



**U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development**
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov

espanol.hud.gov

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

Project Information

Project Name: Mercy Housing Martin Luther King Jr Avenue/Pacific Coast Highway
(MLK/PCH)

Responsible Entity: City of Long Beach

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Mercy Housing

State/Local Identifier:

Preparer: Jenny Vick, Environmental Deputy Project Manager

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Christopher Koontz, Deputy Director Development Services

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Consultant (if applicable): HDR, Inc.

Direct Comments to: Gina Casillas, City of Long Beach Department of Development Services,
411 West Ocean Boulevard – 3rd Floor, Long Beach, CA 90802

Project Location: The Mercy Housing MLK/PCH (project) site is approximately 0.73 acre and consists of four parcels located between Myrtle Avenue and Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, south of 19th Street, and north of Pacific Coast Highway in the central portion of the City of Long Beach (Figure 1). The Assessor Parcel Numbers are 7210013026, 7210013023, 7210013900, and 7210013901.

Description of the Proposed Project [24 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

The project consists of a four-story, 100 percent affordable senior housing development consisting of 68 residential units and 4,000 square feet of commercial tenant space. Residential space located on levels two through four are a combination of community and residential related uses is located on the street level. The project includes 67 units that will be 100-percent senior affordable housing units and one manager unit that would be rented at market rate. The development consists of 7 studio units, 60 one-bedroom units, and 1 two-bedroom unit (manager unit). The building includes 38 parking spaces and 14 bicycle spaces. The entrance for the parking lot would be on the west side of the property from Myrtle Avenue and from the alley to the north. A Conditional Use Permit is requested to permit the operation of the senior housing development. The project site is currently zoned Regional Highway District (CHW), and the project includes a zone change to the Community R-4-N District (CCN) to allow the senior housing project.

To comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, a Statutory Exemption was prepared for the project.

Figure 1 Regional Location and Project Vicinity



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The site is partially vacant and partially developed as an auto repair facility, graded flat to street level, and contains no vegetation. No sensitive resources have been identified on the project site. The project site is surrounded by urban development, including residences and commercial businesses. The surrounding land uses include apartments to the west, a commercial shopping center to the south and east, a market and residential homes to the north, and apartments to the east.

The project site is located in the Central Area West neighborhood of the Central Community Planning Area. Central Area West neighborhood district just north of the Downtown Long Beach area and has been developed since the early 1900s. The Central area is one of the most ethnically and physically diverse areas of Long Beach.

Four bus routes, the 171, 172, 173, and 174, run along Pacific Coast Highway, and bus stops for each route are located within one city block of the project site. The Los Angeles Metro Blue line is also located half a mile west of the project site and provides access to South Los Angeles and Downtown Los Angeles.

Historically, the site has had a number of different land uses. The project site contains city-owned and private-owned parcels. The city-owned parcels are located at 925–945 East Pacific Coast Highway, and the private-owned parcels are located at 901 East Pacific Coast Highway. Historic uses at each address include:

925-945 East Pacific Coast Highway:

- 1925-1944: Residential land use
- 1944-1972: Gas station and automotive repair shop
- 1977-2010: Commercial and retail land uses, including a liquor store

901 East Pacific Coast Highway:

- 1921-1950: Residential land use
- 1951-current: Automotive repair business
- 1962-current: Automotive spray booth

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
M-17-MC-06-0518 and M-18-MC-06-0518	City of Long Beach HOME Funding	\$3,000,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$3,000,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]:

Total cost for this project is estimated to be \$40,752,315. With approximately 15 Section 8 Project Based Vouchers, 18 Project Based VASH Vouchers, \$12,369,775 in funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development Multifamily Housing Program, \$14,460,704 in 4 percent Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits, and \$22,830,167 in Tax Exempt Bonds. The Los Angeles County Development Authority has also awarded \$7,000,000 in funding.

