grounds and replacing it with planting or permeable surfaces, using green
and energy efficient building materials and systems in campus construction, shad-
ing campus parking lots with trees, and providing better access for neighborhoods to school recreation facilities with joint use agreements. Long Beach Unified School District should consider incorporating Livable Schools principles into the implementation strategies for its current Facilities Master Plan. Other livability improvements at corridor schools include a program currently being piloted at Hudson Elementary School to test indoor air purification systems. Improvements such as this have been identified in the corridor wide recommendations addressed earlier in this chapter of the Plan.

Planned Bike Paths Includes bike path improvements identified in the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, for which funding is not currently available. These are long-term plans to complete and improve the bicycle system in the city. There is a planning effort underway to update the Bicycle Master Plan which will incorporate the comments received within this planning effort.

Other important community design issue areas, based on community comments, are described below. While it is not possible to translate these comments into maps and target them to specific projects, this insight should be referenced by City staff as specific improvements are targeted in the I-710 corridor neighborhoods.

Public Safety Residents expressed concerns relating generally to crime, school safety, gang enforcement, police presence, staffing, visibility and patrols.

Traffic and Parking Specific suggestions have been made as part of this public process about traffic signal upgrades, needed traffic control measures and traffic calming opportunity areas, as well as on and off street parking problems, including those involving big rig trucks. It was not possible to evaluate and make recommendations relating to each of these suggestions, but they are important and can be taken into consideration by Public Works staff as traffic and parking planning processes move forward in the City, and as the Mobility element of the Long Beach 2030 Plan is developed. Discussions about the City’s approved truck routes on arterial highways, and their livability impacts on corridor neighborhoods should also be a part of the City’s Mobility element update.

Code Enforcement Concerns about graffiti and litter removal, as well as residential code violations have been expressed by the community as part of this planning process. These concerns have not been tied to specific locations within the corridor. However, proactive code enforcement initiatives in the City, such as Project Impact and the COPS Program, described in Chapter Two of this Plan, as well as the City’s Neighborhood Improvement Strategy Areas (mapped in Figure 4-1, Community Assets), are all established mechanisms for addressing these issues.

Streets and Alleys Concerns about the ongoing maintenance and repair of corridor streets and alleys have been expressed by community members as well. General comments about alley repairs, and cleaning were made, as well as comments about alleys in specific locations in the south and west subareas of the corridor. In response to this, alley improvements are called out on the list of projects associated with the Neighborhood Improvements Map in this Plan. Further, an alley greening concept has been included among the Neighborhood Conceptual Plans included at the end of this chapter of the Plan.

Public Art Roughly a dozen comments have been made by residents about the need for more public art in the corridor during the Neighborhood Design Workshops. Suggestions have been made to incorporate more public art into existing park facilities, into neighborhoods and gateways, and into corridor transportation facilities. Opportunities to incorporate public art and high quality urban design elements into future I-710 projects should certainly be explored in the long term. In the short term, however, the City can take advantage of its newly formed pool of on-call artists, and seek to incorporate art elements into all of the public improvements projects that it constructs.

CONCLUSION

Addressing the community’s preferences relating to changes in the I-710 corridor neighborhoods will be a long-term process in the City. Given the diverse nature of the recommendations, this process will involve a number of City departments and local agencies. In order to compile the information included in this Plan about City initiatives, actions and plans in the corridor to date, as well as to develop the recommendations included here, it has been invaluable to work in collaboration with a wide range of City staff, as well as Port, LBUSD, Long Beach Transit, Metro, and others. Ensuring that a single forum is provided, in which staff from a wide range of disciplines can share information and strategize improvements in a coordinated fashion, and focus solely on the corridor neighborhoods and livability, as implementation goes forward, will continue to be a useful technique.
## TABLE 4-2: NORTH CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION/FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Edison ROW Greenbelt West</td>
<td>Greening of the Edison ROW west of the 710</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Edison ROW Greenbelt East</td>
<td>Greening of the Edison ROW east of the 710</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Artesia Blvd. Safe Route to School</td>
<td>Pedestrian, bridge and streetscape improvements between Long Beach Blvd. and Atlantic</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DPW, Safe Routes to Schools funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. North Long Beach Tree Buffer</td>
<td>Street tree planting in the residential neighborhoods adjacent to the 710, the 405, and the 91</td>
<td>DPW, DS</td>
<td>Short- and Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, Potentially Port of Long Beach, DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Atlantic Ave. Streetscape</td>
<td>Pedestrian and open space improvements between South St. and Artesia as link between existing streetscape projects</td>
<td>DPW, DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Harding St. Class II Bicycle Path*</td>
<td>Construction of class II bikeway along Harding per Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Deforest Wetlands*</td>
<td>Transform current nature trail area of DeForest Park into a wetlands park, per RiverLink plans</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$2.5 million awarded from LA County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. South St. Parkway</td>
<td>Pedestrian and open space improvements and traffic calming measures along South St. between Daisy St. and the River</td>
<td>DPRM, DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Atlantic St. North Village</td>
<td>Enhanced neighborhood services, facilities, and parking in a new neighborhood center</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DS, North Village Redevelopment Project in design now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dairy and Addams One-Way Couplets</td>
<td>Multiple one way couplets in the Dairy and Addams neighborhoods to improve traffic, including couplets and additional streetscape and parking improvements at Ellis and 56th</td>
<td>DS, DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DS, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Carmelitos Senior Ctr. ADA Access</td>
<td>ADA improvements at Carmelitos to improve transit stop access and shopping center on Atlantic Blvd.</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dominguez Gap Wetlands Connector</td>
<td>Proposed open space connection from east to the Dominguez Gap Wetlands</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>RiverLink, Possible state and federal funding or Port of Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Union Pacific Landscaping</td>
<td>Landscape improvements to rail corridor including the addition of screen fabric on bridge</td>
<td>DPRM, DS</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DS, DPRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Dominguez Gap Wetlands*</td>
<td>Restored wetlands adjacent to the LA River</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Funded, Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Alley Improvements</td>
<td>Alley improvements pilot project (location to be identified)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, Grant Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes available funding

**LEGEND**
- **Metro**: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- **Caltrans**: California Department of Transportation
- **DPW**: City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
- **DPRM**: City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine
- **LAC**: Los Angeles County
- **DS**: City of Long Beach Development Services
- **BNS**: City of Long Beach Bureau of Neighborhood Services
- **CLB**: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments
Central Corridor Bird’s Eye View
### TABLE 4-3: CENTRAL CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION/FUNDING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Storm Drain 130 Restoration</td>
<td>Greening of storm drain 130 from Long Beach Boulevard to Scherer Park</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state &amp; federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Atlantic Ave. Streetscape</td>
<td>Enhancements to Atlantic Ave. from Del Amo to San Antonio, such as lighting and lengthened sidewalk times at Del Amo and Atlantic</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. San Antonio Class II Bike Path*</td>
<td>Construction of class II bikeway along San Antonio from Pacific to Atlantic</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Los Cerritos/Del Mar Walking Trail and River Connector</td>
<td>Improvements to existing path and green space that extends from Los Cerritos Park north to the Dominguez Gap wetlands to allow ADA access, and to provide long-term additional maintenance of and access to the connector</td>
<td>DPW, DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, DPRM, LA County, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Del Mar Park</td>
<td>Development of new park per RiverLink plan</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state &amp; federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Pacific Ave. Streetscape</td>
<td>Pedestrian and streetscape enhancements to Pacific Ave. from Country Club Dr. south to Wardlow, including underpass improvements, lighting, trees, and signal at Pacific, to enhance Metro Station pedestrian access</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wrigley Heights RiverLink Connector</td>
<td>Connection south to Wrigley Greenbelt via LA County ROW</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible state &amp; federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Wrigley Heights Park South*</td>
<td>Expansion of Wrigley Heights park south of 405 as part of RiverLink</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>$500,000 from LA County for Baker Mini-park; $1 million for Wrigley Heights Greenbelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Wrigley Heights River Connector</td>
<td>Potential City agreement with LA County to acquire land along river, within Wrigley Heights Park south</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, LA County, Possible State and Federal Funding Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Los Cerritos/Del Mar Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Improvements to existing pedestrian bridge near Los Cerritos Elementary</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Safe Routes to School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Wardlow Streetscape/405 Overpass</td>
<td>Improvements to increase pedestrian safety along Wardlow, including the 405 underpass</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Spring St. Bike Improvements</td>
<td>Planning for a new bicycle path along Del Mar/Pacific that would link RiverLink Wrigley Heights Park with Willow bike station</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Metro Blue Line Landscaping</td>
<td>Greening of the Blue Line corridor with native and drought tolerant plants, from Willow Street to the northern boundary of the City; potential buffering improvements should also include a soundwall along the ROW, north of the 405 in the Los Cerritos area</td>
<td>Metro</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Veteran’s Park/Blue Line Bike Path</td>
<td>Retrofit or removal of parking strip between Veteran’s Park and the Blue Line</td>
<td>Metro, DS, DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro, DS, DPW, Federal and State Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. PE ROW Bike Connection</td>
<td>Bike path connection from PE ROW to Atlantic, north to 27th St. and west to Blue Line station</td>
<td>DPRM, Metro, DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, DPRM, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 27th St. Class II Bike Path*</td>
<td>Construction of class II bike path on 27th St. per Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Willow Streetscape*</td>
<td>Willow Streetscape improvements</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Daisy Ave. Median</td>
<td>Continuation of median and tree planting at Daisy north and south of Willow</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Pacific Ave. Class II Bike Path*</td>
<td>Proposed addition of Class II bikeway along Pacific (Pacific Coast Highway to San Antonio)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEGEND**
- Metro: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Caltrans: California Department of Transportation
- DPW: City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
- DPRM: City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine
- LAC: Los Angeles County
- DS: City of Long Beach Development Services
- BNS: City of Long Beach Bureau of Neighborhood Services
- CLB: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments

* Denotes available funding
South Corridor Bird’s Eye View
### TABLE 4-4: SOUTH CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Hill St. Open Space Connector</td>
<td>Enhancements to Hill St. from Terminal Island Freeway east to LA River to provide open space/pedestrian link</td>
<td>DS, DPW, DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, DPW, DPRM, Possible State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Los Angeles River Class II Bike-way*</td>
<td>Construction of Class II bike path east of the Los Angeles River per Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Pacific Coast Highway Streetscape</td>
<td>Pedestrian improvements along PCH between Magnolia and Santa Fe</td>
<td>Caltrans, DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Caltrans, DPW, State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Seaside Park*</td>
<td>Park development in vacant lot west of Pacific Ave. and 14th</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. 14th Street Park Expansion*</td>
<td>Expansion of 14th St. park as continuation of existing linear park, including skate park and basketball court complex; expansion of 14th St. park south to Drake Park expansion; bicycle connection to LA River</td>
<td>BNS, DPRM</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>DPRM, CDBG funding, Possible State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Anaheim Street River Connection</td>
<td>Pedestrian enhancements to frontage road off Anaheim St. between Daisy Ave. and the river to strengthen the link between 14th St. Park and RiverLink</td>
<td>DPW, DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, Possible State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Anaheim Streetscape</td>
<td>Streetscape improvements to Anaheim from Atlantic Ave. west to the Terminal Island Freeway</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Drake Park*</td>
<td>Additional open space between Drake Park and the River as part of RiverLink</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>$1 million awarded from LA County for conceptual design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. 6th and 7th St. Pedestrian Improvements*</td>
<td>Traffic calming improvements to 6th and 7th to make them safer and more pedestrian-friendly</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Broadway and Third Class II Bike Paths*</td>
<td>Construction of Class II bike paths per Bicycle Master Plan</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Broadway and Third Traffic Calming*</td>
<td>Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements to Broadway and 3rd Street to calm traffic and improve safety in areas near school and freeway entrances (i.e. improved crosswalks, pedestrian lighting)</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short term</td>
<td>Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Harbor District River Edge Greening</td>
<td>Forestation/tree planting inside and outside of Port-operated land</td>
<td>DPW, Port of Long Beach</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach, DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Downtown Alley Improvement</td>
<td>Alley improvements pilot project (location to be identified)</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, Grant Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes available funding

**LEGEND**
- Metro: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Caltrans: California Department of Transportation
- DPW: City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
- DPRM: City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine
- LAC: Los Angeles County
- DS: City of Long Beach Development Services
- BNS: City of Long Beach Bureau of Neighborhood Services
- CLB: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments
### TABLE 4-5: WEST CORRIDOR RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. Waterfront Bike Path</td>
<td>Bike path along the Harbor waterfront to be constructed in three phases; will provide pedestrian access to waterfront restaurants, the Queen Mary, and other attractions</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Ocean Blvd. Greening</td>
<td>Street tree planting along Ocean Blvd.</td>
<td>DPW, Port of LB</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>City/Port of LB, Ocean Blvd. Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Shoemaker Bridge/Chavez Park Realignment*</td>
<td>Replacement of Shoemaker Bridge and realignment of Chavez Park to expand it</td>
<td>DPW, Caltrans</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DPW, Funded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Anaheim Streetscape/710 Overpass</td>
<td>Streetscape improvements to Anaheim from Atlantic Ave. west to the Terminal Island Freeway</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW, State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Pacific Coast Highway Streetscape/710 Overpass Safe Route to School</td>
<td>Enhancements to PCH to improve route to school, pedestrian and bicycle safety</td>
<td>DPW, DS, DPRM</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>DS, Safe Routes to Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Hill St. Open Space Connector</td>
<td>Enhancements to Hill St. from Terminal Island Freeway east to LA River to provide open space/pedestrian link</td>
<td>DS, DPW, DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, DPW, DPRM, Possible State and Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Terminal Island Freeway Tree Buffer</td>
<td>Forestation/tree planting along public ROWs adjacent to the Terminal Island Freeway to buffer schools, parks and Villages at Cabrillo</td>
<td>DPW, Caltrans</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Metro, Caltrans, DPW, Possible state and federal funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Silverado Park Fitness Zone</td>
<td>Improvements to Silverado Park including addition of exercise stations</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Trust for Public Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Tanaka Greenbelt</td>
<td>Development of Tanaka Park Greenbelt along Edison ROW</td>
<td>DPRM, DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>City agreement w/ Pacific Edison needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Tanaka Park Expansion</td>
<td>Expansion of Tanaka Park to east</td>
<td>DPRM</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPRM, Possible State &amp; Federal Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Wardlow Streetscape improvements/710 Overpass</td>
<td>Pedestrian and streetscape enhancements to Wardlow St. from Long Beach Blvd. to Santa Fe (lighting, trees, etc.)</td>
<td>DPW, DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. 27th St. Alley Improvements</td>
<td>Alley improvements pilot project (location to be identified)</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>DS, Grant Funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes available funding

**LEGEND**

- Metro: Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority
- Caltrans: California Department of Transportation
- DPW: City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
- DPRM: City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine
- LAC: Los Angeles County
- DS: City of Long Beach Development Services
- BNS: City of Long Beach Bureau of Neighborhood Services
- CLB: City of Long Beach - Multiple Departments
NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPTUAL PLANS

Fifteen of the projects identified on the Neighborhood Improvements Map, (Figure 4-3) have been conceptually illustrated, in plan, section and bird’s-eye before and after views, and are further described on the following pages. These projects have been selected for further description and illustration because their design intent responds to a broad range of livability issues identified by the community in relation to the corridor, and they illustrate a range of the types of improvements the team is recommending at the neighborhood scale. While specific examples, or case studies, have been prepared, these examples may be applicable to and replicable in, more than one location within the corridor. Ideas for applying these concepts in other locations in the corridor are included on the concept design pages themselves.

The conceptual plans that follow in Figures 4-5 through 4-15 are also located on Figure 4-4, Neighborhood Conceptual Plans Key Map.

LEGEND

1 Artesia Boulevard Safe Route to School
2 North Long Beach Tree Buffer
3 South Street Parkway
4 Wrigley Heights River Buffer
5 Wrigley Heights RiverLink Connector
6 Wrigley Heights Pedestrian Bridge
7 Tanaka Park Expansion
8 Tanaka Greenbelt
9 Veteran’s Park / Blue Line Bike Path
10 Hill Street Open Space Connector
11 Anaheim Street River Connection
12 14th Street Park Expansion
13 Ocean Boulevard Greening

Throughout Plan Area Where Applicable
A Livable Schools Concept
B Alley Greening Concept

FIGURE 4-4: NEIGHBORHOOD CONCEPTUAL PLANS KEY MAP
CHAPTER FOUR    >    COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN

1 SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL (AT GRADE)
- Widened and continuous sidewalk
- Street furniture and lighting
- Bikeways

2 SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL (AT UNDERPASS)
- Widened and continuous sidewalk
- Bikeways
- Protective barrier between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists
- Include wall or ceiling mounted lighting through underpass
- Painting walls of underpass

3 SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL (ON BRIDGE)
- Widened and continuous
- Off street bikeways
- Protective barrier between vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists
- Potential railing improvements
- Continue existing street lighting across entire span

4 IMPROVED CROSSWALKS
- Demarcated with decorative pavement or enhanced striping

DESIGN INTENT
- Improve the safety and livability of routes to school for students accessing their campuses on foot and by bicycle, crossing the I-710 and the LA River
- Modernize and enhance the aesthetic quality and pedestrian safety features of the I-710 overpasses, and LA River bridges along the length of the corridor

APPLICATION
- Bridges, overpasses and underpasses at Long Beach Boulevard, Del Amo, Wardlow, Willow, Pacific Coast Highway and Anaheim.

FIGURE 4-5: ARTESIA BOULEVARD SAFE ROUTE TO SCHOOL

Conceptual Plan #1 on Key Map, Figure 4-4
1 PLANTED CURB EXTENSIONS
Extend curb to add planters on “freeway side” of City street ends, and plant additional trees there as well.

2 I-710 URBAN FOREST BUFFER
Pilot tree planting project targeted on City right of way and private side yards in residential neighborhoods.

DESIGN INTENT
Buffer residents from the aesthetic, air pollution and noise impacts of the I-710

APPLICATION
Corridor neighborhoods west of the I-710, both in north and west Long Beach.

FIGURE 4-6: NORTH LONG BEACH TREE BUFFER
Conceptual Plan # 2 on Key Map, Figure 4-4

WHITE AVE. LOOKING NORTH

WHITE AVE. LOOKING SOUTH
1 PED & OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS
Wider sidewalks/permeable pathway, curb extensions at intersections, enhanced crosswalks, pedestrian lighting, native trees and landscaping, street furniture, storm water management techniques

2 VACANT PROPERTY
New pocket park with furniture and lighting

3 STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS
Added street trees and lighting

4 PARK CONNECTION
Create a pathway across the park, and relocate a park entrance to this location

5 LA RIVER ACCESS POINT
Create a bike/pedestrian access to the River Trail and DeForest Wetlands, including native landscaping and signage

6 DEFOREST PARK NATURE TRAIL
Restore and reopen the nature trail and connect it to the LA River

DESIGN INTENT
Enhance RiverLink/LA River connectivity into the corridor neighborhoods
Better utilize and improve “found” green space in corridor neighborhoods

APPLICATION
Already identified at Market Street in RiverLink Plan
EXISTING PEDESTRIAN CROSSING OVER METRO BLUE LINE AND UNDER 405 FREEWAY
Remove turnstiles, improve lighting, upgrade fencing and screening materials, add public art elements

2. WALKWAY FROM LOS CERRITOS TO PEDESTRIAN CROSSING
Improve and light the walkway, and provide upgraded landscaping and fencing and screening materials

3. STREESCAPE/PEDESTRIAN/BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS
Improve connection from Blue Line/405 pedestrian crossing to LA River with street trees, pathway and lighting

4. COUNTY RIGHT OF WAY
Acquire access to LA County ROW to north and south, continuing LA River trail connection through this area, adjacent to planned RiverLink Park

DESIGN INTENT
Provide safe route to school access for Los Cerritos Elementary School students, from Wrigley Heights Better connect proposed RiverLink parks into their corridor neighborhoods

APPLICATION
Pedestrian bridges in the City connecting schools to corridor neighborhoods Streets adjacent to proposed RiverLink parks

FIGURE 4-8: WRIGLEY HEIGHTS RIVERLINK CONNECTOR, BUFFER AND PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

Conceptual Plans 4 5 6 on Key Map, Figure 4-4
**EXISTING DRIVING RANGE**

405 FREEWAY

LOS CERRITOS PARK

PROPOSED WRIGLEY HEIGHTS PARK AND FORESTATION PROJECT

SILVERADO PARK

EXISTING TANAKA PARK

WARDLOW RD.