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

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

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p><u>Criteria Pollutants</u></p> <p>Construction and operational criteria pollutant emissions were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version (Version 2016.3.2) emission model for estimating exhaust emissions from off-road construction equipment and on-road motor vehicles, as well as calculating long-term mobile, energy, and area source emissions. The modeled criteria pollutants were compared to the federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels and local South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) construction and operational thresholds to determine if the project would result in an adverse air quality effects. Model data and detailed analysis can be found in Attachment 3a and a Record of Non-Applicability for Clean Air Act Conformity can be found in Attachment 3b.</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has classified the South Coast Air Basin as attainment/maintenance for carbon monoxide (CO), particles of 10 micrometers and smaller (PM₁₀), and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), and nonattainment for ozone (O₃) and particles of 2.5 micrometers and smaller (PM_{2.5}). In addition, the Los Angeles County portion of the South Coast Air Basin is in nonattainment for lead.</p> <p><i>Comparison to Federal General Conformity De Minimis Levels</i></p> <p>Construction emissions from the project would result primarily from off-road equipment, vehicle use, and fugitive dust. The modeling results indicate that maximum annual emissions from construction would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.6 ton per year (2021) and 1.2 ton per year (2022) CO • 0.1 ton per year (2021) and 0.4 ton per year (2022) Volatile Organic Gases (VOC)

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.6 tons per year (2021) and 1.0 ton per year (2022) Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) • 0.1 ton per year (2021) and 0.1 ton per year (2022) particles of 10 PM₁₀ • 0.04 ton per year (2021) and 0.1 ton per year (2022) PM_{2.5} <p>Based on the SCAQMD's designation status, federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels would be 10 tons per year for NO_x and VOC and 100 tons per year for CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. A conformity determination would be required for each criteria pollutant or precursor exceeding the federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> level. Emissions for all criteria pollutants would be below federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act.</p> <p>Operational emissions are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources associated with vehicular trips and on-site energy consumption. Results from the CalEEMod indicate the maximum annual emissions from the operation of the project would be approximately:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0.9 ton per year NO_x • 0.5 ton per year VOC • 2.9 tons per year of CO • 0.0 ton per year of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) • 0.8 ton per year PM₁₀ • 0.2 ton per year PM_{2.5} <p>Operational emissions would be below the federal <i>de minimis</i> thresholds of 10 tons per year for NO_x and VOC and 100 tons per year for CO, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. Therefore, the proposed action is exempt from General Conformity regulations.</p> <p><i>Comparisons to South Coast Air Quality Management District Thresholds</i></p> <p>The construction emissions for each phase of construction were calculated using the CalEEMod. The peak day modeling results</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>indicate that the maximum daily emissions from construction would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.2 pounds per day CO • 5.3 pounds per day Volatile Organic Gases (ROG) • 10.4 pounds per day NO_x • 1.5 pounds per day PM₁₀ • 0.9 pounds per day PM_{2.5} <p>The peak daily construction emissions would be below the SCAQMD threshold of 550 pounds per day CO, 75 pounds per day ROG, 100 pounds per day NO_x, 150 pounds per day PM₁₀, and 55 pounds per day PM_{2.5}.</p> <p>The daily operational emissions for area, energy, and mobile sources were calculated using the CalEEMod. The peak daily emissions from operations would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 19.2 pounds per day CO • 4.8 pounds per day NO_x • 2.8 pounds per day ROG • 0.05 pound per day Oxides of Sulfur (SO_x) • 4.6 pounds per day PM₁₀ • 1.2 pounds per day PM_{2.5} <p>The total daily emissions would be below SCAQMD thresholds described above.</p> <p>Consequently, criteria pollutant emissions from construction and operation of the project would be below thresholds with respect to SCAQMD and federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels.</p> <p><u>Fugitive Dust</u></p> <p>SCAQMD has established Rule 403 for reducing fugitive dust emissions. Dust generated daily during construction would vary substantially, depending on the level of activity, the specific operations, and weather conditions. Nearby sensitive receptors and on-site workers may be</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>exposed to blowing dust, depending upon prevailing wind conditions. Fugitive dust also would be generated as construction equipment or trucks travel on unpaved areas of the construction site. The project would comply with Rule 403 for reducing fugitive dust.</p> <p><u>Asbestos</u></p> <p>The project does not involve demolition of structures because the site is currently vacant; however, Los Angeles County is among the counties listed as containing serpentine and ultramafic rock, which may contain naturally occurring asbestos. The portion of the county in which the project lies is not known to contain serpentine or ultramafic rock. Therefore, the impact from naturally occurring asbestos during project construction would be minimal to none.</p> <p>Source Document: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and Attachment 3: and 3a, 3b</p>
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project is located approximately 1.8 mile from the Pacific Ocean. The project site is not located within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission, which generally extends 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line along the California Coast. The project site is not located within the Coastal Zone Management area; therefore, the project would have no effect on the coastal zone.</p> <p>Source Document: 10 and Attachment: 4</p>
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site consist of several parcels. The parcels on the eastern half of the project site are vacant and are comprised of dirt, grass, and shrubs mixed with gravel and is surrounded by a picket fence. Historic land uses on these parcels include a gas station and automotive repair shop. The western half of the project site is developed with an automotive repair shop and an automotive spray booth.</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) and Phase II Subsurface Investigation Report were conducted in 2019 for 901 East Coast Pacific Highway, and a Phase I ESA was conducted for 925-945 East Pacific Coast Highway in 2019. This analysis is based on the results of these studies, which are included as Attachments 5a, 5b, and 5c.</p> <p>The Phase I ESAs concluded no evidence of recognized environmental conditions or controlled recognized environmental conditions in connection with the project site. However, a historical recognized environmental condition, which refers to a past release of any hazardous materials that has been addressed to the satisfaction of the applicable regulatory authority, was identified. The 6,000-gallon underground storage tank associated with the gas station that was on the project site between the 1940s to the 1970s has been removed and has been closed by the regulatory authority.