SANTA FE AVE.

HARBOR ST.

W. 32ND ST.

W. 33RD ST.

W. 34TH ST.

W. ARlington ST.

PROPOSED TANAKA PARK EXPANSION

CONNECTION TO RIVER TRAIL

CONNECTION TO RIVER TRAIL

LOS ANGELES RIVER

1  TANAKA PARK

Expand the park into additional available Edison Right of Way land to the west and south

2  EDISON RIGHT OF WAY

Acquire access to the utility right of way for recreation and open space use and to create a neighborhood greenbelt

3  PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS

Incorporate improvements to Wrigley Heights Pedestrian Bridge over the 405 Freeway into overall greenbelt/connections planning

Streetscape improvements along Wardlow Rd. to improve the pedestrian/cyclist environment and safety.

Streetscape design or wayfinding signage between the “Greenbelt” and Silverado Park.

**DESIGN INTENT**

Build on existing community assets, such as Tanaka Park and Silverado Park, and enhance pedestrian and bicycle connections to them

Access existing utility rights of way for community recreation/open space use

Enhance pedestrian and bicycle connectivity over the I-710

**APPLICATION**

Existing utility rights of way both in north and west Long Beach
1. **BLUE LINE FRONTAGE ROAD AT VETERANS PARK**
   Replace underutilized surface parking with pedestrian and bike improvements, such as pathways and lighting.

2. **IMPROVED PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**
   Across Blue Line corridor on Spring Street.

3. **BLUE LINE CORRIDOR LANDSCAPING**
   Landscape the Blue Line corridor from Willow Street north to the City limit.

4. **PACIFIC ELECTRIC RIGHT OF WAY BIKE CONNECTION**
   Improve Blue Line crossing at Willow Street Station and 27th to accommodate bicyclists approaching from the east on 27th and Atlantic, from the Pacific Electric ROW greenbelt.

**DESIGN INTENT**

- Better integrate both Veterans Park and the Metro Blue Line into their neighborhoods.
- Enhance neighborhood buffering from the Metro Blue Line, and the aesthetics of the Blue Line corridor for both riders and residents.
- Improve bicycle access to the Metro Blue Line station at Willow, and into the larger bike path system developing in the City.

**APPLICATION**

- Bike path connections to all Metro Blue Line stations in Long Beach.

---

**FIGURE 4-10: VETERAN’S PARK / BLUE LINE BIKE PATH**

Conceptual Plan #9 on Key Map, Figure 4-4
1. PEDESTRIAN / BICYCLE BRIDGE OVER LOS ANGELES RIVER / I-710

2. TREE PLANTING, ENHANCED LANDSCAPE AND STREETSCAPE ALONG HILL STREET CORRIDOR

3. LIVABLE SCHOOLS GREENING IMPROVEMENTS

4. TERMINAL ISLAND FREEWAY TREE AND LANDSCAPE BUFFER

**Design Intent**

Provide enhanced access to the proposed RiverLink park and greenbelt areas, as well as the LA River bicycle path, and across the I-710 and LA River. Capitalize on the right of way width of Hill Street to enhance its edges with landscape and pedestrian amenities. Focus attention on buffering the Terminal Island Freeway from the adjacent high school, elementary school and park, as well as the emerging Villages at Cabrillo transitional housing campus and school facility to the south, and capitalize on an opportunity to expand the City’s urban forest.

**Application**

East-west collector or local streets that cross I-710 and the LA River and connect open spaces, greenbelts and public facilities in corridor neighborhoods.
1 PROPOSED SEASIDE PARK
2 OPEN SPACE CONNECTION TO MAGNOLIA YARDS REDEVELOPMENT / RIVERLINK
3 OPEN SPACE MID-BLOCK CONNECTION TO DRAKE PARK TO THE SOUTH
4 MAGNOLIA YARDS / RIVERLINK PLAN AREA
5 EXPANSION OF 14TH STREET LINEAR PARK FROM PINE AVE. TO LONG BEACH BLVD.
6 EXTENSION OF STREETSCAPE AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS FROM LONG BEACH BLVD. TO ATLANTIC AVE.
7 CONNECTIONS TO WASHINGTON MIDDLE & LONG BEACH POLYTECHNIC HIGH SCHOOL

DESIGN INTENT
Build on the 14th Street Park areas and enhance their connectivity to the west, Drake Park, and its associated RiverLink park spaces to the south, and Washington Middle School to the east.

APPLICATION
14th Street, or other local streets in the corridor neighborhoods with excess right of way, that can be repurposed as open space.

FIGURE 4-12: 14TH STREET PARK EXPANSION AND ANAHEIM STREET RIVER CONNECTION
1 TREE PLANTING AND LANDSCAPING ALONG OCEAN BOULEVARD THROUGH HARBOR DISTRICT

2 LOS ANGELES RIVER EDGE SCREENING AND BIKEWAY CONNECTION TO THE QUEEN MARY

**DESIGN INTENT**

- Capitalize on unused right of way edges on roadway corridors throughout the Harbor District for greening opportunities and expansion of urban forest.
- Focus efforts to green the LA River edge where it also adjoins the Harbor District in order to buffer the City from the Port and enhance the aesthetics of a major gateway into the community and its destinations, including the Queen Mary.

**APPLICATION**

Roadway right of way edges within the Harbor District, and on the west side of the LA River.

---

**FIGURE 4-13: OCEAN BOULEVARD GREENING**
COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN for the I-710 CORRIDOR NEIGHBORHOODS > LONG BEACH CALIFORNIA

FIGURE 4-14: LIVABLE SCHOOLS CONCEPT

1. SAFE, PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY INTERSECTIONS; CURB EXTENSIONS
2. MID BLOCK CROSSINGS
3. GREEN STREETS
   Street tree planting, sidewalk improvements, bioswales and natural drainage systems
4. PARKING LOT IMPROVEMENTS
   Shade parking areas with tree plantings; incorporate pervious paving and natural drainage systems, bioswales; capture storm water runoff from surrounding streets
5. PERVIOUS SURFACES AND RE-GREENING TECHNIQUES
   Tree plantings, bioswales, minimized paving, pervious surfaces; above and underground cisterns and planters to collect grey water for reuse, etc.
6. HEALTH OF THE INDOOR ENVIRONMENT
   Improve indoor air quality with air filtration systems; use low- or no-voc paints and materials; install double-paned windows for noise abatement and pollutant sealing; provide ample daylighting for classrooms
7. JOINT USE
   Negotiate joint use agreements to allow access to school fields and recreation facilities after school hours and on weekends

DESIGN INTENT
   Improve the livability of corridor neighborhoods by enhancing their existing assets, such as schools
   Improve corridor schools’ sustainability and environmental contribution to their neighborhoods over the long term
   Recreate schools as environments that teach about livability and sustainability
   Expand the City’s open space and recreational facilities and system, despite the fact that new park space is difficult to find in this dense corridor area

APPLICATION
   All schools in the I-710 Corridor

PLANTING AND LANDSCAPING
CURB EXTENSIONS FOR SAFER CROSSINGS
MEDIANS FOR SAFER MID-BLOCK CROSSINGS
BIKE LANES

Conceptual Plan on Key Map, Figure 4-4

FIGURE 4-14: LIVABLE SCHOOLS CONCEPT
FIGURE 4-15: ALLEY GREENING CONCEPTS

CONCEPT ONE
Pervious Paving; Tree Planting

CONCEPT TWO
“Hollywood track” Pervious Paving with planting

CONCEPT THREE
Secure Alley Park with tree Plantings, pathway, areas for additional plantings

DESIGN INTENT
Implement a range of creative solutions to the problem of deteriorating alleys in neighborhoods throughout the corridor

Where automobile and service access is required, rehabilitate paving only to the degree necessary to accommodate it. Where motorized vehicle access can be eliminated, explore securing the right of way areas and creating shared green space for residents to use and potentially maintain.

Enhance the permeability of the spaces, while acting on opportunities to green neighborhoods, expand the urban forest, and turn currently degraded areas into assets.

APPLICATION
Degraded alleys throughout the corridor

EXAMPLES OF ALLEY GREENING
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## TASK 1 - PROJECT START-UP & DATA GATHERING

1.1 - Initiate Project/Council Interviews
1.2 - Data Gathering
1.3 - Develop Outreach Plan & Database
1.4 - Engage Regional Stakeholders
1.5 - Community Stakeholders - Drop In Meetings
1.6 - Team Meetings
1.7 - Site Tour
1.8 - Existing Conditions Documentation

## TASK 2 - CULTURAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

2.1 - Mobilization & Advance Work
2.2 - Community Stakeholders - Drop In Meetings
2.3 - Neighborhood Summits
2.4 - Team Meetings
2.5 - Compile Cultural Needs Report

## TASK 3 - COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN

3.1 - Advance Work/Plan Design
3.2 - Neighborhood Community Livability Review
3.3 - Team Meetings
3.4 - Report Edits

## TASK 4 - PLAN APPROVAL

4.1 - Preparation
4.2 - Team Meetings
4.3 - Presentation to City Council Oversight Committee
   - Presentation to Community/Stakeholders
   - Presentation to City Council

---

**July 20, 2007**

**Meléndrez**
Community Livability Plan for the Long Beach I-710 Corridor Neighborhoods

KICK-OFF MEETING NOTES
February 16, 2007

In attendance:

Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Melendrez
Steve Patton—Melendrez
Dan Rosenfeld—Long Beach Transit
Shirley Hsiao—Long Beach Transit
Lee Ward—Meyer Mohaddes Associates
Tony Torres—DSO
Pat Garrow—City of Long Beach Department of Planning
Anna Mendiola—City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine
Dennis Eschen—City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine
Karen Heit—Gateway City COG
Carl Kemp—Port of Long Beach

CONSULTANT TEAM:
Meléndrez
Consultant team lead. Role is urban planning/urban design/community engagement facilitation.

Diverse Strategies for Organizing
Leading the community engagement effort, including stakeholder database creation, community contacts, and meeting scheduling and logistics.

Meyer Mohaddes Associates
Providing continuity with the earlier I-710 Locally Preferred Strategy process, input on transportation issues.

CITY/COG STAKEHOLDER TEAM COMMENTS:
City/COG stakeholders summarized for the group the plans, programs and activities they have underway that are relevant to this plan.

Long Beach Transit
Long Beach Transit is a franchise of the City, working to provide a better level of accessibility for the community.
- Currently advocating for involvement in the Long Beach General Plan update.
- Interested in long-term ridership, as well as public safety issues with regard to public transit.
- Noted that there is a significant transit-dependent population in Long Beach.

Department of Park, Recreation and Marine
Currently developing over 100 projects including many projects along the I-710 corridor. Have an identified need for programmed indoor space in parks.
- Green Vision Map: they are looking at potential locations for new parks within the City, including vacant parcels that could be converted to green space.
- Riverlink: open space plan for the east bank of the LA River, developed by graduate students in landscape architecture from Pomona. Plan is currently in the process of being presented to City Council.
- West Long Beach: Molina Park, development of mini park at Santa Fe and 20th St.
- Admiral Kidd Park: 3-acre expansion and renovation of recreational space, including two lighted soccer fields and baseball fields.
- Tree planting project at Coolidge Park in partnership with the Port.
- Tree planting project at 34th and Wardlow in the Wrigley Greenbelt.

**Long Beach Comprehensive Planning Division**
Currently focused on the General Plan update—Long Beach 2030, One Great City.
- The Plan will include a significant outreach effort, including a range of outreach meetings, community surveys, community festivals, and the Plan Van, a mobile informational kiosk.
- EDAW is heading the team, with MIG for community engagement
- Community Festivals are scheduled for April 21—Jordan High School, May 12—Hughes Middle School, May 19—Hill Middle School, and June 2—Stevenson Elementary.

Noted that there is also a Downtown Visioning project underway spearheaded by the City Council.

**Gateway Cities Council of Governments**
Karen is on the regional steering committee for the I-710 improvement project and the Local Advisory Committee in Long Beach.
- Interested in how this process can potentially inform or be integrated into the EIR/EIS for the I-710.
- Possibilities for observation of this process by the I-710 Oversight Committee.
- Air Quality Action Plan: made possible by a grant from the MTA. The COG is currently doing outreach for this process for the communities involved in the I-710 corridor study. Common themes are emerging. Many community members want more monitoring stations. They will also be conducting interviews with Tier 1 members, environmental groups, and advisory committee members among others.
- The timeline for the I-710 EIR is 36-43 months. A first draft will be developed within 14 months.

**Port of Long Beach**
Carl Kemp touched on the following key Port initiatives:
- I-710 Trees program (referenced above in the Parks and Recreation section) for communities that are impacted by the I-710.
- Long Beach Green Port Policy: serves as a guide for decision making and establishes a framework for environmentally friendly Port operations. The Policy establishes six key areas of emphasis, and fundamental goals for each area as follows:

**Air** - Reduce air emissions from Port activities
**Water** - Improve the quality of Long Beach Harbor waters
**Wildlife** - Protect, maintain or restore aquatic ecosystems and marine habitats
**Soil/Sediment** - Remove, treat, or render suitable for beneficial reuse Port-contaminated soils and sediments in the Harbor District
**Sustainability** – Implement sustainable practices in marine terminal design, development and operations as well as training, operations and practices within the Port Administration and Maintenance Centers
**Community Engagement** – Interact with and educate the community regarding Port environmental programs
• Pier B rail yard: the Pier B rail yard is part of the Port’s ongoing efforts to improve traffic and congestions in and outside of the harbor. As part of its Master Plan, the Port is promoting operational changes such as on-dock rail yards, which allow cargo to be transferred from ships to trains within the Port.

• Pier S: new terminal north of the Gerald Desmond Bridge including back channel improvements.

• Middle Harbor EIR: infill development.

• Gerald Desmond Bridge: $850 million replacement/renovation of bridge.

• Pier G: Mega Container Terminal project. Scheduled to be completed in 2011.

• Southern California Intermodal Gateway: For near dock rail transport of Port goods. Being pursued by the Port of Los Angeles and BNSF railway. Would be located on the west side of the Terminal Island Freeway.

• The Port is also striving to increase its use of the Alameda Corridor.

• The Port is working toward 32% of its cargo being moved via on-dock rail. This would be the highest percentage of on dock port facilities in the country.

Long Beach Department of Public Works
Sumi Grant described the following key public works projects.

• Projects at 710 Southern terminus: Shoemaker Bridge, Anaheim St., Cesar Chavez Park. $60 million in project funding.

• Broadway: the City received $1.6 million for traffic calming projects on Broadway, 3rd, 6th and 7th Streets between Golden Avenue, at the termination of the 710 off ramp, and Pacific. Projects are in the conceptual design phase, and there have been discussions about creating a bike boulevard on Broadway as one of the traffic calming measures.

• Streetscape enhancement project on Anaheim Street.

• Bike Master Plan: The plan calls for various improvements including signage, wayfinding and stenciling.

• Creating access to the river from the neighborhoods: they are currently pursuing funding sources for this process.

• Currently pursuing the development of an Urban Forest Master Plan.

REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS
The group agreed that the following entities should be on the list of key regional stakeholders to engage in the project:

• AQMD
• CARB
• MTA
• Caltrans
• River groups
• Los Angeles County
WHO IS NOT AT THE TABLE?
Team members suggested the following City agencies/entities should also be involved in this project:

- Health and Human Services Department
- Community Development (Redevelopment Agency)
- Neighborhood Services
- Downtown Visioning effort
- Bike Station
- Long Beach Police Department
- City Prosecutor’s Office (Project IMPACT: Being developed by the City Prosecutor’s Office. It is organized quadrant by quadrant within the city; in partnership with community services. Tom Reese is the contact.)
- Long Beach City Council Environmental Committee, which meets monthly

Clearly the Long Beach Unified School District also needs to participate. The District is in the process of doing a Facility Master Plan, and will be conducting community dialogs some time in March. They also have demographic data which may be relevant to us. It was noted that the District is facing a declining environment.

PROJECT DISCUSSION

Questions from the public that we should anticipate:

- Who will pay for the project?
- How does it impact us?
- Why should people attend the public meetings?
- How do we differentiate our project from the many ongoing initiatives in the City, particularly those are the in connection with the 710?

Other questions/comments:

- Should other groups/agencies be invited to participate with us at public meetings, such as the Port?
- What are the I-710 corridor neighborhoods?
- What are the project boundaries?
- We need to describe this as a project to improve neighborhoods at “street level”, in order to improve the quality of life, regardless of the I-710 and its impact on surrounding neighborhoods.
- We need to be clear that we want to engage the community about their dreams and wishes in relation to neighborhood livability. In order to make a plan that can be marketed for funding. Improvement projects won’t get funding without a vision for change and a plan.
ADDENDUM:

Conference Call with Departments of Neighborhood Services and Health and Human Services

March 1, 2007

Sumi Grant
Melani Smith
Steve Patton
Dennis Thys—Neighborhood Services Bureau
Jeff Benedict—Department of Health and Human Services

Redevelopment Agency Involvement
The Long Beach Community Development Department should also be involved in this project. There are a variety of housing initiatives currently being developed on the west side.
- Residential housing development near Santa Fe and Willow. Commercial developments are being removed and housing is being developed. David White is the contact.
- Pacific Coast Highway—median island upgrades to make PCH more of a “neighborhood street”. Lee Mayfield is the contact.
- Various downtown initiatives. Craig Beck is the contact.

Neighborhood Services
Enhancement concepts proposed in the North Long Beach Street Enhancement Master Plan could be used as models for project ideas in west Long Beach.

The City is also in the process of developing a Streetscape Master Plan for portions of Pacific Avenue in West Central Long Beach. This effort has been spearheaded by Councilmember Laura Richardson. The master plan will include the street, crosswalks, and street furniture, landscaping, benches, light poles and other fixtures.

Silverado Park area: Neighborhood Services is currently working on a community code enforcement initiative, which involves meeting with block captains. They have two outreach venues that may be of use to us.

Department of Health and Human Services
Health Risk Assessment: DHHS is currently waiting on an AQMD release of the MATES III (Multiple Air Toxics Exposure Study) that terminated in March of 2006. MATES III is monitoring for 21 toxic air contaminants and four other substances at 10 sites across the Los Angeles Basin. In addition, AQMD is utilizing mobile monitoring stations to sample at several neighborhood sites near toxic emission sources or in areas where community members are concerned about health risks from air pollution.

It was mentioned that the MATES II study (which ran from 1998-1999) sited the deplorable air quality conditions along the 710 as a result of diesel trucks. However, it was noted that the study didn’t consider the on shore wind in the city, which could mitigate some of the impacts.

The areas along the 710 have the worst air quality in the entire city.

Noise study: a baseline study of noise was done after the ports expanded trucking activities after hours. This was done in partnership with Val Lerch and Caltrans. The study found that there is a tremendous amount of noise in some neighborhoods. This project might find a way to fund a
program to provide double-paned glass for affected homes. Perhaps a cost estimate for a pilot project could be developed.

USC has released some asthma and respiratory studies that the health department has used. Research has shown that air quality is often the most problematic for individuals who are active outdoors (such as school athletes).

Other Items:

- The Long Beach Riverlink project should also be considered in this project. There are many new open space projects being proposed along the 710 corridor. Phil Hester is the contact.

- School District: Sumi has contracted the District to request their participation in the project.

- Port of Los Angeles initiatives: Truck terminal (BNSF). SCIG UP truck yard in the Lincoln Arlington neighborhood. Windward mobile homes will be affected.

- Dr. Lisa Nicholas of the Long Beach Alliance for the Prevention of Asthma is a good person to have at the table. She works for the Miller Children’s Clinic.

- Within the study area, the fumes coming off the 710 are noticeable.

- Do regional stakeholders have programs to address these problems?

- In general, as crime has gone down in the city, concerns about quality of life issues related to traffic noise and emissions are rising.

- Long Beach Police Department: Commander Billy Quach of the West Division is the contact. He is located at the Santa Fe Avenue police building. Boundary is north of Anaheim Street and east of the river to Wardlow. We could also contact the North Division-Commander Scott Robertson. Located at the Scherer Park Building.

- Neighborhood Resource Center (Margaret Madden) has a list service that we might be able to use.

Process/Community Engagement

- One concept for public meetings is to market this project as a “transition plan” that will focus on what we can do in the next 15 years. The project should have a neighborhood focus as opposed to a 710 focus.

- The environmental study for the 710 will take 3-4 years. $7 billion of improvements are likely.

- There is a lot that can be done in the interim period before the 710 expansion projects happen.

- The project should consider truck traffic only as it affects the neighborhoods.
• Agendas and speakers for the public meetings: we need to get on this right away because many local groups are already setting up their schedules for the next couple of months.

• We should do asset mapping early on in the process—this will get us some wins early on and allow us to make sure we know what’s going on in the neighborhoods. We need to know where we are potentially going to have problems with the implementation of projects. The asset maps developed out of the community cluster meetings from the first General Plan effort area good place to start. We don’t want to put problem areas on the map though. Asset mapping should differentiate between constructed projects, those that are in planning, and those that are funded for construction.

• We should think about what we can do to engage and involve key individuals who have been vocal in the 710 oversight process.

• One possible component of the Cultural Needs Assessment is the development of a resource guide that would describe relevant plans and projects as well as provide contact information for important stakeholders.
MEETING #2 NOTES
March 23, 2007

In attendance:

Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Meléndrez
Steve Patton—Meléndrez
Shirley Hsiao—Long Beach Transit
Lee Ward—Meyer Mohaddes Associates
Tony Torres—DSO
Irene Payan—DSO
Pat Garrow—City of Long Beach Department of Planning
Scott Robertson—Long Beach Police Department
Marlene Arrona—Long Beach Police Department
Lee Mayfield—Redevelopment Agency
David White—Redevelopment Agency
Jonathan Kraus—Office of the 8th District
Niki Tennant—Office of the 1st District
Dennis Thys—Neighborhood Services

INTRODUCTION
Sumi Gant gave a short introduction to the project for those individuals who were not able to attend the first meeting. Her summary included a description of recent activities, including project team presentations to local community groups to inform them about the project, and a presentation to the chiefs of staff of Long Beach Councilmembers. She also mentioned that this project is using an asset-based approach to planning that seeks to build off of the strengths of local neighborhoods.

PROJECT UPDATE
Melani Smith gave a description of the overall focus on neighborhood design and planning strategies, reminding people that the project will seek to develop conceptual plans in a number of key opportunity areas. The budget and schedule is not large enough to create a comprehensive plan for the entire planning area. Her summary also included an up date of work-to-date, including the following:

- updated project schedule showing the dates of the General Plan 2030 outreach
- progress on an Existing Conditions Report
- project concept diagram and accompanying resource table

OUTREACH SUMMARY
Tony from DSO provided an update of the public outreach thus far, including a summary of the interviews with Councilmembers Bonnie Lowenthal, Val Lerch, and Tonia Uranga. He also stated that during these presentations, neighborhood organizations are being invited to the Neighborhood Summit.

PROJECT DIAGRAM AND RESOURCE TABLE
Melani presented a diagram Meléndrez developed that shows the range of plans and planning issues—such as air quality and goods movement—that will influence the Community Livability
Plan but aren't necessarily the focus of the plan. The focus of the plan will be on neighborhood
design and community livability. Melani also presented a table that identifies the various public
agencies involved in these planning efforts.

Lee from MMA talked about how there is a question of time that can be connected to the graphic.
The outer rings refer to issues that will be addressed at a later date, for example with the
implementation of the 710 EIR and other long-term planning initiatives. The inner rings refer to
things that we can do now or in the near future, as part of this project and other neighborhood
initiatives.

Sumi encouraged people to make changes and/or additions to the table, including any plans or
documents that may have been left out. The following suggestions were made:

Lee Mayfield from Redevelopment mentioned that the Westside Project Advisory Committee has
done a lot of work within the planning area, and should be involved in the project. He also stated
that most of the Redevelopment project areas have strategic plans, and that he can make these
available to the project team.

Pat Garrow from Planning mentioned that the Red Book might be a good resource. It is a
citywide list of neighborhood organizations. (Note that the team is already using this resource)

AGENCY INTRODUCTIONS
During the Kick-off Meeting each participating agency on the project team was asked to provide a
summary of work they are currently doing that might be important for the Community Livability
Plan. Because the Redevelopment Agency and the Police Department were not present at the
Kick-off Meeting, Sumi asked the representatives to give summaries of their work.

Long Beach Police Department
Traffic is always a big issue. For example, along Del Amo Boulevard there have been many
impacts from road construction and traffic is always a big community concern. With an increase
in traffic, there is an increase in the number of accidents, increased use of local arterials, and an
increase in the number of noise complaints. Any improvements that are proposed as part of this
project should take into account the potential impact on traffic.

There is always a chance that the local homeless community will be impacted with any
neighborhood improvement project. Homeless individuals tend to be stationary. So if a new
project impacts an area where they live, they will be displaced.

It was also stated that homeless individuals are forced to cross the Los Angeles River and the I-710 in order to get to the local service center.

There is often a public safety issue associated with neighborhood enhancement projects, such as
streetscape plan, that sometimes reduce visibility for local motorists.

The department uses COPS philosophy and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
(CPTED) for the development of long-term crime prevention measures. Copies of their CPTED
literature can be made available to the project team.

Redevelopment Agency
Within the Central project area, current projects include:

- Willmore Historic District Plan implementation
- West Gateway development
• Pacific Avenue streetscape plan for Wrigley Village
• East Village
• Downtown plans on Atlantic Avenue--$100 million has been invested in this area
• 3-4 major projects between Pacific Coast Highway and Willow downtown. $100 million has been invested in this area
  o Public service yard within the Magnolia Avenue industrial district
  o Pine and PCH: land designated for a community recycling center
  o Long Beach Blvd. and Anaheim: TOD project. City is building 300-400 new units in the area

There was a discussion of how Redevelopment can incorporate community livability into specific project areas, including North, Central, West and Downtown. Because the Agency has so many relevant projects, it was mentioned that we don’t want to duplicate anything redevelopment is already working on. We should consider what livability means in TODs, historic districts, dense neighborhoods, etc.

One possibility is that Redevelopment could use Community Livability Plan concepts to market specific projects they are trying to develop. The plan documents would give them renderings and plans that might be useful to them.

The Community Livability Plan could also focus on the development of archetypes or examples of model projects that could be developed as part of the Community Livability Plan and then applied to other areas.

**Neighborhood Services**

The department has a Neighborhood Leadership Program. Participants in the program choose a neighborhood beautification project and implement it. There might be an opportunity for us to select a project for implementation.

The department has a strong relationship with Goodwill Industries, which is the largest stakeholder in the North Long Beach neighborhood.

**OTHER DEPARTMENT UPDATES**

**Long Beach Transit**

They have a Bus Stop Improvement Plan, which should be brought to the table. Shirley has some usage information for the transit system and bus routes that she can provide the team. (Note that this information has been submitted to the team)

**Council Staff**

The Drake-Chavez Greenbelt should be added to the list of relevant projects. It is not part of Riverlink, but will serve as an important open space linkage.

The LA County River Master Plan should also be brought to the table.
ADDENDUM:

After the meeting, an additional meeting was held with Carri Matsumoto of the Long Beach Unified School District.

In attendance:

Sumi Gant  
Melani Smith  
Steve Patton  
Lee Ward  
Irene Payan  
Shirley Hsiao  
Carri Matsumoto

FACILITY MASTER PLAN

LBUSD is currently in the process of developing a Facility Master Plan for the district. The district has eight million square feet of building space. The Master Plan includes:

Enrollment trends—projections will go to 2015. Currently there is a declining enrollment. In 2006 the district lost 2500 students. Most of this decline is at the elementary level. The highest enrollment is at the high school level.

Condition of facilities—there is a concern about aging facilities. Many building are not suitable for technology upgrades. 30% of classroom facilities are portable.

Planning Areas—the Master Plan delineates seven different planning areas, which are organized by high school attendance boundaries. Over 16 planning area committees (PACs) and several sub-committees have been established to focus on specific planning efforts. Each of these committees is developing a list of recommendations.

More information can be obtained at:  http://www.dejongprojects.com/?collection=Long+Beach.

Major Issues/Products

- Joint Use of Facilities: discussions within specific planning areas have focused on joint and shared use of facilities and the development of smaller facilities. Carri has met with Parks, Recreation and Marine to talk about the joint use of facilities. There is sub-committee for the joint use of facilities.

- A Live In-Live Out Analysis has been developed. It is available online.

- A questionnaire was developed and given to individuals within each planning area. The results are available online.

- Many people are interested in pre-kinder services and full days for kindergarten.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTEGRATION

There are opportunities for integrating information from the Facility Master plan into the Community Livability Plan.
The Jordan and Cabrillo planning areas are within the Community Livability planning area. Although, it might be better to community directly with specific school representatives, rather than go through the specific planning area representatives.

The District could look at schools around the corridor and put together a working group focused on community livability issues related to schools within our planning area. The District would appreciate criteria for 710 school design that is responsive to key livability issues.
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MEETING #3 NOTES
April 27, 2007

In attendance:

Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Meléndrez
Steve Patton—Meléndrez
Irene Payan—DSO
Shirley Hsiao—Long Beach Transit
Pat Garrow—City of Long Beach Department of Planning
Scott Robertson—Long Beach Police Department
Lee Mayfield—Redevelopment Agency
David White—Redevelopment Agency
Jonathan Kraus—Office of the 8th District
Dennis Thys—Neighborhood Services
Jeff Benedict—Department of Health and Human Services
Carri Matsumoto—Long Beach Unified School District
Jonda Matrone—Office of the 9th District
Anna Mendiola—Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine

INTRODUCTION
Sumi Gant gave a short summary of work that has been accomplished since the last team meeting, including the various presentations that we have given to local community stakeholder groups, and progress that has been made on the project base maps.

PROJECT UPDATE
Melani Smith elaborated on Sumi's introduction and provided a progress report of work that was accomplished in the last month. The project team met with David White from Redevelopment to review the various projects and development initiatives that are happening in the Central Long Beach project area. A similar meeting will be held to discuss projects in the North Long Beach and West Long Beach project areas.

The team has now given a number of presentations to community stakeholders and Long Beach Councilmembers. The locations and geographic spread of the meetings we are holding with stakeholders has been mapped for easier review, and shared with the team. The goal of these presentations is to inform individuals in the community about the project. In general, attendees understand and accept that this project is different than the 710 EIR/EIS. Only a small group of individuals have expressed skepticism about the project. Common interests and concerns expressed in these presentations include the following:

- Long Beach Riverlink
- Pedestrian improvements and safety
- Bicycle improvements and safety
- ADA access for seniors
- Homelessness issues in the River corridor
- Access from one side of the freeway and river corridor to the other
- Pride in local neighborhoods and the corridor itself
- Focus should be on ideas that can actually be implemented
- Traffic coming off of bridges
- Traffic-calming measures
- More planting along major corridors
With regard to presentations to Councilmembers, the following themes and concerns emerged:

- Southern California Intermodal Gateway (SCIG), though adjacent to the City, is a concern because of its potential impacts
- Connecting communities/centers of communities
- Finding the “low-hanging fruit” i.e. projects that can actually be implemented
- Freeway access
- Noise related to the I-710
- Enhancing the corridor by planting trees
- Access from one side of the freeway and river corridor to the other

A list of potential Regional Stakeholders was distributed. The team is in the process of compiling a list of contacts. Outreach to these groups will most likely be done through phone interviews with key individuals. Team members were asked to suggest additional stakeholders that could be contacted. The following groups were identified:

**Rethinking Long Beach**: they are a private advocacy group working on a range of issues

**Rivers and Mountains Conservancy**: work on river corridor issues for the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers

**REVIEW OF BASE MAPS**

Melani provided a summary of the base maps that have been developed thus far. It was decided that PDF files of these maps would be sent out to everyone on the project team so people would have a chance to review the maps and provide comments. The following comments were made about the maps:

Pat Garrow mentioned that the technical background report for the General Plan Update has an existing land use map. This map will replace the map presented at the meeting.

On the Community Facilities map, there was a question about the definition of the Neighborhood Centers category on the Community Design map. The Central Long Beach project area defines neighborhood centers as strategic areas that have a public facility, park and retail area within a residential neighborhood. The North Long Beach project area defines neighborhood center as a pedestrian-oriented area.

Sumi provided some additional information about the Bridge Improvements category on the Community Design map. MTA/Caltrans will take 10 to 20 years at best with regard to the completion of ultimate expansion plans for the I-710 Freeway. However, some early action projects have been identified and include bridge improvements at PCH, Anaheim Street and the Shoemaker Bridge. Sumi also pointed out that the Shoemaker Bridge is mislabeled on the map.

It was pointed out that Dooley School needs to be added to the Community Design map. We should also add senior centers to the map, including the senior center at 4th and Orange.

**TEAM UPDATES**

**Schools**: There was a discussion about how we can integrate school input into the Community Livability plan, and whether or not we intend to engage private schools (we think this is outside our capabilities). Carri Matsumoto mentioned that timing is difficult because this is a very busy time of the year for LBUSD. In addition, the short time frame of this project makes it more difficult to coordinate with the District. Carri does think there would be utility in creating a series of livable schools principles in this project that she can apply as she gets into the design phase and the
implementation of the LBUSD facilities master plan. David White suggested that perhaps design principles and strategies could be geared toward three categories of schools in the corridor: those directly I-710 adjacent, those that are in neighborhood centers, and those that are located along major commercial corridors.

**Public Works:** Sumi mentioned that the previous day she had attended a workshop with seniors, in which data on pedestrian accidents and fatalities was presented. Accidents and fatalities involving seniors have increased in the last several years, and we should think about creating more pedestrian safe environments for seniors in particular.

**Air Quality and Health:** Jeff Benedict stated that there is a lot going on with regard to health. He is going to provide the project team with a copy of the Health Risk Assessment for the City. The Air Quality Element is also a good document, though it is not going to be updated as part of the Long Beach 2030 General Plan Update.

**SITE TOUR**
We are shooting for June 1st, the first Friday in June, as the date for the site tour. The timeframe for the tour would be from 9:00-12:00 AM. Shirley Hsiao stated that she can help provide us transportation for the tour. The team has been asked to identify and nominate specific sites that could be included in the tour.

**CORRECTIONS TO MEETING #2 NOTES**
Carri Matsumoto pointed out the following correction to the meeting notes:
- Long Beach Unified School District has eight million square feet of building space, not two million square feet of land.
- In a description of school building facilities, it was stated that “many building are not suitable for technology upgrades and/or have seismic problems.” The term ‘seismic problems’ was removed from this statement because this is not a term that the district uses.
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MEETING #4 NOTES
July 20, 2007

In attendance:

Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Meléndrez
Steve Patton—Meléndrez
Tony Torres—DSO
Irene Payan—DSO
Lee Ward—MMA
Dan Rosenfeld—Long Beach Transit
Shirley Hsiao—Long Beach Transit
Pat Garrow—Department of Planning
David White—Redevelopment Agency
Dennis Thys—Neighborhood Services
Jonda Matrone—Office of the 9th District
Anna Mendiola—Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine
Steve Gerheardt—Department of Planning
Ray Choi—Metro
Jerry Caligiuri—Office of the 9th District
Ray Pok—Office of the 7th District
Marlene Arrona—Long Beach Police Department
Bianca Román—Office of the 1st District
Susan Ahn—Long Beach Unified School District (sitting in for Carri Matsumoto)
Karen Heit—Gateway Cities Council of Governments

INTRODUCTION
Sumi Gant gave a short summary of work that has been accomplished since the last team meeting, including the site tour and finalization of community outreach presentations.

PROJECT UPDATE
Melani Smith provided an additional summary of work accomplished to-date, including a description of the site tour, completion of the draft Existing Conditions Report, and finalization of Task One and the community outreach presentations.

REGIONAL STAKEHOLDERS
Melani also talked about outreach to regional stakeholders, which is currently in process. A contact list of regional stakeholders was handed out to team members. These stakeholders were recently contacted by email. Melani emphasized to the team our understanding that additional follow-up will be needed.

The following suggestions were made regarding additional people we may want to contact.

Ray Pok mentioned that we might want to change the contact person we currently have listed for the Rivers and Mountains Conservancy. Patrick O'Donnell of the 4th District and former Mayoral candidate Frank Colonna are both on the Board of Directors.

Dan Rosenfeld suggested that Long Beach Gas and Oil Department be added to the utilities list.

Dennis Thys suggested we speak with elected officials outside of the city since these individuals will likely be important resources for securing potential funding for projects that come out of this initiative.
Ray Pok suggested we contact someone from the Water Replenishment District. Lillian Kawasaki, who is on the Board of Directors, was mentioned as a good contact because she is the Division Three representative and is also a resident of the Los Cerritos neighborhood.

Ray Pok pointed out that Joe Cassmassi is probably not the right person to contact at the South Coast Air Quality Management District, and that it would be better to speak with someone from Public Affairs. He is going to provide the project team with a contact name.

NEIGHBORHOOD DESIGN WORKSHOPS
Melani gave a summary of the Neighborhood Design Workshops. The flyer, a workshop agenda, the Powerpoint outline, and a description of the small group activity were all handed out. She spoke about the change that has occurred with the original idea for the workshops, and the fact that it has gone from two weekend-long charettes to four short workshops that will be held at night. Irene gave a summary of what she has accomplished with regard to outreach to residents and community groups for workshop #1 on August 8.

It was pointed out that the location of workshop #4 was wrong on the flyer (note that this error was corrected directly after the meeting).

Melani then went through the Powerpoint outline to give people an understanding of what will be presented at each workshop. She emphasized that the overall focus of the Powerpoint is to get people thinking about possible neighborhood improvements by providing documentation of existing conditions as well as a photo survey of potential neighborhood improvements.

Melani then gave a summary of the small group exercise.

The following questions/comments were made about the workshops:

- **How much time will each workshop take?** It is anticipated that each workshop will go until 9:00, or 2.5 hours.
- **Can we cater each presentation to the specific neighborhood?** Sumi informed everyone that we are going to present the same information at all four workshops
- **Missing from the agenda is a section about next steps.** This will be added to the closing remarks section on the agenda.
- **Can Neighborhood Services provide translation equipment?** Dennis Thys is going to look into this.
- **Can the meeting start at 7:00 instead of 6:30?** Some people have difficulty getting to a public meeting before 7:00. It is going to be difficult to start at 7:00 because we have limited time at each venue, and we have a lot to cover because of the size of the study area and the complexity of the issues involved.
- **David White suggested that, at each workshop, we organize specific small groups into the four different geographic areas that are listed in the flyer. This way, people can talk about issues that are specific to their own neighborhoods.**
- **Dan Rosenfeld suggested that we assign job to specific individuals, which will help neutralize overly-aggressive individuals.**

UPDATES/COMMENTS FROM SPECIFIC TEAM MEMBERS

*Gateway Cities Council of Governments Clean Air Action Plan:* One of the outcomes of the Project Oversight Committee for the I-710 Major Corridor Study was the suggestion that GCCOG develop an Air Quality Action Plan to address specific community concerns regarding air quality. An initial grant of 75K was allocated for the plan. Gladstein, Neandross and Associates were
hired to develop a Preliminary Report for the AQAP. Karen Heit will make copies of this report available to anyone who is interested. The report includes a summary of air quality plans in the region, as well as a list of early action items that will be moved through the transportation committee.