</p> <p>The Phase II ESA conducted a subsurface assessment investigation to evaluate the potential impact of petroleum hydrocarbons, VOCs, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) to soil gas, soil, and groundwater as a consequence of a release from the on-site automotive repair and body activities. The subsurface investigation included 10 borings. Nine soil samples and one groundwater sample were analyzed for total petroleum hydrocarbons (TPH-cc) and VOCs, one soil sample was analyzed for TPH-cc and PCBs, and nine soil gas samples were analyzed for VOCs.</p> <p>The detected concentrations of TPH-d and TPH-o did not exceed maximum soil screening levels. None of the analyzed soil samples contained VOCs or PCBs above the laboratory reporting limits (RL) and the laboratory RLs were below applicable regional screening levels. The detected concentration of tetrachloroethylene did not exceed the</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>maximum contaminant levels (MCL). None of the remaining VOCs were detected in the analyzed groundwater sample above laboratory RLs and the RLs did not exceed the MCLs. None of the detected concentrations of VOCs in soil gas exceed the current regulatory guideline for residential redevelopment.</p> <p>Based on the results of the Phase I and Phase II ESAs, contamination and toxic substances are not of concern. No recognized environmental conditions are associated with the project site and there does not appear to be a release above <i>de minimis</i> concentrations at this time.</p> <p>Source Document: 11, 12 Attachment: 5, 5a, 5b, 5c</p>
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is disturbed and surrounded by urban development with no ornamental trees. The site is partially vacant and partially developed as an auto repair facility, graded flat to street level, and contains no vegetation. Database searches of Information for Planning and Consultation and the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California indicate no species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status have the potential to occur on the project site. There is no critical habitat in the project vicinity.</p> <p>Source Document: 13, 14 and Attachment: 6</p>
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>As part of the Phase I and Phase II ESAs, no visual evidence was observed during site reconnaissance of unobstructed or unshielded above ground storage tanks (fuel oil, gasoline, propane, etc.) at, or immediately adjacent to, the project site. Based on the record search as part of the Phase I ESA, there are no above ground storage tanks within 1 mile of the project site. In addition to database searches, a review of aerial photos using Google earth was conducted, and no above ground storage tanks were observed.</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>The project would not involve explosive or flammable operations. Additionally, no known sites containing flammable, explosive, hazardous, or toxic materials were found to be of concern to future development of the site.</p> <p>Source Document: 15 and Attachment: 7</p>
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is located in urbanized Long Beach and is not utilized for agriculture production. No farmland is present that would be converted. The project site is not zoned for agriculture and is not under a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source Document: 16 and Attachment: 8</p>
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is not located in an existing floodplain. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the project site is in an area of area with reduced risk due to a levee. Therefore, no impacts related to floodplain hazards or management would occur.</p> <p>Source Document: 3 and Attachment: 9</p>
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the purposes of archeological resources is limited to the project site; however, an expanded APE was utilized to identify historic properties adjacent to the project site that may be exposed to adverse indirect effects.</p> <p>On March 27, 2020, the South Central Coastal Information Center was contacted to perform a record search of all previously recorded cultural resources (including archaeological sites) within 0.5 mile of the Direct APE. No cultural resources, built environment resources, or archeological resources have been identified within the Indirect APE.</p> <p>A review of the records available from the South Central Coastal Information Center identified 17 previously recorded built environment resources</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>recorded within a 0.5 mile search radius of the project area. These include 15 historic residential properties and 2 historic commercial buildings. None of the resources are within the project area. The closest recorded resource is P-19-187307, located approximately 330 feet to the northeast. No archaeological sites have been recorded within the search area.</p> <p>The project site is situated in an area (central Long Beach) that has been heavily developed and built-up for both commercial and residential purposes for the last 70+ years based on historic aerial imagery. Additionally, various portions of the project site itself have been developed since the 1920s with commercial businesses and residences. This has resulted in considerable past ground disturbance in the Direct APE, which would have resulted in the destruction or loss of integrity of any potential buried cultural resource. Therefore, there is low to no potential for encountering intact buried cultural resources.</p> <p>Due to the lack of identified historic properties within the APE, as well as past land use activities and ground disturbance within the Direct APE, the proposed project is expected to have no effect on historic properties. Therefore, the city recommends a finding of No Historic Properties Affected.</p> <p>Source Document: 17 and Attachment: 10</p>
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Construction Noise</u> Construction noise, although temporary, can potentially affect nearby sensitive receptors, such as residences closest to the project site. Project construction would require the use of heavy equipment that may be periodically audible at off-site locations. Received noise levels would fluctuate depending on the construction activity, equipment type, and distance between noise source and receiver. Additionally, noise from