The process for developing the AQAP has been delayed so GCCOG is currently behind schedule in terms of the overall development of the plan.

*Long Beach Riverlink:* the Long Beach Riverlink project was just awarded $5 million in funding for four Riverlink projects, including the Wrigley Greenbelt, Drake Greenbelt, Baker-Golden mini-park and the Deforest Wetlands. The Rivers and Mountains Conservancy had $6 million dollars in funding that had not been earmarked for any specific project. Los Angeles County made a deal with the Conservancy that five million dollars of this money would be reallocated to the City of Long Beach for implementation of the Riverlink system.

*General Plan Update:* The Planning Department has wrapped up Phase One, which included a series of Community Festivals, and is now entering into Phase Two. The Planning Department is currently preparing for a meeting with their internal advisory committee. After that, they will start working on the framework for the plan.

**PROJECT FUNDING**
Sumi pointed out that, with regard to the funding of the Community Livability Plan, she anticipates that much of the funding for more short-term projects will come from specific departments. Long-term funding for the project could be obtained by turning the project over to Caltrans as part of a mitigation package.

Melani encouraged people to push us to develop specific components of the plan that could potentially be tied to specific funding sources.

**OTHER COMMENTS**
Dennis Thys commented to the group that we need to figure out a way to tie the Community Livability Plan together with many of the other plans and projects that are currently happening in Long Beach. One concern is that, because there are so many initiatives currently taking place, residents are going to get planning fatigue and won’t be able to distinguish between these different projects. The connection with the Community Livability Plan with other plans therefore needs to be figured out so that we can communicate a clear objective to community residents.

It was stated that the overall focus for Phase One of the project has been community outreach, and in the presentations that have been given to local neighborhood groups much emphasis has been placed on making this distinction between the Community Livability Plan and other planning efforts. We have told everyone that we are the 710 expansion, and that we are not the General Plan Update. Response from individuals has been favorable, and people seem to understand that the Community Livability Plan is a distinct project. It was mentioned, however, that we still might struggle to get people to come to our workshops because it is something we are asking them to do on their own time, in addition to the community events they already attend.
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MEETING #5 NOTES
October 12, 2007

In attendance:
Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Meléndrez
Steve Patton—Meléndrez
Irene Payan—DSO
Lee Ward—MMA
Pat Garrow—Department of Planning
Dennis Thys—Neighborhood Services
Dennis Eschen—Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine
Ray Choi—Metro
Jerry Caligiuri—Office of the 9th District
Susan Ahn—Long Beach Unified School District (sitting in for Carri Matsumoto)
Jonathan Kraus—Office of the 8th District
John Pope—Port of Long Beach
Ryan Gragnano—Port of Long Beach
Scott Robertson—Long Beach Police Department
Claudia Escobedo—Office of the 1st District
Aldo Schindler—Redevelopment Department

INTRODUCTION
Sumi Gant gave a short summary of the four Neighborhood Design Workshops that were held in August.

PROJECT UPDATE
Melani Smith provided an additional summary of the Neighborhood Design Workshops, including a summary of the overall process and the emphasis on the three key questions that were asked. She also summarized our methodology for compiling the comments from the workshops into a series of categories.

There was a brief summary of the outreach process for the Regional Stakeholders, and the fact that we have received very little response from individuals who were asked to fill out a questionnaire about this project. It was suggested that a group format for future outreach to these individuals might be a better strategy.

Irene gave a short summary of work she has completed to date organizing the eight community outreach meetings planned for October and November, as well as the three Community Livability Plan review meetings scheduled for late November and December.

Concern was expressed that there is a missing link in the community outreach process because there is a section in the middle of the study area—located around the Wrigley neighborhood—that is not going to be approached in the next community outreach phase. Jonathan Krause suggested that someone attend one a “Community Coffee” meeting currently scheduled for November 3rd. Note: since the meeting an additional outreach meeting has been scheduled with the Wrigley Alliance on November 1st.
UPDATES/COMMENTS FROM SPECIFIC TEAM MEMBERS

Neighborhood Services Bureau: Neighborhood Services has a community forestry program and in the last ten years has planted 12,000 trees in the city. They recently received a grant from the State to plant 1,000 trees.

Long Beach Unified School District: some of the elementary schools in the city are also in the process of planting trees on specific sites. It’s a collaboration with Tree People. Maintenance has been an issue with these projects.

Public Works: with regard to the air quality and 710 expansion issues, we need to figure out the best way to put these issues into the hands of the people who are involved in that process. These comments need to be captured and acknowledged in the 710 outreach process. With regard to pedestrian/bike improvements, Public Works is in the process of completing a grant application for Safe Routes to Schools, which is a possible grant funding source that could address the issues that have been raised in this process.

DHHS: there are a lot of things happening with regard to air quality, particularly around Port of Long Beach and Port of LA activities. The MATES III study is supposed to be released soon. They are anticipating very different results compared to MATES II because there are more monitoring sites. MATES III should therefore have better data. The Health Risk Assessment was potentially controversial because the results seemed to negate the Corridor of Death model that many people ascribe to the 710. However, there are definitely problems with that model. Hopefully the MATES III study will further clarify the existing condition of air quality along the corridor.

Port of Long Beach: the Port can provide information related to their air quality programs, eg. clean trucks and air quality monitoring.

SOCIOECONOMIC DATA

A brief summary of the socioeconomic analysis that was completed for the plan was given. It provides a simple snapshot of the study area, broken down by the four corridor subareas, with regard to race, household income and age.

LONG BEACH NEIGHBORHOODS CONCEPT

Melani gave a brief explanation of the San Jose Strong Neighborhoods Initiative, which could serve as a possible precedent for the development of a similar program in Long Beach. The Community Livability Plan could potentially introduce this concept to the City. The model could be very beneficial in encouraging greater and ongoing collaboration happening among the different departments involved in livability issues in the City.

OTHER COMMENTS

City Council study session: it was stated that there needs to be a study session with Council before we start proposing a bunch of potentially controversial policies and recommendations that they are not aware of. Sumi spoke with Ray Pok about a possible November study session with the City Council I-710 Oversight Committee. This will give us an opportunity to talk about the Community Livability Plan and the Shoemaker Bridge project, both of which will go to the Committee.

Safe Routes to School projects: are there any possible projects within the study area that could be funded by the Safe Routes to School grant? The Los Cerritos pedestrian overpass has a lot of potential, but this project involves a partnership with Caltrans.
Bridges: with regard to possible improvements of bridges that go over the 710, a cooperative agreement was done many years ago that needs to be reviewed so that we understand the various restrictions, jurisdictional issues, etc.

Another working group meeting will be held on November 16th before we go to the Community Livability Plan review meetings in late November and December.
MEETING #6 NOTES
November 16, 2007

In attendance:
Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Meléndrez
Steve Patton—Meléndrez
Irene Payan—DSO
Lee Ward—MMA
Dennis Eschen—Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine
Roy Choi—Metro
Bianca Román—Council District One
Linda Ivers—Council District Eight
Tim Patton—Council District Seven
Susan Ahn—Long Beach Unified School District (sitting in for Carri Matsumoto)
Jason Kim—Harbor Department

PROJECT UPDATE
This Working Group focused entirely on presenting the proposed corridor and neighborhood livability improvements that the project team developed after the Neighborhood Design Workshops. Melani and Sumi gave brief project recaps, including reviewing the project tables created from the comments generated at the workshops as well as the summary of the second round of outreach meetings that took place in September and October.

PROJECT MAPS AND CONCEPTUAL PLANS
Melani presented the corridor and neighborhood improvements maps and conceptual plans.

COMMENTS
Los Cerritos trail: the trailhead that connects to the Los Cerritos pedestrian bridge also goes north to the Dominguez Gap wetlands and the LA River. This should be shown on the neighborhoods improvement map.

Deforest Wetlands: to improve connectivity between the South Street Parkway and the Deforest Wetlands, an entrance to the wetlands could be located at South St. as shown on the map.

Wardlow Overpass: this project is part of the Locally Preferred Strategy for the I-710. The ramps on Wardlow near the 405 are going to be removed.

Alleys: under Public Works, alley funding is the same as streets and sidewalks. The enhancement of alleys could be addressed through assessment districts, but this would have to be approved by local residents.

School Issue: only selected schools are currently called our for livability improvements on the neighborhoods map. We need to call out all schools for livability improvements.

Cabrillo High School: LBUSD has a project to improve part of the Cabrillo property on Hill St, which involves planting trees in front of a new building.

710 Ramps: would it be possible to get Caltrans funding for these?
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WORKING GROUP #7 - MEETING NOTES
Friday, January 25, 2008, 10:00 AM

In attendance:

Sumi Gant—City of Long Beach Department of Public Works
Melani Smith—Melendrez
Valerie Watson (for Steve Patton)—Melendrez
Irene Payan—DSO
Jeff Benedict—Health
Claudia Escobedo—Vice Mayor Bonnie L.
Lee Mayfield—Redevelopment/Long Beach Development Services
Ray Pok—Council District 7 – Uranga
Lei Ronca—CD-NSB
Pat Garrow—City of Long Beach Department of Planning
Edith Martinez—LB Unified School District
Shirley Hsiao—Long Beach Transit
Roy Choi—Metro
Jonathan Kraus—8th Council District

PROJECT RECAP (Melani Smith)
- Held 3 design review workshops in Nov. – 80 attendees: 1. Chavez; 2. Cabrillo; 3. Dooley
- Comments from participants reinforced comments from before; positive response
- Most important: 710 mitigation; streets, trees, and pedestrian improvements; Dooley had more to say than other workshop locations
- Same concerns as previous round of workshops: where is funding coming from?; river corridor itself, homeless, crime.
- We consolidated this and everything we’ve done so far into the draft plan you now have.

REVIEW
- Working group has one more week to review and make comments on the draft plan.

CHAPTER TWO
- Like that Ch. 2 consolidates plans and information all in one place. A good resource for everyone!
- LA River Estuary: how far will dredging affect the Estuary? Mouth of the river to where? Dominguez Gap and DeForest?
- AIR QUALITY: monitoring stations are located at Hudson School / Cesar Chavez in addition to N. Long Beach and the one by the Harbor – issue of data – reconcile the two studies
  - MATES III: diesel is the main issue…reiterates USC and MATES II studies – major corridors are impacted by diesel from trucks as well as stationary sources offshore – ships idling
  - Public may perceive refineries as major polluters, maybe because they constantly smell odors, but it’s really diesel trucks and ships.
  - One Ship = All Refineries in terms of emissions
  - CARB has a RAV4 that drives around to monitor
  - Can monitor freeways but there is background pollution coming from ships offshore that interferes, so you can’t get accurate reading on freeway-only pollution
  - Different interpretations Melani brought up is a result from different MATES approaches
  - Adding more monitors yields more data but doesn’t improve air quality
LB as a REGION is actually cleaner than IE places like Fontana, but corridors are heavily impacted – higher than Fontana.

- MATES III, still in draft form, is to look at REGION, not individual sources
  - Diesel is 84% of total air toxin risk
  - Pronounced exposure at intermodal sites and corridors

- Street Enhancements Master Plan
  - 3 year action plan is completed
  - still addressing additional streets for paving and will complete median planting on Del Amo, Atlantic, and Artesia (above and beyond 3 year action plan)
  - Central Strategic Plan is completed

To Do:
- Give web links in Ch. 2 as well – perhaps in the margins?
- Put into document where monitoring stations are... MATES sites: Wilmington and Long Beach Boulevard (?)
- Make sure Street Enhancements Master Plan reflects comments above.

CHAPTER THREE

To Do:
- Sub Area discussions: describe more about who attended and why their concerns might be focused on one issue. Example: South area concerns were related to safe routes to school because two schools are located between on and off ramps
- Put a smaller location map of where north, south, etc. are next to discussions of subareas towards the end of the chapter. (so you know south people live near downtown)
- Make sure language about “no concern” or “zero concern” instead reads “less of a priority.”
- Get rid of the word “ranked”

CHAPTER FOUR

- Hudson has a pilot program for classroom air purifiers
- EICO has a proposal to do portable air purifiers
- Do not show private schools on Community Assets Map, stick to public
- Need to include more on transit improvements in Plan such as bus shelters, etc. areas in plan when talking about pedestrian improvements is the right time to discuss transit improvements as well.
- Describe the importance of the integration of transit improvements through a discussion of: rider ship and population; bus stops and other transit related facilities and amenities are a major part of the urban environment; show how transit can be pleasantly integrated into the environment – put photos in document near other corridor wide improvements

To Do:
- Show Dooley School on Community Assets Map
- Sutter is now Lindsey – revise on Community Assets Map
- Page 33 – rail system: it’s “Locally Preferred Strategy” not Alternative – change to read
  - Change to read “I-710 Corridor Project EIR/EIS” (this is the future study)
  - Not automobiles – remove reference.
  - (Incidentally, Jan 28 is contract award date – kickoff is Feb 6-7)
- #49 – no associated conceptual plan for Shoemaker so take off the * by Shoemaker on Page 40 Neighborhoods Map
- NIS areas are permanent – but we do improvements outside of NIS areas too – so should include other areas and also explain that code enforcement is very active in the south, that’s why this wasn’t a concern (in Ch. 3)
- Label the improvements from 1 to 15 on the Birds Eye drawings too.
- On Page 40, couldn’t find point #43 on neighborhood improvements map – make sure there’s a correct label for #43
- Write in Figure numbers on all design plans (currently only says Figure X-X)
- Enlarge numbers on Key Map (Figure 4-4)
- Add discussion on transit improvements when pedestrian improvements are mentioned.
- Show how transit can be better integrated into urban environment with photos and graphics – how transit, pedestrians and bikeways can all be integrated pleasantly. Perhaps near corridor-wide improvements photos.
- Include photos of multimodal transit.
- Show photos of people actually in corridor like pedestrians, cyclists, kids walking to school, etc. in existing conditions photos or elsewhere.
- Write what the major concerns were for each subarea, like one sentence summarizing/listing major concerns.
## Interview with Councilmember Bonnie Lowenthal

### March 19, 2007

**What are the most significant community livability initiatives and accomplishments you can point to in your District?**

- Condo Association Folks
- Chavez School
- Renaissance High School
- Westside Industrial Area

**Are there key community stakeholders, relevant to this project, in your District, not already on our list?**

- Gateway Cities partnership
- MTA
- Aquarium

**Are there specific areas you would target either as neighborhood design models to be duplicated, or as in need of change or improvement, in your District’s corridor neighborhoods? And are there specific areas you think we should include on our site tour?**

- Bembridge House
- Enhancing the corridors
- Vacant lots
- 7th Street TOD
### INTERVIEW WITH COUNCILMEMBERS TONIA URANGA AND RAE GABELICH
#### March 20, 2007

**What are the most important community livability issues/areas of concern expressed by your constituents?**
- SCIG presentations by ACTA - schools impacted along the I-710 corridor
- Schools, parks and libraries - currently it isn't possible to cross the freeway to get to parks or libraries
- Rumor about schools closing
- Lighting inadequate on Willow
- Willow - library access
- Wardlow and Blue Line Wrigley Heights off ramp
- Connecting communities and centers of communities

**What are the most significant community livability initiatives and accomplishments you can point to in your District?**
- Painted bridges
- Reconfigured ramps, added pedestrian refuge islands
- Renaissance High School
- Westside Industrial Area

**Are there key community stakeholders, relevant to this project, in your District, not already on our list?**

**Are there specific areas you would target either as neighborhood design models to be duplicated, or as in need of change or improvement, in your District’s corridor neighborhoods? And are there specific areas you think we should include on our site tour?**
- Find the low hanging fruit - channel to things that can be done
INTERVIEW WITH COUNCILMEMBER VAL LERCH
March 20, 2007

What are the most important community livability issues/areas of concern expressed by your constituents?
- Pier pass - 8 month experiment
- Soundwalls in Coolidge
- Alternative transportation systems must be considered
- Mature trees
- Noise studies

What are the most significant community livability initiatives and accomplishments you can point to in your District?

Are there key community stakeholders, relevant to this project, in your District, not already on our list?

Are there specific areas you would target either as neighborhood design models to be duplicated, or as in need of change or improvement, in your District’s corridor neighborhoods? And are there specific areas you think we should include on our site tour?
**Community Comments**

- Parks where will they be built?
- Where's the funding coming from?
- Many concrete sidewalks are elevated, makes walking for seniors and others very dangerous.
- Crossing streets is very dangerous too many big turcks along neighborhood.
- Can big trucks be separated from cars?
- On Willow where no U turns are allowed, many drivers still go ahead and make these turns.
- Many blind spots on Santa Fe Ave, can the median islands be designed to be safer?
- Can there be better signage thru-out in terms of the traffic flow.
### I710 Corridor Neighborhoods
Community Drop In Meeting Comments

**PRESENTATION TO LONG BEACH ASTHMA COALITION**  
June 21, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns were expressed about expanding the 710, and the fact that there is already too much pollution associated with it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anaheim, PCH and Willow bridges are all considered dangerous for pedestrians, including Cabrillo High School students to cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broken sidewalks are a concern, especially for women walking with kids and strollers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are many homeless people around the parks, which is a concern. Although the City should be cautious about just moving homeless people out, and shifting the problem to other areas, instead of coming up with real solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need better signage around Cesar Chavez elementary, relating to school crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need better maintenance in parks, the grass is yellow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school nurse at Hudson Elementary has a &quot;detox room&quot; in which the air is filtered more than in the rest of the school. Kids can use the room after they have been playing outside and are feeling the effects of the air pollution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Community Comments**

- 22 Freeway may be a good model for soundwall and custom design treatments
- Countdown pedestrian signals are good devices that help people cross the street
- Truck traffic is a problem for the community
- How does the community voice concerns about intersections that need signals?
- Would the City consider in pavement flashers for pedestrian crossings, like Santa Monica uses?
- 710 Freeway ramps on the east side at Del Amo look bad, need improvement
- Willow bridge should be considered for improvements
- Issue in the 710 freeway corridor is the homeless. Don't have anything against them, but we should help them by finding them another place to go.
### Community Comments

No comments received, brief project introduction only
### Community Comments

- Many homeless live along the 710 bank on PCH. Can we do something about that?
- Need sidewalks on PCH and the bridge needs to be more pedestrian friendly
- The traffic coming off the bridge onto eastbound PCH needs to be slowed
- More plantings on PCH and the embankment
- Pedestrian safety improvements and traffic calming for students that walk to Cabrillo on PCH
- Prohibit the left turn for trucks onto Golden from PCH - they get stuck
- Expand the bike path on PCH
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The area feels dangerous at night; better lighting is needed around the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No crossing guards at the intersections near the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a need to make the routes to school safer because many children walk from the surrounding neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More crosswalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many families are concerned about air quality and asthma</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I710 Corridor Neighborhoods
Community Drop In Meeting Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The Santa Fe beautification needs more work - not beautiful enough yet. Dry trees and a little grass is not enough. Need to do building improvements as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Concerns about the 710 expansion and pollution and health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Think about intersections and timing signals better so that people can cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is no light at 32nd and Santa Fe, so it is tough to access Webster on foot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wheelchair access and stroller access is limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student drop offs in the bus zones around the school are a problem. Need signage telling people where and how to drop off kids. Not enough drop off areas around Muir.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicycle routes are important, esp in the river corridor along the 710.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Homelessness is a problem in the river corridor; need better security. Not able to use a bike to get to the beach; the pathway is not safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which areas will be destroyed, and schools impacted by the 710 project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PCH bridge at night is scary for people on bikes, and for students crossing to get to school even during the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A community park at Chestnut and 14th has been promised. Is it really happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which areas will be destroyed, and schools impacted by the 710 project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Which areas will be destroyed, and schools impacted by the 710 project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Comments

- The Edison right-of-way from Del Amo north to Artesia is a desert now that the nurseries are no longer there. We should work with Edison about what that land is used for. Could be a forest of trees. Its condition impacts the impression of what the community is all about.
- Consider the multiple environmental benefits of trees.
- Consider a solar farm in the Edison right of way
- Consider advanced bikeway design, tied into the Riverlink project, as part of this project
- 710 project should consider alternative technologies, like mag lev
- Any livable community solutions need to consider air pollution mitigation
- Consider other model programs like Costa Mesa Releaf
- Truck parking and truck routes are issues
- Instead of soundwalls, think of the freeway edges as greenbelts.
**Community Comments**

- Be aware of the homeless problem in the corridor, and in the River corridor.
- Powell School tree planting was done - needed it very much given its proximity to the corridor - kids say that it "smells funny" on the playground when they are out there.
- Coolidge Triangle neighborhood was mentioned as very impacted by the 710.
- Planting trees would help the corridor, and the River corridor.
- Jointly consider all of the planning that is going on in Long Beach - that will help as a starting point.
- Consider financing issues for anything we propose.
- At one time there was a plan to extend the Terminal Island freeway to the 405 - this would help a great deal with Port traffic, though would require home removals.
- SCIG may help in relieving goods movement impacts on the neighborhoods, rail should be emphasized, as well as increasing use of the Alameda corridor.
- Clean diesel for trucks is necessary as well.
- Don’t add any blank walls in the corridor - cover them all with planting to decrease opportunities for graffiti.
- Emphasize the boundary of this project.
## Community Comments

- Streets and sidewalks are very unsafe
- Many residents are concerned about the safety of the industrial plants in the area
- Concern about air quality
- Drivers on main streets drive too fast and pedestrians are in danger; better crosswalks should be constructed
### Community Comments

- **1200 block of Cameron at Wise - 710 freeway clean up project, accessed from eastbound Wardlow offramp from 710.** Cleaned up the berm and planted only shrubs, no groundcover, no trees. Unsatisfactory and should be improved.