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>construction equipment would vary dependent on the construction phase and the number and type of equipment at a location at any given time.</p> <p>The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are the residences located north of the alley along the project sites northern property line. Although construction noise would be higher than the ambient noise in the project vicinity, construction noise is short-term and would cease to occur once project construction is complete.</p> <p>Chapter 8.80 Noise, of the City of Long Beach Municipal Code, establishes exterior and interior noise limits for the generation of sound within the City of Long Beach. The project would be required to comply with the municipal code which limits construction to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and Saturdays between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Additionally, no construction activities can occur on federal holidays and the City of Long Beach's Noise Control Office must issue a permit for construction work on Sundays.</p> <p>Traffic noise associated with project construction is not anticipated to be a substantial source of noise. Traffic noise is not greatly influenced by lower levels of traffic, such as those associated with the project's construction effort. For example, traffic levels would have to double for traffic noise on adjacent roadways to increase by 3 A-weighted decibels (dBA). The project's construction traffic on adjacent roadways would increase hourly traffic volumes by much less than a factor of two; therefore, acceptable noise levels would not be exceeded.</p> <p><u>HUD Noise Standards</u></p> <p>The acceptable exterior noise levels set forth by HUD regulations for new construction of housing are 65 day-night average sound level (DNL) or less. DNL is a 24-hour average noise</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>level with a 10 dBA penalty for noise occurring during the nighttime hours, defined as 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. The regulations consider the range between 65 dBA DNL and 75 dBA DNL to be normally unacceptable, unless appropriate sound attenuation measures are provided. Unacceptable noise levels, set by the HUD regulations, are 75 dBA DNL and higher.</p> <p>Based on the preliminary site plan the proposed residential units will be constructed within 50 feet of the centerline of Pacific Coast Highway. At this distance the proposed residential units would be exposed to noise levels of up to 73 dBA DNL. Standard building construction in warm climates provides 24 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are closed and 12 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are open (Protective Noise Levels, Environmental Protection Agency 550/9 79 100, November 1978). All new construction of residential units requires some form of mechanical ventilation to ensure that proper indoor air quality is maintained even with all windows and doors closed. Therefore, with windows closed, the new residential units would be exposed to interior noise levels exceeding the 45 dBA DNL standard ($73 - 24 = 49$). Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be implemented.</p> <p>HUD regulations also establish standards for exterior noise (24 CFR § 51.101(a)(9)). Associated open outdoor areas where people may congregate are considered in the evaluation for noise. The resident's courtyard is located in the center of the parcel and is shielded from traffic noise by buildings. Additionally, there are no balconies located on the Pacific Coast Highway side of the building. Due to this design characteristic for outdoor attenuation purposes, acceptable noise levels for exterior noise would not be exceeded.</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>The project site is located more than two miles southwest of the Long Beach Airport. The noise from the airport would not contribute to the noise environment at the project site based on each airport's respective noise contour map.</p> <p>Source Document: 18, 19 and Attachment: 11</p>
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project is not located in an area designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as being supported by a sole source aquifer. The project is served by the Long Beach Water Department, which is not provided from a sole source aquifer. The nearest sole source aquifer is over 100 miles southeast near the Mexico border, east of San Diego.</p> <p>Source Document: 20 and Attachment 12</p>
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is not located within or adjacent to wetlands. Based on the United States Fish and Wildlife Service wetland mapper and aerial photograph review, there are no previously identified wetlands within 0.25-mile of the project site. In addition, the project site is already heavily disturbed, urban in nature, and the project will not affect any coastal or riparian wetlands.</p> <p>Source Document: 21 and Attachment 13</p>
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>There are no waterways on the project site and there are no wild and scenic rivers in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the project would have no effect on any scenic rivers as part of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968.</p> <p>Source Document: 22 and Attachment: 14</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The project site is partially vacant and partially developed as an auto repair facility. The project site does not house any populations. The project site has an environmental justice population</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>based on 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.</p> <p>The project would provide new affordable senior housing, thereby adding to the environmental justice population of the area. The community serving tenant would provide job opportunities for the neighborhood, and the development of the project site would provide low-income seniors with affordable housing opportunities, thus providing benefits to an environmental justice population. This analysis further considers project impacts and their potential to disproportionately affect the projects introduced environmental justice population.</p> <p><u>Project Impacts</u></p> <p>From the consideration of regulatory factors in this Environmental Assessment, a number of environmental topics were identified to generate potential effects requiring mitigation. However, because impacts would be shared by neighboring, non-environmental justice populations, thus the following impacts with their mitigation summarized below do not represent impacts with potential to disproportionately affect an environmental justice population.</p> <p><i>Air Quality.</i> Construction and operation of the project would result in criteria pollutant emissions below threshold levels, with respect to federal General Conformity <i>de minimis</i> levels and SCAQMD's threshold of significance. Further, the project would be required to comply with Rule 403 to reduce fugitive dust from leaving the project site.</p> <p><i>Contamination and Toxic Substances:</i> The Phase I and Phase II reports prepared for the project concluded contamination and toxic substances are not of concern. No recognized environmental conditions are associated with the project site</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<p>and there does not appear to be a release above <i>de minimis</i> concentrations at this time.</p> <p><i>Historic Preservation:</i> The project site has previously been disturbed and the new building does not propose subterranean levels. Record searches indicate there are no historic properties in the APE that would be adversely affected.</p> <p><i>Construction Noise.</i> The project would introduce short-term noises during construction of the new building. The nearest sensitive land uses to the project include residences to the north of the project site. The project would be required to comply with the City of Long Beach Municipal Code, which restricts construction hours.</p> <p><i>Operational Noise.</i> The HUD DNL Calculator estimates that exterior noise levels at the project site would be within HUD's normally acceptable range, thus indicating low-income residents would be exposed to excess noise. Mitigation Measure NOI-1 requires windows and doors with a Sound Transmission Class of 32 or higher be installed. Therefore, exterior noise exposure would be reduced for environmental justice populations.</p> <p><i>Geology and Soils:</i> The project site is outside of an Earthquake Fault Zone, the principal seismic hazard that could affect the site is ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along one of several major active or potentially active faults in Southern California. The site does have the potential to be exposed to strong seismic shaking; however, the project facilities would be designed consistent with the California Building Code in order to minimize hazards during a seismic event. The California Building Code includes standards related to soils and foundations, structure design, building materials, and structural testing and inspections.</p>