- **Need to determine who's jurisdiction(s) the bridges over the 710 fall under -** e.g. the Wardlow bridge is three different paint colors, a lot of it is peeling. What does this say about the neighborhood?

- **All of the bridges need work, and could be much better gateways into the neighborhoods -** Wardlow is a neighborhood bridge, vs. Anaheim, which is an industrial bridge

- **Add lighting to the bridges - for decoration as well as safety**

- Wardlow bridge could accommodate a bike path and sidewalks

- **In Wrigley Heights, at the end of Magnolia, where the 7th and 8th District meet, there's a walking bridge, which is on an on-ramp for the 710**

- Don't reinvent the wheel in this project, consider the final report for the Tier 2 Committee, and their Comments and Mitigations. Start there for our suggested improvements, don't start with a clean slate. Don't waste the neighbors time. They've been through a lot of meetings and planning. Come into the workshops with ideas, based on what has gone before, don't just start with "what do you want to change"

- **Also consider the Community Cluster presentations and work from the first General Plan go-around, and the work of the Central PAC**

- Don't come in and tell the community what it wants, despite what it says it wants - e.g. the Central Project Area plan for housing over retail on Willow Street, west of the 710 - this is not what the community wants.

- **Consider native plants, and appropriate street trees, not non-native eucalyptus, which is what is in some of the medians on Santa Fe**

- Look at parkways as well as medians, when doing streetscape improvements

- Suggest concepts that can be implemented in the short term, so that progress can be seen and tracked.

- Make connections for the community about where to go for funding for projects, grants and other funding

- **$5000 promised to the neighborhood for signage "welcome to the Westside" and never materialized.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• New fire station to be built at the nw corner of Orange &amp; Artesia, may also include the LBFD warehouse facilities as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orizaba murals under the 91 freeway are a good model for improvements, as well as the Andy Street murals, and the Veterans Mural on Harding Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider Atlantic Avenue undercrossing near the 91 and 710 interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be aware that additional foliage attracts rodents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Comments

- Wheelchair accessibility on sidewalks on Del Amo, Atlantic and Orange, around Carmelitos is a problem. LB Transit bus benches, signs and light poles are obstacles.
- Sidewalks should be 6’ wide.
- Consider accessibility for seniors.
- Consider curb ramps at intersections, are they installed on all four corners? Or can you use one and get to the other side and find there isn't one there?
- Orange Avenue is just as bad as Atlantic, but at least has a bike lane, which folks in wheelchairs use.
- Think about incorporating wheelchair accommodation in bike lanes, special markings, striping, signage, etc…
- 51st Street - no crosswalk? At many crosswalks, walk time is too short.
- Consider traffic control within Carmelitos itself, there has been a pedestrian death.
- Add trees!
- Look at residents’ pathway from Carmelitos to Atlantic - it is dark and unsafe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments/North Long Beach PAC Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Long Beach Boulevard and Atlantic Boulevard are the major corridors in north long beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Village - key commercial area on Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 59th and Atlantic is a key new development by Amcal Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One way couplets are being tested in the Dairy Neighborhood, Ellis &amp; 56th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admiral Kidd Park teen center is opening now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a utility box painting project by a artist in Virginia Village, on LB Blvd and 56th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider noise study information on 90805.net, as well as USC Health Risk Study information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Think about lighting upgrades for safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sound walls are great but need to consider graffiti, cover them with vines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Turn the freeway edge into a greenbelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider planting that thrives in smoggy environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community Comments

- Concern about kids crossing the bridge at Artesia from westside of the freeway over to Jordan high
- In workshops, provide maps, sketches, and images as ideas to help people visualize solutions
- Think about carving the corridor into subdistricts, so that we can deal with smaller parts
- Make sure to provide food at workshops
- Big ideas should be considered too, like decking over the River and providing development areas there
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No comments received, brief project introduction only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I710 Corridor Neighborhoods**
Community Drop In Meeting Comments

---

**PRESENTATION TO EAST VILLAGE ARTS DISTRICT**
April 19, 2007

**Community Comments**

- Need to consider authenticity in design solutions - really reflect the history and character of Long Beach in what we do
- Consider bicycle routes as well as roadways
- Homelessness must be considered in the corridor, and specifically the LA River corridor
- Excited about the potential for the whole corridor to change, and to provide a series of different experiences and destinations in the neighborhoods, all the way down to Downtown
- Have to consider maintenance as well as installation in anything we do
## I710 Corridor Neighborhoods
### Community Drop In Meeting Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Riverlink is an excellent opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordination with the General Plan update is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perhaps we should focus on one area, such as the river, and do it well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Aesthetic improvements relating to the freeway corridor and improving the image of the city are important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# I710 Corridor Neighborhoods
## Community Drop In Meeting Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The city is already planned to death - we need more implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interest in the river, but don't want to see that effort take away from the neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific improvements include being able to access the river trails in regulare time frames and know the gates will be unlocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are are going to plan only the Caltrans portion of the freeway - to Anaheim - or the whole corridor to the end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We should include ideas that are real and that we think can be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Why hasn't the neighborhood association been consulted about the design of Drake Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking is a problem in these neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**I710 Corridor Neighborhoods**  
Community Drop In Meeting Comments

**PRESENTATION TO WEST EASTSIDE COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION**  
April 5, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• River corridor enhancements were mentioned, especially related to bicyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bicycling in general was seen as important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This group hosts a safety fair for kids relating to bikes and stakeboarders - on June 2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• River bike path - water, fountains and planting; separation and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community gathering - Walmart downtown; music, people, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bike path - parks linked to it; nore design, setting the city apart, draw on the art community; better separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More use of the Alameda Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consider the homeless population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blue Line - Pacific to Long Beach Boulevard; stay on Pacific to pick up more residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Get our ideas into the 710 EIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4th Street next to River - new park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metro grants for transportaiton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 710 looks like New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sound walls not as good as planting and berms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 710 north and south - why not a loop? Add a loop around and sumberge it; deal with east-west corridors and the traffic on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can't add bikeways without dealing with auto traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connect 710 and 110 freeways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GROUP QUESTIONS

OVERALL SUMMARY
● = each individual participant placed a sticker beside the issue they felt was most important or critical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>(your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●● Trees and maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Sidewalks need repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●● Traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●● Lighting for pedestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●● Median and trees on Long Beach Boulevard and other corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Street repair (spot patching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bridge in Artesia walkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Overpass with design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Supermarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood</strong></th>
<th>(places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for corridor development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, what little there is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for development of Atlantic Ave.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading basins in river</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “step child of Long Beach”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park in Scherer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New fire station at Artesia and Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian lighting everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees along the river should be indigenous to California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street beautification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected bikeways into neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good murals on over/under passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification along 91 and 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th St. Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Group Two**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- *** Sidewalk repair
- *** Streets—fill pot holes
- ** Parking for trailers, boats and RVs
- ** Tree trimming

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.?)

- Jordan High School
- Houghton Park
- CVS Pharmacy
- Public transportation main corridors
- Skate park

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Street lighting improvements
- Drugs prevalent
- Public transit neighborhood access
- Recreation activities—Jordan pool? Public access
- Public pool
- Parking enforcement—Morningside and Long Beach Blvd. north of Del Amo
- Illegal truck parking, work trucks, etc.
- Overcrowded housing and parking shortage
- People living in garages in Deforest Park area and others
- Community center in old theatre hasn’t happened (South and Atlantic)
- Community lacks department stores, food stores
- Lime Street business residential areas
### Group Three (translated from Spanish)

#### What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- More maintenance of Coolidge Park
- Diesel exhaust—Long Beach and the port
- Lighting issue—parks and streets
- Trees are being cut/destroyed by people in neighborhood—replace all trees that are cut or damaged

#### What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Park maintenance at Coolidge—water fountains and removal of trees
- School security @ Jordan High School
- Coolidge Park—employees should provide better services and supervision for children
- Poor street maintenance
- Pedestrian crossing on Butler and Artesia bridge is dangerous
- Too many factories, too much noise and pollution
- Traffic at Colin Powell Academy is unsafe for kids
- Truck traffic on Victoria and Long Beach Blvd. unsafe
- Wall on north side of Coolidge Park is too low and kids jump over
- Street-cleaning services on alleys—none currently
- Better schools like Lakewood High School
- Higher river buffer on Artesia bridge for safety
- Need supermarkets
- Mural on Butler underpass
- Add trees/landscaping to freeway entrances and community. Replace damaged trees.
- Speed bumps, speed limit signs, post speed limits
- Add Library and police station
- Recreation center with pool and gym
- Make residential driveways
- Change freeway entrances like 105 and Carson freeway entrance
### Group Four

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- ●●●●● Parks (more and better parks)
- ●●●● Gang issues—need activities for 12-22 range and adults
- ●● Community resources—after school activities
- ● Trash—neighborhood cleanup

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- No through traffic
- Convenience to local businesses (grocery, banks, restaurants)
- Senior center at Houghton
- Bicycle trail and horse trail
- California St.—Chinese Elms
- Long Beach Blvd. on-ramp paved
- YMCA Boys and Girls Club
- Public transportation access

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Using area under power lines for soccer fields, youth sports
- Lack of parking at Blue Line station (Del Amo)
- Lack of youth activities
- Conditions on Butler Ave. (potholes)
- Street lights out on Long Beach Blvd. (Market and Del Amo north of Artesia)
- Caltrans area east of Coachella—no greenery
- Need to put speed bumps on 53rd St. riverbed to Long Beach Blvd. or make 53rd St. and Pacific Ave. a four-way stop
- Need crossing guard at Barclay
- Not necessarily playground equipment, but places to play
- More street tree planting
- South and Atlantic—open area, park and swimming pool
- Boys and Girls Club—hours need to increase
- More youth activities
- Street sweeping—Main St., boulevards
- More soccer, baseball and football fields
- Not enough parking at Del Amo station
- No grass next to Caltrans, all dirt (north Long Beach near Edison right-of-way)
- More trees/landscaping along freeway
- No supermarket in North Long Beach
- Need trees in river bike trail
- Open all public schools to after-school activities
- Condition of streets—trim trees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Graffiti removal
- More street trees
- More and better-maintained open spaces
- Safety for pedestrian crossing at major streets (not enough time)
- Parking enforcement near intersection
- Supermarket (around Atlantic/Harding)
- Repair vandalism of public property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open space around Villa Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memories of Houghton Park the way it used to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deforest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus line on Atlantic Ave. (frequent service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North branch library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some areas have neighborhood groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reopen swimming pool at Atlantic/South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better landscaping on Atlantic all along Cherry, Artesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and restore park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No major supermarket (Atlantic/Harding or Atlantic/South)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of maintenance of public property (eg. Houghton Park or other parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs and tagging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absentee landlords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall ignores North Long Beach (north of Del Amo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No enforcement of fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater response by City officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, trees and more trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of medians and parkways (eg. watering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore original building at Houghton Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round-the-clock public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up business corridors on Artesia Boulevard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Six

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>Pot holes and street improvements—too narrow, construction done at wrong time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●</td>
<td>More parks—sports, for kids, after school programs, cover river and make entertainment facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●</td>
<td>Safety—sex offenders, night (walking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●</td>
<td>Air quality because of freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Shoreline Park
- Main library
- Affordability of community
- Responsive police
- People take care of their property
- Dooley’s Elementary
- Deforest Park—green space and walking path

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Too much fast food—no nice restaurants
- More walkable environment
- Former city parking plan never got implemented
- Public transit lacking
- No place in the community that’s free—everything costs money
- River is isolated and unsafe
- South Street opportunity for green corridor/pedestrian environment
- Bridge needed between Cesar Chavez school and park
- Chavez Park area is dangerous for pedestrians
- Sex offenders live in the neighborhood
- Opportunity to expand Deforest Park nature trail
- Speeding along Long Beach Blvd.
- Enhance commercial area along Atlantic Blvd.
- Decent public library within walking distance
- New stores—coffee shop, better quality businesses, computer store, bagel shop, record store, bookstore restaurant
- Nature trail at Deforest Park is dangerous

At Deforest or Houghton Park

- Open air meeting place with room (and appropriate sound/video equipment) for a bandstand/stage that could be used for outdoor performances
- Outdoor free performances of all kinds scheduled
- Tables w/umbrellas and room for grass picnickers in front
- Area on outside perimeter where vendors can sell food
- Recycling, composting and gardening center—could teach global warming prevention techniques, composting, gardening
- Outreach center of PAL at Houghton Park (a location next to Jordan High where anti-gang message would be most useful)—storytelling, martial arts training, career exploration/internships
- Pet care and obedience training and “foster a pet” program
- Comfortable picnic/lounging area with wi-fi spots
COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN
Neighborhood Design Workshop #2
August 15, 2007

GROUP QUESTIONS

OVERALL SUMMARY
● = each individual participant placed a sticker beside the issue they felt was most important or critical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●● Pedestrian-friendly sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●● Green space/trees on Chester and Loma Vista as entryway to new Drake Park/Riverlink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Grade separation/bridge over I-710, 1/8 mile span (Del Amo over Alameda Corridor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Move four-way stop signs and speed bumps near parks and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Traffic-calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Transportation of goods from Port on silent, green magnetic levitation rail train—silent, pollution-free, 300 miles, $50 million per mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)? |
| Bike access to riverbed |
| Cesar Chavez Park |
| Preservation of historic homes—Wilmore District |
| River bike path |
| Veteran’s Memorial Park |

| What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood? |
| Slow 6th Street exit, reduce traffic |
| Construct I-710 on west side of river and expand Cesar Chavez Park to river |
| Make all vacant land next to river a park with trees and lawn |
| Remove fence west of Veteran’s Park so you can park |
| Barnett Elementary can be a park during when school is not in attendance |
| Replace and expand bridge with 1/8 mile span grade. Separation bridge Golden to East St. |
| Homeless housing near Blue Line where homeless get off train at 1AM |
| I-710 onramps—Ocean, 7th, Anaheim, PCH. Close other ramps. |
| Chavez, Edison—safe crossing for students |
| Smoke shops on 5th/Cedar—get rid of them near schools. Smoke shops should not be near school |
| Diversified transportation on Golden/6th St.—get rid of the ongoing noise from the vans and repair of vehicles behind Edison Elementary |

Note: Groups one and two were combined for the map exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Air quality—6th Street exit, smell on 710 freeway, begins at Anaheim Street exit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Safety—loitering, lighting on streets, police patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Freeway exit at 6th Street—the noise from cars exiting the freeway; the high speed of cars exiting the 6th Street ramp (no one follows the speed limit and there is no police patrol to enforce the speed limit)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Three

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- **Alleys must be paved**—dust, air pollution; downtown alley between 3rd and 11th streets
- **Enclosed pedestrian overpass with improved lighting and design**
- **Address stagnant water within flood control channel**
- **Air pollution/air quality along terminal island freeway and 710 freeway**

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?
- Must keep Silverado Park

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?
- Better lighting, esp. Wardlow
- Unpaved dirt alley on 27th St.
- Taller freeway wall
- Repair alley between 3rd and 4th between Chestnut and Magnolia

### Group Four

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- **Air quality (710 freeway, buses)**
- **More residential/community police patrol**
- **Bathrooms along the riverbeds and bicycle trails for environmental and health issues**
- **Fix and maintain sidewalks—fix whole street, new method of repairing parking problems**
- **Community pride—band concerts at Cesar Chavez and Drake just like other parks**

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?
- Blue Line and Long Beach transit
- Transit system (Passport)
- Thank you for Passport system—buses are pollution through cleaner gas
- Cesar Chavez Park
- Buses—connection to MTA is great (Delta and Wardlow)

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?
- Accommodate the homeless along the river
- Connect the communities together
- Open space connection to new library
- Bathrooms along river
- Air quality
- Access to drinking water along river bike path
- Exit along riverbed for bikes
- Condition of streets (Cameron and Easy)
- Better use and access to LA River
- Maintain Cesar Chavez Park better. Remove homeless, fix sprinklers, more activities for adults
- The Pike—more interesting stores, retail, boutiques
**Group Five (translated from Spanish)**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Safer bridge and river crossings
- More after school programs for kids
- Third Street crossing guard near the entrance to the 710
- Higher security and community alerts when people in the Megan’s Law program move into the neighborhood
- Make the schools safer
- Crosswalks near the schools

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Cesar Chavez Park location
- Pocket Park beautification with trees
- Less vagrancy and street cleaning
- Noticed increased police patrol

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Napkins, soap for all schools
- Add lighting to and clean up alleys
- Murals on freeway entrances and exits and bridges
- Add street lighting on Pacific Coast Highway, Magnolia and 4th Street
- Light signal @ 5th and Magnolia
- More safety, pedestrian crossing for students on Pacific Coast Highway
- Clean up stagnant water, river walk, safety
- Rent control policy
- More shade trees on 4th and Magnolia
- Access to restrooms after school
- Cesar Chavez rec. center—cleaning, better maintenance, pool and after school activities, water fountains, adult/mother aerobics
- Pedestrian crosswalk near Cesar Chavez Park
### Group Six

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of open spaces. Parks are too small and not enough of them</td>
<td>need lots of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students walk on congested sidewalks—not enough buses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to educate residents about keeping storm drains clear and</td>
<td>not littering on public spaces (including streets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition of alleys and sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Stable population and hardworking families. Some families are three generational homeowners
- Community is safe. Only 3 entrances. It’s in the shape of a circle. No through traffic.
- Vibrant multicultural area. Wide range of ethnic eateries and also various worshipping places.
- Steps have been taken to enlarge Admiral Kidd Park. Beautification of medium strip on Santa Fe Ave.
- Trees on Easy. 55 years old. Only one block. Taper to Cameron.
- Mobile recreation trucks during summer. 17th, Chestnut and Cedar.
- Parks and Rec.—movie night, offering piñatas every 3rd Saturday at the park between Pacific and Pine on 14th St.
- Neighborhood clean up, graffiti removal

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Cabrillo High School students walking down PCH through the bridge to get to school because of lack of buses
- Youth programs to keep them off the streets
- No pool in our area for children to learn how to swim. Not even at Cabrillo.
- Washington Middle School area. We need the big park. The children around this area really need to be off the streets.
- Noise and speeding of cars—Delta Street calming
- Bus on Delta (residential street)
- Rails not to be switched behind our schools. Should happen in port.
- Horrible air quality. Surrounded by refineries, freeways and intermodal facility transfer
- Bus goes down a narrow street (Delta)
- Trees have been planted on Santa Fe but not watered. They are dry.
- Advertisement of meetings of West Long Beach Association
GROUPE QUESTIONS

OVERALL SUMMARY

● = each individual participant placed a sticker beside the issue they felt was most important or critical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>Landscape the MTA right-of-way from the LA River crossing to Willow Street, as promised by the County Transportation Commission (the forerunner to the current MTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>Noise pollution (from expanded 710 freeway, just below Los Cerritos school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●●</td>
<td>Repeal Landerman Petris Act to provide housing and care for mentally challenged people—a serious health issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●</td>
<td>Air pollution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Oakwood School
- Petroleum Club
- Wardlow Station rail
- Pacific Hospital
- Memorial Hospital
- Long Beach Municipal Band
- Johnny Rebs restaurant
- Virginia Country Club
- Los Cerritos Rancho
- St. Mary Hospital
- Poly High School
- Long Beach Grand Prix races
- PAL Campus
- North Division police
- Los Cerritos Park
- Practice golf, learning center

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Poor parking @ Pike
- Improve homelessness @ Lincoln Park
- Need more parking on Atlantic Ave. in Bixby Knolls
- More police in all public areas
- 100 more police per Bob Foster’s promise
- Plant native trees that grow to a height of 50’ tall along river
- Health: Repeal Landerman Petris Act re: homeless
- Safety: Barangi system
- Improve aesthetic of 405 freeway over Pacific Ave.
### Group Two

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Trains instead of trucks for containers
- Air quality
- Crime on the border

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Long Beach Aquarium—great educational outlet
- Aqua Bus water taxi—fun transportation option
- Great frog tiles on freeway soundwall
- Good secondary hospital option
- Los Angeles River bike path
- Library—good local resource
- San Antonio—green median is great
- Los Cerritos School—meeting place
- Rancho Los Cerritos golf course—good asset
- Good restaurant options downtown
- CSULB—adds academic environment to Long Beach

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Reduce crime
- Change pedestrian walkway over freeway—lights, safety
- Metro Blue Line—sound wall and drought-tolerant plants
- 710—reduce traffic, improve air quality, add sound walls
- Trash barrier near Port/Ocean Blvd. overflows during storm—clean up upstream
- More port containers by rail along Alameda Corridor

### Group Three

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Increased green zones
- More park rangers
- Homeless along river bank and under overpasses
- Dirt bikes in riverbed north of the 405 along the Blue Line

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Rancho Los Cerritos and Los Cerritos Park
- Quiet Streets

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Attention to and follow-through on habitat/running trails along the Los Angeles River
- Tree-planting along the River
- Enlarge Los Cerritos Park
- Sidewalks needed around school
- No services in the area
### Group Four

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Youth centers—utilization of Los Cerritos Park
- Program to green locomotives—Union Pacific and Santa Fe companies to and from port
- Air quality
- 69th Way and Butler—speed bumps or other means to slow traffic
- Better access to parks from neighbors west of freeway—pedestrian and bike access; bridges across freeway for pedestrians and bikes

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.?)

- Bike trail to beach
- The Riverlink Plan
- Los Cerritos Park
- Del Mar—community started nature walk
- Wetlands
- Houghton Park
- Senior center
- Skate park
- Bikes
- Kids program at Coolidge Park
- Coolidge Triangle Neighborhood monthly meetings—keep us informed and active in the community
- Beautiful trees

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Need more west side parks
- Veteran’s Park—large park but not well-utilized
- Air quality needs improving—405/710 area
- Lack of facilities (eg. Youth center or equipment loan for use at park). Rec. center—change equipment to challenge older children. Eg. Wood climbing structure, rock climbing (not a wall, just old-fashioned rocks); hills; play area
- No pedestrian/bike alternate transportation across the river
- Not enough thoroughfares to cross freeway and river esp. for Jordan students
- Keep graffiti off buildings
- Using park space for city facilities
- North town needs more businesses, major markets, banks
- North town—alley needs to be repaved
### Group Five

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Traffic noise and air pollution from 710, 405, Blue Line and railroad
- Clean up homeless problem around river and corridor
- Traffic light at Wardlow and Pacific

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Farmer’s Market at 45th and Atlantic
- Beautiful residential neighborhoods
- First Fridays on Atlantic

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Increase off-street parking
- Citywide: Change code enforcement to be proactive
- Barren plot of land—west of Target at 405 and Atlantic
- Linden traffic too fast between San Antonio and 37th
- Rundown business corridor on Atlantic in need of redevelopment

### Group Six

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Control traffic at Pacific and Wardlow to San Antonio and Long Beach Blvd. (no turns at certain times)
- Beautiful sign for entry into Los Cerritos Rancho
- Budget for long-term maintenance—are we wasting our time here?
- Sound wall with Ivy—noise of freeway
- Landscape the light rail and promise water
- Extended walkway on bike path that is safe for children

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Rancho Los Cerritos
- Atlantic Ave—patio dining
- Old trees
- Los Cerritos Elementary School
- People who care about their neighborhood
- Diverse architecture

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Remove turnstiles at Los Cerritos Park
- Budget for long-term maintenance
- Control outside traffic at Wardlow and Pacific
- Clean up Wrigley Heights walking bridge
- Sound wall with ivy along the 405 freeway
- Los Cerritos Rancho sign
- Safe walkway/bikeway along LA River
- Traffic control at Long Beach Boulevard and San Antonio St.
**Group Seven**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Mobility for wheel chairs: sidewalks are not wide enough obstacles such as lamp posts and trash cans block safe access
- Walk indicators at street crossings are not adequate for the amount of vehicle traffic traveling along Atlantic and Del Amo.
- Safety
  - More green spaces as well as open spaces are needed. Would like to see more environmental art.
  - Existing greenbelts are not maintained
  - Empty commercial properties suggest blight in the area
  - Illumination issues of pedestrian ways. Example on Atlantic near Del Amo below the railroad overpass. There is no lighting. Additionally at this location there is a problem with bird waste.
  - Vehicles park along main throughways and are left for days at a time. These include cars, trucks, boats and trailers. They also create safety issues for pedestrians.

What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?

- Pocket parks add green and serve as community gathering spaces

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Use different material for paving. Walkways should be more appealing.
- Incorporate art into more areas ie. Park benches, street signs, even garbage cans
- More art at Scherer Park
- Parks for animals. Better enforcement of water, clean-up from dog owners
- More trees near the Alameda Corridor and the Port
- More trees along Blue Line
- More art at Wrigley Heights Park
- Use different materials for fencing besides chain link
- Less banks along the business corridors
- Need more activities for kids during early evening hours
- More business along Atlantic corridor=
- More programs to bring seniors and kids together
- Need better facilities for younger children
- Set up “canvases” for public art (on areas such as large buildings) and encourage graffiti artists to use them. These can be rotated or wiped clean every few months for new works.
- More art along LA River
- Additional hours of operation at police station
- More pocket parks
- Utilize large empty commercial spaces as shelters for homeless
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Eight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•••••••• Repave and repair sidewalks and alleyways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>••••• Improve safety access across bridges to schools (Del Amo/Sutter Academy) as well as Wardlow/Willow/PCH/Anaheim, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>••• Improve Willow St. business corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•• Line freeways with trees, soundwalls. Major streets also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bixby Knolls business district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Brand library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley marketplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced involved community leadership in Wrigley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Avenue tree lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike path along river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Los Cerritos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed and responsive police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium of the Pacific</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More positive focus on Jordan High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve bridge crossing to Sutter School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More funding for women’s sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate re-opening of Johnny Rebs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repave/repair sidewalk/alleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve fire station #12 at Long Beach Boulevard and Roosevelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape light rail ROW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic crossing signals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 more police officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Willow Bridge crossing and business corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve water quality of harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Long Beach Transit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN
Neighborhood Design Workshop #4
August 29, 2007

GROUP QUESTIONS

OVERALL SUMMARY
● = each individual participant placed a sticker beside the issue they felt was most important or critical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group One</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●● Air quality (from freeway traffic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Preventing dumping/graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Green space/public space vs. commercial developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge Park Triangle area—tree-lined streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Park—nice, large park but freeway noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership—single family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolidge area—trim trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a dog park @ Deforest Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleys—dead space, invites graffiti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer ways for kids to cross busy streets from school (Long Beach Blvd.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add more barriers/trees along freeway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add a real supermarket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian crossing by Webster Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add exercise stations in Silverado Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Long Beach sign needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●● Health issues-asthma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Tree trimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●● Stray animals and illegal trash dumping in alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Easy access to LA Riverbank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors working together to inform each other of suspicious activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discarding furniture, trash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree trimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray animals (10th and Gale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting (20th and Gale)—lighting too dim, crime issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree trimming (20th and Gale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need higher walls and sound walls for homes on freeway edge (20th and Gale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need freeway greenery or pocket park and remove homes on freeway edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocket park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need air filters for homes that are on freeway edge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Three**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- More trees (generally all Long Beach)
- Beautify Wardlow between Santa Fe and Magnolia (walk, trees, plants, flowers)
- Smooth streets (pot holes)
- More lighting poles near bus stops
- More trash cans (too much trash on the ground)
- Neighborhood safety-burglary
- Neighborhood parking (20th and Gayle)

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Bike paths
- Parks
- Trees/plants
- Caltrans (get trash from freeways)
- Many quiet nights
- Keep few remaining large trees in Long Beach
- Shoreline Village
- The Pike
- Restaurants
- Trees are planted in the front yard in every house

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- More lights, trees, parkways, pedestrian lanes
- Beautify Wardlow between Pacific and Santa Fe
- Graffiti
- Plant trees along 103 corridor
- Police cars should patrol the area every three hours for safety reasons
- Too many people and too many cars per each residence
- Trash, pollution from trucks along 103 corridor
- Parks: tall grasses, trimming of trees, branches
**Group Four**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ●●●</td>
<td>Trees and landscape (Arlington, Wrigley area, South Metro, Pacific Ave.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ●●</td>
<td>Air quality-runoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ●</td>
<td>Safety (walkways, crossings, Metro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ●</td>
<td>Public art-more sculptures, mosaic, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

Clean and caring neighbors

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Air quality
- Missing street trees on Cedar Ave. and 32nd
- More planting along light rail
- Traffic signals at Wardlow and Pacific
- No sidewalks on Wardlow Rd across freeway
- Need lights under overpass at Wardlow Rd.

---

**Group Five**

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ●●●</td>
<td>Parking space is sufficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ●●</td>
<td>Quality of air (emissions from trucks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ●</td>
<td>Sheer lack of trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ●●</td>
<td>Safety along riverbanks for bikers and pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ●</td>
<td>Wider sidewalks and bike paths</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Water on the river for recycling
- Bridges
- Underutilized space

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Trucks, parking space near port
- Graffiti on overpasses
- Safety—law enforcement, visibility
- Need for more public libraries
- No major bookstores around
- Congested thoroughfares (Willow, PCH, Magnolia)
- No Walmart and big pharmacy—no big retail store
- Air/noise pollution (I-710)
- No farmer’s market
- Spiritual services in the parks
- Lack of police substations
- New cultural center in Admiral Kidd Park
- Bridges can provide aesthetic opportunities
- Swimming pool expansions
## Group Six (translated from Spanish)

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>Poor air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●●●</td>
<td>More police patrol and no more bars in areas near homes, schools, hospitals and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>●●●</td>
<td>Repair of curbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Washington School (Cedar and Pacific)
- Hospital

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Request nurseries to donate new trees
- Take out old car from street (52nd)
- Repair sidewalk, clean street
- Police, school
- Force all tenants and homeowners to clean and upkeep common areas
- New cultural center right next to Cabrillo High School (empty lot)
- Alley clean up, street maintenance (PCH and Anaheim)
- Crosswalk for kids near John Muir School
- Summer concerts and events for families—Cinco de Mayo celebrations, parades in all areas of Long Beach
- Closure of bars on Pacific and Pine
- Do not permit new bars on Anaheim and Long Beach Blvd.
- Increase police monitoring of gangs (PCH and Anaheim)
- Plant trees
- Outreach to substance abuse prevention programs to get involved in beautification projects
### Group Seven

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- More trees
- Make (have) community meeting w/LBUSD regarding safety issues w/parks (homeless people) and schools surrounding neighborhood (w/children)
- Trim our trees more often at the appropriate time of year
- Parks that do what the neighborhood wants rather than what the City decrees
- Code enforcement 24/7 (preventive enforcement)
- Clean alleys on West side (especially between 33rd and 34th streets)
- Remove truck exits on PCH and 710
- Health and air quality (cancer causing particulates—result of ship-generated pollution and truck pollution. Particular matter know to cause short and long-term serious health consequence and premature death)
- No I-710 expansion—any economic benefits more than offset by public health consideration ($10 billion/year in LA basin)
- On-dock rail—no rail boarding in neighborhood
- Incorporate recommendations which accompanied I-170 expansion plan submitted to Gateway COG
- No trucks on street
- Lawns are being paved for parking

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Keep the palm trees on Golden
- Keep trees on 23rd St.
- Police Department (west division)
- Green river south of Willow
- Single family homes—keep them, no higher density

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Clean river frequently
- Trim trees appropriately
- Extend library hours
- Sweeper needed to sweep the street not run a race without using water
- Divert river water into the port
- Proximity to I-170 with trucks and freeway expansion
- Don’t take down single-family homes because of 710 expansion

### Group Eight

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Cultural awareness programs for African heritage and others
- Unpaved dirt alley (7th Street)
- Higher sound wall barrier (710 freeway)
- Removal of junk cars from residential areas

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Keep existing trees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westside banking facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Silverado Park landscape and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June cars and trash removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No lights on Canal and Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved alley (1252 W 27th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cultural center—celebrate diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito and bug breeding in river @ Willow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Group Nine

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tree planting and landscaping—many different areas, as a buffer for freeway and for shade when kids walk to school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alley paving and cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bridges (safety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?

- Good mixture of senior citizens and young families
- Safe neighborhood because there are no streets that go through
- Secluded neighborhood where people watch out for each other
- Good neighborhood and neighbors
- Our wonderful Japanese cultural center
- Great cultural diversity including restaurants
- A wonderful nursery and a flower vendor on Santa Fe
- Good variety of houses of worship

What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

- Loud neighborhoods
- Alleys being dark
- The schools are not enforcing strict rules
- Graffiti in alleys by 710 freeway
- Too close to the refineries and the intermodal facility—air pollution, noise pollution
- Not enough green areas
- Access to riverbed is inconvenient
- Borders the I-710, the 405 and the Terminal Island freeway
- Would be so nice to have a bank on this side of town even a credit union
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Ten</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Safety/Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family homes—low density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ave. development project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverlink project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced gateways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping along Blue Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification of major thoroughfares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and restaurant hub on Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality—refinery smell, noise pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety—pedestrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design freeway w/ purification system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solar power/lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacate alleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit blowers (gardeners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike path—connection to LA River bike path to Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large trees in medians on broad streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacate alley (2900 block of Eucalyptus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works unwillingness to not cut our mature trees and root prune instead of meander sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make streets more pedestrian-friendly rather than car-friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools are disrespectful of residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf blowers cause too much pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaf blowers cause too much pollution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless hang out along bike path and river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a tile mural with landscaping (gateway viewed on Blue Line)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighted landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow St.—narrow sidewalks and no street trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy for City—install solar power along LA River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need a tree parkway south of Willow on Daisy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many studies not enough action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN

The following table is a comprehensive list of ideas generated by Long Beach residents at a series of Neighborhood Design Workshops that were organized for the Long Beach Community Livability Plan. Four of these workshops were held at different locations within the plan study area during the month of August, 2007 (see map on following page). The primary goal of these workshops was to ask local residents a series of questions that would encourage people to talk about how they would like to see their neighborhoods improved. Meeting participants were divided into small groups so that people could be more candid about their own personal concerns in their neighborhood, as well as what specifically they would like to see improved. Each small group was asked the following three questions:

1. What livability issues most concern you in your corridor neighborhood (your ability to get around, safety, community services, physical conditions, health and air quality, cultural resources, open space, employment, etc.)?
2. What are the major assets or strengths in your corridor neighborhood (places, groups, services, environment, etc.)?
3. What would you specifically like to change or improve in your corridor neighborhood?

Meeting participants addressed the first question by talking amongst themselves in small groups and then writing their responses on large format sheets. At the end of a short discussion period, each small group then voted on their top three issues and reported these to everyone else at the workshop. The remaining two questions were addressed with large format maps of the study area and different colored post it notes. Using one color of post it note, small group members wrote what they believed are the major strengths in their neighborhood, and then placed the post it note on the map. A different color of post it note was used to address the specific changes or improvements that people would like to see. The overall result of this exercise was a series of large format maps with a variety of specific suggestions about where potential neighborhood improvements could take place.

In order to organize the workshop responses in a manner that would be useful for the overall development of the plan, the issues that people voted in question one were selected and then organized into thirteen categories that emerged. These categories include the following:

- 710 Freeway: Air Quality, Health and Noise
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
- Public Safety
- Trees and Streetscapes
- Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces
- Traffic and Parking
- Neighborhoods, Services, Facilities and Amenities
- Code Enforcement
- Streets and Alleys
- LA River Improvements
- Transportation and Goods Movement
- People, Groups and Organizations
- Uncategorized

After the priority issues were organized by category, the responses to questions two and three were also organized according by these categories. In the table below, the first question is listed as Concerns, while questions two and three are listed as Strengths and Changes respectively.

Finally, the comments were further organized into two separate tables. The first table is a list of comments that can be tied to specific locations within the study area. These comments helped the Community Livability Plan project team develop a set of maps and plans that show proposed improvements along the corridor and within specific neighborhoods. The second table is a list of more general comments that are not location specific. These comments were used to develop an additional set of improvements that could not be incorporated into the proposed maps and plans.
# LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS

## 710 FREEWAY: AIR QUALITY, HEALTH AND NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air quality because of freeway</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diesel exhaust—Long Beach and the port</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway exit at 6th Street—the noise from cars exiting the freeway; the high speed of cars exiting the 6th Street ramp (no one follows the speed limit and there is no police patrol to enforce the speed limit)</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality—6th Street exit, smell on 710 freeway, begins at Anaheim Street exit</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution/air quality along terminal island freeway and 710 freeway</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality (710 freeway, buses)</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality (from freeway traffic)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of air (emissions from trucks)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and air quality (cancer causing particulates—result of ship-generated pollution and truck pollution. Particular matter known to cause short and long-term serious health consequence and premature death)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise pollution (from expanded 710 freeway, just below Los Cerritos school)</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic noise and air pollution from 710, 405, Blue Line and railroad</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound wall with Ivy—noise of freeway</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line freeways with trees, soundwalls. Major streets also.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway noise</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher sound wall barrier (710 freeway)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STRENGTHS

- Great frog tiles on freeway soundwall                                  | W3       |
- Caltrans (get trash from freeways)                                    | W4       |

## CHANGES

- Murals on freeway entrances and exits and bridges                     | W2       |
- Don’t take down single-family homes because of 710 expansion          | W4       |
- Design freeway w/ purification system                                 | W4       |
- Add trees/landscaping to freeway entrances and community. Replace damaged trees. | W1       |
- Beautification along 91 and 710                                       | W1       |
- Change freeway entrances like 105 and Carson freeway entrance         | W1       |
- Construct I-710 on west side of river and expand Cesar Chavez Park to river | W2       |
- Horrible air quality. Surrounded by refineries, freeways and intermodal facility transfer | W2       |
- I-710 onramps—Ocean, 7th, Anaheim, PCH. Close other ramps.             | W2       |
- Taller freeway wall                                                   | W2       |
- 710—reduce traffic, improve air quality, add sound walls              | W3       |
- Sound wall with ivy along the 405 freeway                               | W3       |
- Air quality needs improving—405/710 area                               | W3       |
- Need air filters for homes that are on freeway edge                     | W4       |
- Trash, pollution from trucks along 103 corridor                        | W4       |
- Air/noise pollution (I-710)                                            | W4       |
- Too close to the refineries and the intermodal facility—air pollution, noise pollution | W4       |
- Air quality—refinery smell, noise pollution                            | W4       |
- Add more barriers/trees along freeway                                  | W4       |
- Need freeway greenerry or pocket park and remove homes on freeway edge | W4       |
- Proximity to I-170 with trucks and freeway expansion                   | W4       |

## PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge in Artesia walkway</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overpass with design</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosed pedestrian overpass with improved lighting and design</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer bridge and river crossings</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street crossing guard near the entrance to the 710</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalks near the schools</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better access to parks from neighbors west of freeway—pedestrian and bike access; bridges across freeway for pedestrians and bikes</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended walkway on bike path that is safe for children</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination issues of pedestrian ways. Example on Atlantic near Del Amo below the railroad overpass. There is no lighting. Additionally at this location there is a problem with bird waste.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility for wheel chairs: sidewalks are not wide enough obstacles such as lamp posts and trash cans block safe access</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk indicators at street crossings are not adequate for the amount of vehicle traffic traveling along Atlantic and Del Amo.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety access across bridges to schools (Del Amo/Sutter Academy) as well as Wardlow/Willow/PCH/Anaheim, etc.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike paths</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (walkways, crossings, Metro)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges (safety)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STRENGTHS**

| Bridges | W4 |

**CHANGES**

| Connected bikeways into neighborhood | W1 |
| Good murals on over/under passes | W1 |
| Mural on Butler underpass | W1 |
| Street lights out on Long Beach Blvd. (Market and Del Amo north of Artesia) | W1 |
| Pedestrian crossing on Butler and Artesia bridge is dangerous | W1 |
| Bridge needed between Cesar Chavez school and park | W1 |
| Chavez, Edison—safe crossing for students | W2 |
| Better lighting, esp. Wardlow | W2 |
| Replace and expand bridge with 1/8 mile span grade. Separation bridge Golden to East St. | W2 |
| Add street lighting on Pacific Coast Highway, Magnolia and 4th Street | W2 |
| More safety, pedestrian crossing for students on Pacific Coast Highway | W2 |
| Pedestrian crosswalk near Cesar Chavez Park | W2 |
| Cabrillo High School students walking down PCH through the bridge to get to school because of lack of buses | W2 |
| Safer ways for kids to cross busy streets from school (Long Beach Blvd.) | W2 |
| Sidewalks needed around school | W3 |
| Change pedestrian walkway over freeway—lights, safety | W3 |
| Remove turnstiles at Los Cerritos Park-pedestrian bridge | W3 |
| Clean up Wrigley Heights walking bridge | W3 |
| Improve bridge crossing to Sutter School | W3 |
| Improve Willow Bridge crossing and business corridor | W3 |
| Bridges can provide aesthetic opportunities | W4 |
| No sidewalks on Wardlow Rd across freeway | W4 |
| Willow St.—narrow sidewalks and no street trees | W4 |
| Pedestrian crossing by Webster Elementary | W4 |
| Crosswalk for kids near John Muir School | W4 |
| Lighting (20" and Gale)—lighting too dim, crime issue | W4 |
| Need lights under overpass at Wardlow Rd. | W4 |
| No lights on Canal and Spring | W4 |
| Not enough thoroughfares to cross freeway and river esp. for Jordan students | W4 |

**PUBLIC SAFETY**

**CONCERNS**

| More lighting poles near bus stops | W4 |

**STRENGTHS**

| Police Department (west division) | W4 |
### CHANGES

- School security @ Jordan High School
- Chavez Park area is dangerous for pedestrians
- Increase police monitoring of gangs (PCH and Anaheim)

### TREES AND STREETSCAPES

#### CONCERNS

- South Street opportunity for green corridor/pedestrian environment
- Median and trees on Long Beach Boulevard and other corridors
- Green space/trees on Chester and Loma Vista as entryway to new Drake Park/Riverlink
- Improve Willow St. business corridor
- Trees and landscape (Arlington, Wrigley area, South Metro, Pacific Ave.)
- Tree planting and landscaping—many different areas, as a buffer for freeway and for shade when kids walk to school
- Beautify Wardlow between Santa Fe and Magnolia (walk, trees, plants, flowers)

#### STRENGTHS

- California St.—Chinese Elms
- Pocket Park beautification with trees
- Trees on Easy. 55 years old. Only one block. Taper to Cameron.
- San Antonio—green median is great
- Coolidge Park Triangle area—tree-lined streets
- Keep the palm trees on Golden
- Keep trees on 23rd St.

#### CHANGES

- More trees/landscaping along freeway
- Better landscaping on Atlantic all along Cherry, Artesia
- Trees have been planted on Santa Fe but not watered. They are dry.
- More shade trees on 4th and Magnolia
- More trees near the Alameda Corridor and the Port
- Coolidge area—trim trees
- Tree trimming (20th and Gale)
- Beautification of major thoroughfares
- Large trees in medians on broad streets
- Plant trees along 103 corridor
- Missing street trees on Cedar Ave. and 32nd
- Beautify Wardlow between Pacific and Santa Fe

### PARKS, GREENBELTS AND OPEN SPACES

#### CONCERNS

- Increased green zones
- Youth centers—utilization of Los Cerritos Park

#### STRENGTHS

- Shoreline Park
- Deforest Park—green space and walking path
- Deforest Park
- Parks, what little there is
- Houghton Park
- Skate park
- Bicycle trail and horse trail
- Memories of Houghton Park the way it used to be
- Parks and Rec.—movie night, offering piñatas every 3rd Saturday at the park between Pacific and Pine on 14th St.
- Cesar Chavez Park
- Veteran’s Memorial Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Must keep Silverado Park</th>
<th>W2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez Park</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain Cesar Chavez Park better. Remove homeless, fix sprinklers, more activities for adults</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar Chavez Park location</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps have been taken to enlarge Admiral Kidd Park. Beautification of medium strip on Santa Fe Ave.</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar—community started nature walk</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Park</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Los Cerritos golf course—good asset</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Park</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Avenue tree lane</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Park—nice, large park but freeway noise</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cultural center in Admiral Kidd Park</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Silverado Park landscape and programs</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGES**

- South and Atlantic—open area, park and swimming pool
- Recreation activities—Jordan pool? Public access
- Park maintenance at Coolidge—water fountains and removal of trees
- Coolidge Park—employees should provide better services and supervision for children
- Nature trail at Deforest Park is dangerous
- Dog park in Scherer Park
- 14th St. Park
- Wall on north side of Coolidge Park is too low and kids jump over
- Using area under power lines for soccer fields, youth sports
- Caltrans area east of Coachella Avenue—no greenery
- Open space around Villa Park
- Opportunity to expand Deforest Park nature trail
- Restore original building at Houghton Park
- Barnett Elementary can be a park during when school is not in attendance
- Cesar Chavez rec. center—cleaning, better maintenance, pool and after school activities, water fountains, adult/mother aerobics
- Make all vacant land next to river a park with trees and lawn
- Open space connection to new library
- Washington Middle School area. We need the big park. The children around this area really need to be off the streets.
- Improve homelessness @ Lincoln Park
- Create a dog park @ Deforest Park
- More art at Scherer Park
- More art at Wrigley Heights Park
- Rancho Los Cerritos and Los Cerritos Park
- Enlarge Los Cerritos Park
- Los Cerritos Park
- Need more west side parks
- Veteran’s Park—large park but not well-utilized
- Add exercise stations in Silverado Park
- Need a tree parkway south of Willow on Daisy

**TRAFFIC AND PARKING**

**CONCERNS**

- Control traffic at Pacific and Wardlow to San Antonio and Long Beach Blvd. (no turns at certain times)
- 69th Way and Butler—speed bumps or other means to slow traffic
- Traffic light at Wardlow and Pacific
- Neighborhood parking (20th and Gayle)

**STRENGTHS**
### CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement—Morningside and Long Beach Blvd. north of Del Amo</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to put speed bumps on 53rd St. riverbed to Long Beach Blvd. or make 53rd St. and Pacific Ave. a four-way stop</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic at Colin Powell Academy is unsafe for kids</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck traffic on Victoria and Long Beach Blvd. unsafe</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light signal @ 5th and Magnolia</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow 6th Street exit, reduce traffic</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove fence west of Veteran’s Park so you can park</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise and speeding of cars—Delta Street calming</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor parking @ the Pike</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parking on Atlantic Ave. in Bixby Knolls</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden traffic too fast between San Antonio and 37th</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control outside traffic at Wardlow and Pacific</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic control at Long Beach Boulevard and San Antonio St.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congested thoroughfares (Willow, PCH, Magnolia)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signals at Wardlow and Pacific</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks, parking space near port</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES, FACILITIES AND AMENITIES

#### CONCERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket (around Atlantic/Harding)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful sign for entry into Los Cerritos Rancho</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main library</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooley’s Elementary</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans for development of Atlantic Ave.</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS Pharmacy</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan High School</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior center at Houghton</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA Boys and Girls Club</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North branch library</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of historic homes—Wilmore District</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile recreation trucks during summer. 17th, Chestnut and Cedar.</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Fridays on Atlantic</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Ave—patio dining</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bixby Knolls business district</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley marketplace</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Los Cerritos</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Country Club</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library—good local resource</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood School</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Hospital</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Rancho</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Hospital</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly High School</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Division police</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice golf, learning center</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos School—meeting place</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market at 45th and Atlantic</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Elementary School</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Elementary</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Los Cerritos</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Brand library</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wonderful nursery and a flower vendor on Santa Fe</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ave. development project</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington School (Cedar and Pacific)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New fire station at Artesia and Orange</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need crossing guard at Barclay</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No supermarket in North Long Beach</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No major supermarket (Atlantic/Harding or Atlantic/South)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall ignores North Long Beach (north of Del Amo)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center in old theatre hasn’t happened (South and Atlantic)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up business corridors on Artesia Boulevard</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance commercial area along Atlantic Blvd.</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke shops on 5th/Cedar—get rid of them near schools. Smoke shops should not be near school</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless housing near Blue Line where homeless get off train at 1AM</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve fire station #12 at Long Beach Boulevard and Roosevelt</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids program at Coolidge Park</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Pike—more interesting stores, retail, boutiques</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More positive focus on Jordan High School</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerate re-opening of Johnny Rebs</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barren plot of land—west of Target at 405 and Atlantic</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rundown business corridor on Atlantic in need of redevelopment</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Rancho sign</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More business along Atlantic corridor</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New cultural center right next to Cabrillo High School (empty lot)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of bars on Pacific and Pine</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment and restaurant hub on Pacific</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside banking facility</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not permit new bars on Anaheim and Long Beach Blvd.</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CODE ENFORCEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCERNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People living in garages in Deforest Park area and others</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STREETS AND ALLEYS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONCERNS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleys must be paved—dust, air pollution; downtown alley between 3rd and 11th streets</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray animals (10th and Gale)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take out old car from street (52nd)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti in alleys by 710 freeway</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean alleys on West side (especially between 33rd and 34th streets)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved dirt alley (7th Street)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRENGTHS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach Blvd. on-ramp paved</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGES</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions on Butler Ave. (potholes)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeping—Main St., boulevards</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved dirt alley on 27th St.</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair alley between 3rd and 4th between Chestnut and Magnolia</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of streets (Cameron and Easy)</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North town—alley needs to be repaved</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley clean up, street maintenance (PCH and Anaheim)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaved alley (1252 W 27th)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacate alley (2900 block of Eucalyptus)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS
### CONCERNS
- Address stagnant water within flood control channel (W2)
- The Riverlink Plan (W3)
- Homeless along river bank and under overpasses (W3)
- Dirt bikes in riverbed north of the 405 along the Blue Line (W3)
- Clean up homeless problem around river and corridor (W3)
- Easy access to LA Riverbank (W4)

### STRENGTHS
- Bike access to riverbed (W2)
- River bike path (W2)
- Wetlands (W3)
- Los Angeles River bike path (W3)
- Bike path along river (W3)
- Green river south of Willow (W4)

### CHANGES
- Need trees in river bike trail (W1)
- Higher river buffer on Artesia bridge for safety (W1)
- Attention to and follow-through on habitat/running trails along the Los Angeles River (W3)
- Trash barrier near Port/Ocean Blvd. overflows during storm—clean up upstream (W3)
- Bike trail to beach (W3)
- No pedestrian/bike alternate transportation across the river (W3)
- Safe walkway/bikeway along LA River (W3)
- Riverlink project (W4)
- Bike path—connection to LA River bike path to Pacific (W4)

## TRANSPORTATION AND GOODS MOVEMENT
### CONCERNS
- Grade separation/bridge over I-710, 1/8 mile span (Del Amo over Alameda Corridor) (W2)
- Landscape the MTA right-of-way from the LA River crossing to Willow Street, as promised by the County Transportation Commission (the forerunner to the current MTA) (W3)
- Landscape the light rail and promise water (W3)
- Remove truck exits on PCH and 710 (W4)

### STRENGTHS
- Public transportation main corridors (W1)
- Blue Line and Long Beach transit (W2)
- Buses—connection to MTA is great (Delta and Wardlow) (W2)
- Wardlow Station rail (W3)

### CHANGES
- Lack of parking at Blue Line station (Del Amo) (W1)
- No grass next to Caltrans, all dirt (north Long Beach near Edison right-of-way) (W1)
- Bus line on Atlantic Ave. (frequent service) (W1)
- Not enough parking at Del Amo station (W2)
- Bus on Delta (residential street) (W2)
- Bus goes down a narrow street (Delta) (W2)
- Diversified transportation on Golden/6th St.—get rid of the ongoing noise from the vans and repair of vehicles behind Edison Elementary (W2)
- Rails not to be switched behind our schools. Should happen in port. (W2)
- More port containers by rail along Alameda Corridor (W3)
- Improve aesthetic of 405 freeway over Pacific Ave. (W3)
- Metro Blue Line—sound wall and drought-tolerant plants (W3)
- More trees along Blue Line (W3)
- Landscape light rail ROW (W3)
Landscaping along Blue Line  
Need a tile mural with landscaping (gateway viewed on Blue Line)  
Borders the I-710, the 405 and the Terminal Island freeway  
Need higher walls and sound walls for homes on freeway edge (20th and Gale)  
More planting along light rail  

PEOPLE, GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

CONCERNS

STRENGTHS

Petroleum Club  
Long Beach Municipal Band  
Coolidge Triangle Neighborhood monthly meetings—keep us informed and active in the community  
Experienced involved community leadership in Wrigley  
Wrigley Association  

CHANGES

Advertisement of meetings of West Long Beach Association

UNCATEGORIZED

STRENGTHS

CSULB—adds academic environment to Long Beach  
Long Beach Grand Prix races  
PAL Campus  
Long Beach Aquarium—great educational outlet  
Aqua Bus water taxi—fun transportation option  
Aquarium of the Pacific  
Shoreline Village  
The Pike

CHANGES

Lime Street business residential areas
**NON LOCATION SPECIFIC COMMENTS**

### 710 FREEWAY: AIR QUALITY, HEALTH AND NOISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air pollution</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality-runoff</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor air quality</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health issues-asthma</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate recommendations which accompanied I-170 expansion plan submitted to Gateway COG</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No I-710 expansion—any economic benefits more than offset by public health consideration ($10 billion/year in LA basin)</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRENGTHS

### CHANGES

- Too many factories, too much noise and pollution                     | W1|
- Air quality                                                           | W2|
- Air quality                                                           | W4|

### PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety for pedestrian crossing at major streets (not enough time)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks need repair</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk repair</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting for pedestrians</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian-friendly sidewalks</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix and maintain sidewalks—fix whole street, new method of repairing parking problems</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repave and repair sidewalks and alleyways</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikes</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider sidewalks and bike paths</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STRENGTHS

### CHANGES

- More walkable environment                                              | W1|
- Pedestrian lighting everywhere                                          | W1|
- Street lighting improvements                                            | W1|
- Connect the communities together                                       | W2|
- Safety (pedestrian)                                                    | W4|
- Pedestrian safety                                                      | W4|
- Repair sidewalk, clean street                                          | W4|
- Make streets more pedestrian-friendly rather than car-friendly         | W4|
- Pedestrian safety                                                      | W4|

### PUBLIC SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONCERNS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting issue—parks and streets</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the schools safer</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang issues—need activities for 12-22 range and adults</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety—sex offenders, night (walking)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More residential/community police patrol</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community is safe. Only 3 entrances. It’s in the shape of a circle. No through traffic.</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Higher security and community alerts when people in the Megan’s Law program move into the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety—loitering, lighting on streets, police patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students walk on congested sidewalks—not enough buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime on the border</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transients use the railroad corridor as throughway. Trees along the rail lines are falling and creation hazardous conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood safety-burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More police patrol and no more bars in areas near homes, schools, hospitals and parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make (have) community meeting w/LBUSD regarding safety issues w/parks (homeless people) and schools surrounding neighborhood (w/children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths**
- Responsive police
- Noticed increased police patrol
- Neighborhood clean up, graffiti removal
- Safe neighborhood because there are no streets that go through
- Neighbors working together to inform each other of suspicious activities

**Changes**
- Drugs prevalent
- Sex offenders live in the neighborhood
- Crime increase
- Gangs and tagging
- No enforcement of fireworks
- More police in all public areas
- 100 more police per Bob Foster’s promise
- Reduce crime
- Safety: Barangi system
- Neighborhood watch
- Police cars should patrol the area every three hours for safety reasons
- Police, school
- Safety—law enforcement, visibility
- Lack of police substations
- Crime

**Trees and Streetscapes**

**Concerns**
- More street trees
- Trees and maintenance
- Trees are being cut/destroyed by people in neighborhood—replace all trees that are cut or damaged
- Tree trimming
- Trim our trees more often at the appropriate time of year
- More trees (generally all Long Beach)
- Sheer lack of trees
- More trees
- Tree trimming

**Strengths**
- Old trees
- Beautiful trees
- Trees are planted in the front yard in every house
- Keep few remaining large trees in Long Beach
- Trees/plants
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGES</th>
<th>W1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More street tree planting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, trees and more trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of streets—trim trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of medians and parkways (eg. watering)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use different material for paving. Walkways should be more appealing.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant trees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep existing trees</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees everywhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to Long Beach sign needed</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More lights, trees, parkways, pedestrian lanes</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trim trees appropriately</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request nurseries to donate new trees</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blighted landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works’ unwillingness to not cut our mature trees and root prune instead of meander sidewalks</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree trimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PARKS, GREENBELTS AND OPEN SPACES                                                          | W4  |
| CONCERNS                                                                                   |     |
| Parks (more and better parks)                                                              |     |
| More maintenance of Coolidge Park                                                          |     |
| More and better-maintained open spaces                                                      |     |
| More parks—sports, for kids, after school programs, cover river and make entertainment facilities | W1  |
| Lack of open spaces. Parks are too small and not enough of them (need lots of trees)         | W2  |
| Community pride—band concerts at Cesar Chavez and Drake just like other parks               | W2  |
| More park rangers                                                                          | W3  |
| Existing greenbelts are not maintained                                                      | W3  |
| More green spaces as well as open spaces are needed. Would like to see more environmental art | W3  |
| Green space/public space vs. commercial developments                                        | W4  |
| Parks that do what the neighborhood wants rather than what the City decrees                 | W4  |

| STRENGTHS                                                                                   |     |
| Skate park                                                                                 | W3  |
| Pocket parks add green and serve as community gathering spaces                               | W3  |
| Parks                                                                                       | W4  |

| CHANGES                                                                                   |     |
| Lack of green space                                                                        | W1  |
| Not necessarily playground equipment, but places to play                                   | W1  |
| More soccer, baseball and football fields                                                   | W1  |
| Preserve and restore park                                                                  | W1  |
| Recreation center with pool and gym                                                        | W1  |
| Public pool                                                                                 | W1  |
| Lack of maintenance of public property (eg. Houghton Park or other parks)                   | W1  |
| No pool in our area for children to learn how to swim. Not even at Cabrillo.               | W2  |
| Using park space for city facilities                                                       | W3  |
| More pocket parks                                                                          | W3  |
| Parks for animals. Better enforcement of water, clean-up from dog owners                    | W3  |
| Lack of facilities (eg. Youth center or equipment loan for use at park). Rec. center—change equipment to challenge older children. Eg. Wood climbing structure, rock climbing (not a wall, just old-fashioned rocks); hills; play area | W3  |
| Pocket park                                                                                | W4  |
| Parks: tall grasses, trimming of trees, branches                                            | W4  |
| Not enough green areas                                                                      | W4  |
| Spiritual services in the parks                                                            | W4  |
### Exercise points
- Swimming pool expansions
- Dog Park

### TRAFFIC AND PARKING
#### CONCERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking enforcement near intersection</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking for trailers, boats and RVs</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic-calming</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move four-way stop signs and speed bumps near parks and schools</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles park along main throughways and are left for days at a time. These include cars, trucks, boats and trailers. They also create safety issues for pedestrians.</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking space is sufficient</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No trucks on street</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illegal truck parking, work trucks, etc.</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed bumps, speed limit signs, post speed limits</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No through traffic</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcrowded housing and parking shortage</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make residential driveways</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former city parking plan never got implemented</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeding along Long Beach Blvd.</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase off-street parking</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic crossing signals</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parking</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES, FACILITIES AND AMENITIES
#### CONCERNS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarket</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resources—after school activities</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More after school programs for kids</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget for long-term maintenance—are we wasting our time here?</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeal Landerman Petris Act to provide housing and care for mentally challenged people—a serious health issue</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness programs for African heritage and others</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art-more sculptures, mosaic, etc.</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plans for corridor development</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better schools like Lakewood High School</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience to local businesses (grocery, banks, restaurants)</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrant multicultural area. Wide range of ethnic eateries and also various worshipping places.</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse architecture</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good secondary hospital option</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s Market</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful residential neighborhoods</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior center</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed and responsive police</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family homes—low density</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secluded neighborhood where people watch out for each other</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good neighborhood and neighbors</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized space</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our wonderful Japanese cultural center</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Homes</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership—single family</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good variety of houses of worship</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHANGES

| Add Library and police station        | W1 |
| The “step child of Long Beach”        | W1 |
| Community lacks department stores, food stores | W1 |
| Need supermarkets                     | W1 |
| Lack of youth activities              | W1 |
| Boys and Girls Club—hours need to increase | W1 |
| More youth activities                 | W1 |
| Open all public schools to after-school activities | W1 |
| Decent public library within walking distance | W1 |
| New stores—coffee shop, better quality businesses, computer store, bagel shop, record store, bookstore restaurant | W1 |
| Too much fast food—no nice restaurants | W1 |
| No place in the community that's free—everything costs money | W1 |
| Greater response by City officials    | W1 |
| Less vagrancy and street cleaning     | W2 |
| Youth programs to keep them off the streets | W2 |
| North town needs more businesses, major markets, banks | W3 |
| More programs to bring seniors and kids together | W3 |
| Need better facilities for younger children | W3 |
| Need more activities for kids during early evening hours | W3 |
| Budget for long-term maintenance      | W3 |
| More funding for women’s sports       | W3 |
| 100 more police officers              | W3 |
| No services in the area               | W3 |
| Incorporate art into more areas ie. Park benches, street signs, even garbage cans | W3 |
| Less banks along the business corridors | W3 |
| Set up “canvases” for public art (on areas such as large buildings) and encourage graffiti artists to use them. These can be rotated or wiped clean every few months for new works. | W3 |
| Additional hours of operation at police station | W3 |
| Utilize large empty commercial spaces as shelters for homeless | W3 |
| Enhanced gateways                     | W4 |
| Single family homes—keep them, no higher density | W4 |
| Need for more public libraries        | W4 |
| No major bookstores around            | W4 |
| No farmer’s market                    | W4 |
| No Walmart and big pharmacy—no big retail store | W4 |
| Outreach to substance abuse prevention programs to get involved in beautification projects | W4 |
| Extend library hours                  | W4 |
| Public Art                            | W4 |
| Loud neighborhoods                    | W4 |
| Limit blowers (gardeners)             | W4 |
| Amphitheatre                          | W4 |
| Beautification                        | W4 |
| Leaf blowers cause too much pollution | W4 |
| Solar power/lighting                  | W4 |
| Historic district                     | W4 |
| Add a real supermarket                | W4 |
| Summer concerts and events for families—Cinco de Mayo celebrations, parades in all areas of Long Beach | W4 |
| No cultural center—celebrate diversity | W4 |
| Would be so nice to have a bank on this side of town even a credit union | W4 |
| Farmer’s Market | W4 |

**CODE ENFORCEMENT**

**CONCERNS**
- Repair vandalism of public property: W1
- Trash—neighborhood cleanup: W1
- Graffiti removal: W1
- Empty commercial properties suggest blight in the area: W3
- Code enforcement 24/7 (preventive enforcement): W4
- Preventing dumping/graffiti: W4
- More trash cans (too much trash on the ground): W4
- Stray animals and illegal trash dumping in alley: W4
- Lawns are being paved for parking: W4
- Removal of junk cars from residential areas: W4

**STRENGTHS**
- People take care of their property: W1

**CHANGES**
- Absentee landlords: W1
- Litter removal: W1
- Remove graffiti: W1
- Keep graffiti off buildings: W3
- Citywide: Change code enforcement to be proactive: W3
- Discarding furniture, trash: W4
- Graffiti: W4
- Graffiti on overpasses: W4
- Stray animals: W4
- Too many people and too many cars per each residence: W4
- Force all tenants and homeowners to clean and upkeep common areas: W4
- Graffiti: W4
- Junk cars and trash removal: W4

**STREETS AND ALLEYS**

**CONCERNS**
- Streets—fill pot holes: W1
- Street repair (spot patching): W1
- Pot holes and street improvements—too narrow, construction done at wrong time: W1
- Poor condition of alleys and sidewalks: W2
- Smooth streets (pot holes): W4
- Repair of curbs: W4
- Alley paving and cleaning: W4

**STRENGTHS**
- Street-cleaning services on alleys—none currently: W1
- Quiet Streets: W3

**CHANGES**
- Street beautification: W1
- Poor street maintenance: W1
- Add lighting to and clean up alleys: W2
- Repave/repair sidewalk/alleys: W3
- Alleys—dead space, invites graffiti: W4
- Sweeper needed to sweep the street not run a race without using water: W4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor/Concern</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alleys being dark</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacate alleys</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LA RIVER IMPROVEMENTS**

**CONCERNS**

- Bathrooms along the riverbeds and bicycle trails for environmental and health issues
- Need to educate residents about keeping storm drains clear and not littering on public spaces (including streets)
- Safety along Riverbanks for bikers and pedestrians

**STRENGTHS**

- Spreading basins in river
- Water on the river for recycling

**CHANGES**

- River is isolated and unsafe
- Trees along the river should be indigenous to California
- Exit along riverbed for bikes
- Better use and access to LA River
- Bathrooms along river
- Accommodate the homeless along the river
- Access to drinking water along river bike path
- Clean up stagnant water, river walk, safety
- Tree-planting along the River
- Access to riverbed is inconvenient
- Plant native trees that grow to a height of 50’ tall along river
- More art along LA River
- Mosquito and bug breeding in river @ Willow
- Clean river frequently
- Divert river water into the port
- Energy for City—install solar power along LA River
- Homeless hang out along bike path and river

**TRANSPORTATION AND GOODS MOVEMENT**

**CONCERNS**

- Transportation of goods from Port on silent, green magnetic levitation rail train—silent, pollution-free, 300 miles, $50 million per mile
- Trains instead of trucks for containers
- Program to green locomotives—Union Pacific and Santa Fe companies to and from port
- On-dock rail—no rail boarding in neighborhood

**STRENGTHS**

- Transit system (Passport)
- Public transportation access
- Thank you for Passport system—buses are pollution through cleaner gas

**CHANGES**

- Round-the-clock public transportation
- Public transit lacking
- Public transportation
- Public transit neighborhood access
- Improve Long Beach Transit

**PEOPLE, GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS**

**CONCERNS**

**STRENGTHS**

- Community organizations
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The People</strong></th>
<th>W1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some areas have neighborhood groups</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable population and hardworking families. Some families are three generational homeowners</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who care about their neighborhood</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good mixture of senior citizens and young families</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great cultural diversity including restaurants</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean and caring neighbors</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of partnership</th>
<th>W1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community participation</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools are disrespectful of residents</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNCATEGORIZED**

**STRENGTHS**

| Affordability of community                         | W1  |
| Good restaurant options downtown                   | W3  |
| Many quiet nights                                  | W4  |

**CHANGES**

| Distance from downtown                              | W1  |
| Access to restrooms after school                    | W2  |
| Napkins, soap for all schools                       | W2  |
| Rent control policy                                 | W2  |
| Use different materials for fencing besides chain link | W3  |
| Improve water quality of harbor                     | W3  |
| The schools are not enforcing strict rules          | W4  |
| Too many studies not enough action                  | W4  |
### What are the three most important projects listed on the Neighborhood Improvements Map?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridges/Overpass improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Freeway Corridor (soundwalls/tree buffers, air quality, noise)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Streetscape (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway and Third Traffic Calming (44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces Improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Have we left anything out that should be included on either the Neighborhood Improvements or the Corridor Improvements maps? Please explain.

- Improvements to bridges on 6th and 7th
- More green areas
- A community center on 14th St. Park that includes fitness equipment
- More street lighting
- Cleaner streets
- We need more safety in the 3rd St. by the entrance to the freeway (710). We are thinking a bridge or crossing guard to be able to cross the street especially for our children from Cesar Chavez Park to Cesar Chavez School
- More light on the alley and better pavement on alleys
- More light on Broadway by the freeway
- We need a pedestrian bridge at Broadway and Third (translated from Spanish)
- We also need a crossing guard to help kids cross the street (translated from Spanish)
- More street lighting (translated from Spanish)
- We would like to have a bridge because we are worried about the safety of our children, because there is a lot of traffic and cars travel very fast and we don’t want to see any accidents (translated from Spanish)
- We need a bridge at Broadway and Third (translated from Spanish)
- We also need a crossing guard to help kids cross the street (translated from Spanish)
- More street lighting (translated from Spanish)
- A cleaner city (translated from Spanish)
- Clean streets and alleys (translated from Spanish)
- Please fix the streets because there are many that need repair because the city only fixes the ones downtown (translated from Spanish)
# COMMUNITY LIVABILITY PLAN

## Design Review Workshop #2

**December 5, 2007**

### What are the three most important projects listed on the Neighborhood Improvements Map?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic Ave. Streetscape (#5)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia Blvd. improvements (#3)</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Long Beach Tree Buffer (#4)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces Improvements</td>
<td>●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-710 Freeway Corridor (soundwalls/tree buffers, air quality, noise)</td>
<td>●●●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees and Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Heights Pedestrian Bridge (#24)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA River Bike Path Improvements</td>
<td>●●●● ●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>●●●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic St. North Village (#9)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Gap Wetlands Connector (#11)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Landscaping (#13)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livable schools</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Gap Wetlands</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Heights Park North (#19)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ave. Streetscape (#20)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Blue Line Landscaping (#27)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverlink projects</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges/Overpass improvements</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos/ Del Mar Walking Trail (#18)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Have we left anything out that should be included on either the Neighborhood Improvements or the Corridor Improvements maps? Please explain.

- Traffic on Artesia moves 45-50 mph most of the time. When 91 freeway backs up, Artesia is used as an alternate route. You want to risk lives of our citizens sharing the street with that kind of traffic? Not a good idea!
- Tree buffer is only on west side of I-710 but is needed also on east side in vicinity of Jordan High and Houghton Park
- Houghton Park is a filthy mess—the City needs to clean up/restore existing resources before starting new projects
- Houghton Skate Park needs to be cleaned up or closed
- Flood control to encourage walking and bicycling. No access on Artesia Boulevard!
- They should turn on the lights from the parks
- The County and City property along the Blue Line from San Antonio North is drying out and going to waste—City turned off the water
- Cooperation between County and City
- Del Mar entrance to bike path was recently locked and blocked after 40 years
- Police presence on the bike trail
- Pacific Ave. between Country Club and Wardlow—close off to thru traffic during the day or speed bumps
- Del Mar St. access to bike trail
- More police presence on the bike trail to prevent crimes
- We need a dip or special speed bumps on San Antonio between Long Beach Blvd and Pacific
[One thing] you guys left out on Neighborhood Improvements is littering. North Long Beach has trash everywhere in the streets.

Del Amo Blvd. is being designated as a Ped/Bikeway but as it approaches the 710 it gets very dangerous. There are two freeway ramps there and a park-and-ride Blue Line Station a little further down. There needs to be a safe way to get from the neighborhoods to the station. Perhaps a ped/bike bridge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Air quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding—just do it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| More improvements in the Addams neighborhood |
| More street resurfacing |
| More skate parks |
| Skate park near Long Beach Blvd. and Del Amo |
| Basketball court or small soccer field in park at Locust and Plymouth |

| DeForest Park entrance is poorly paved, and you have to go under Long Beach Blvd. and there is a lot of homeless people there |
| Of all the parks you are going to build, which ones are skate parks? Most of the people in the neighborhoods don’t want kids on the streets, property, etc. If there is no place to skate, then our only option is the streets. |

| Bike paths and widening the streets or sidewalks. Opening more areas for bike paths. Vacant lots should be little skate parks or small parks. |
| Speed bumps on San Antonio Dr. (between Long Beach Blvd. and Country Club Dr.) Also, on Pacific Ave. between Wardlow Rd. and San Antonio Dr.) |

| Forget the tree buffer at Hudson School facing the Terminal Island Freeway. Hudson needs a wall—contact Caltrans. |
| Storm drain restoration everywhere |
| Bike path restoration everywhere |

| Speed bumps on Pine Ave. (from Wardlow north) and San Antonio (east to Long Beach Blvd.). If you have a bike path (#17) you need to slow the short-cut traffic down. Many school age kids do ride on San Antonio. |
| Skate parks on the west side of LB. Skate parks on the North of LB (south of Jordan HS) |

| Paving of the currently unpaved alley between the 3400 blocks of Locust Ave. This could be tied to item #25 since Wardlow Rd. is the southern terminus of this alley. |
| Residents should be given double-paned windows and air filtration systems if they are by freeways. |

| Maintenance of trees if planted |
| Lighting |

| Need more neighborhood parks where youth can have relevant activities. Skateboard, basketball. |
| Lighting |

| #18 and #24 should be one project |
| Connection between the south end of the Dominguez Gap wetlands project and the county property that connects the walking trail that parallels Del Mar Ave. in the Los Cerritos Park neighborhood. |

| Air quality issues from 710 freeway, Carson refineries and the ports |
| The lack of improvements planner for the area north of Del Amo to DeForest Park. And if improvements are planned will they be representative of the quality and consideration that has been shown in the area behind Virginia Country Club. I’ve notices that the pedestrian walkway was moved down the embankment so as not to disturb the golfers, yet the same courtesy was not extended to the residents of the trailer park south of Del Amo. Apparently their privacy isn’t as important as that of the golfers and I’m sure that there are no such considerations planned for the residents north of Del Amo. That is, of course, if there are similar plans for that area at all. And what about the old Seventh Day Adventist school? |
| SE corner of Del Amo flood control. Park maybe? |
Landscaping of on/off ramp to and from I-710 (apart from tree buffer). Many on/off ramps from the 710 area an embarrassment. Example—offramp from 710 N. to Del Amo Blvd. East

Removal of trash from our streets and freeways should be a priority

Most of your meetings to discuss were Thursday nights when most of us in North have obligations

Between Del Amo and city limits (especially to South): 1. Why Class II bike paths limited on corridor? 2. Why corridor improvements not shown? 3. Why greening is nominal? 4. Why is Riverlink application/improvements so limited on these corridors? 5. Why aren’t major bridge and corridor improvements and bike paths not of any significance at Del Amo South Market and Long Beach Blvd? Huge open area near Long Beach Blvd. and river is screaming for improvements
What are the three most important projects listed on the Neighborhood Improvements Map?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Coast Highway Streetscape (#36)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Streetscape (#31)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaheim Streetscape (#40)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Ave. Streetscape (#20)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Park/Blue Line Bike Path (#28)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverlink projects</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Street Open Space Connector (#34)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy Ave. Median (#32)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks, Greenbelts and Open Spaces Improvements</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Cerritos Walking Trail (#18)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardlow Streetscape/405 Overpass (#25)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardlow Streetscape Improvements /710 Overpass (#56)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>●●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Heights Park South (#22)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrigley Heights Park North (#19)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Services</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th St. Alley Improvements (#57)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Improvements (#14)</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles River Class II Bike Path (#35)</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have we left anything out that should be included on either the Neighborhood Improvements or the Corridor Improvements maps? Please explain.

Bridge over 710 and river on Willow

When alleys are turned into green spaces, you should consider closing off the ends with gates or something that neighbors have keys to so homeless don’t hang out

Consider doing something like the Millennium Park in Chicago—a park that goes over the freeway more than bridge but actually a very large area that can connect the west side of Long Beach to the east side. Create a green space and athletic areas—a real destination and the freeway can be under it, the river can be incorporated into it. A big vision that can change the face of Long Beach.

The sound walls along the freeways are great, but is there a way to install some type of filtration devices on the walls to attract diesel particulates? This could be used in addition to greening the freeways.

It would be nice to install solar power canopies along the LA River Bike Path. CSULB has installed these in some of their parking lots.

Security concerns along the LA River and proposed parks need to be addressed.

Access to bike path from Del Mar and North Virginia St. (just north of Los Cerritos School)

A right turn only lane at Wardlow and Pacific Ave. eastbound west of Blue Line

Problem of homes encampments in LA riverbed, especially south of PCH to Ocean Blvd.

Security—police, camera on 710 to prevent crime

Senior discount on parking meters etc. for walking exercise on shoreline beaches

These little mini malls on the corner of Willow and Easy Ave, and Willow and Delta, they cause too many accidents and traffic jams

A big problem with graffiti all over—by the 710 freeway between Willow and Hill, and by the 710 and Santa Fe, in the alleys

If we want to get PCF tree’ed up by grant or otherwise do have to deal with Caltrans? Or the Port?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Replace the city engineer who says one thing and does the opposite—consistently, and he has decimated our urban forest!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make the river bike path safe! Cops, cameras, lights, move the vagrants selling drugs, setting fires, and attacking residents and bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not connect Hill St. over the river. That would make Riverlink Crimelink.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>