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
		<u>Conclusion</u> Overall, the project is not anticipated to create permanent adverse effects in the project area existing populations, or to an introduced environmental justice population. Source Document: 23, 24, 25 and Attachment: 15

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27] Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

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

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The project site is located within the heavily urbanized community of the Central Area West neighborhood. The project is in an infill development on parcels that were previously developed. The project would not physically divide an established community. The project consists of the construction of a new mixed-use building with a maximum of four stories. The project site is not located in a coastal zone and is not subject

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>to the Local Coastal Program. The project would consist of 100 percent affordable senior housing units and would take advantage of the density bonus offered by state law (California Government Code §65915) for such project.</p> <p>The project also would take advantage of the provisions of state law that require local government to grant development standards waivers and additional development standards concessions for affordable housing projects (§65915) and commercial development partnered with affordable housing project (§65917.5) if the strict application of normal development standards would preclude the project from being feasible. Under California’s Density Bonus Law (Assembly Bill 1763) the project is entitled to four development standard incentives. The applicant is proposing to use three of the four incentives it is eligible for in order to reduce the project’s setback requirements under the City of Long Beach zoning. Additionally, the project’s parking requirements for the low income residential units are eliminated under Assembly Bill 1763. The project is allowed three additional stories or 33 feet increase in height over existing zoning. The proposed project is adding one additional story above what the existing zoning allows. The proposed density is consistent with the proposed zoning.</p> <p>The required entitlements are site-specific and an allowable discretionary action and would not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations; as they would not result in broader changes to the goals, policies and programs.</p> <p>Source Document: 26, 27, 28</p>
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	2	<p><u>Geology/Soil Stability</u></p> <p>Due to the relatively flat topography and the lack of exposed slopes, the risk of substantial erosion or loss of topsoil is considered low. According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project, the project site is underlain by Pleistocene age alluvium, which is not prone to liquefaction. The potential for liquefaction and associated ground deformations beneath the site is very low.</p> <p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <p>Construction of the project would disturb less than 1 acre of soil. The project would comply with all requirements of the Long Beach Municipal Code related to stormwater management, the city’s Stormwater Management Plan and the city’s Waste Discharge Requirements for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>System Discharges from the City of Long Beach (City of Long Beach Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit).</p> <p>Due to the increase in impervious surfaces, the project would be required to implement post-construction best management practices to mitigate stormwater pollution during operation and prepare a Low Impact Development Plan or equivalent, in compliance with the City of Long Beach Low Impact Development Best Management Practice Design Manual.</p> <p>Source Document: 29, 30, 31, 32 and Attachment 16</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise</p>	<p>3</p>	<p><u>Hazardous Materials</u></p> <p>The project would involve the construction of a mixed-use building, which would not typically involve the use or storage of large quantities of hazardous materials. During construction, the use of potentially hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents would occur. The transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials would be conducted in accordance with all applicable state and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. The city is an urbanized community, and there are no wild lands in the project site vicinity. There would be no risk of exposing people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires.</p> <p><u>Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise as discussed above in Noise and Abatement Control would be temporary and require compliance with the City of Long Beach Municipal Code, which regulates hours of construction. Noise generated by the project would consist of short-duration noise resulting from construction activities, and long-term noise from on-site stationary sources and off-site traffic noise from vehicles operated by employees using the proposed mixed-use building.</p> <p>Based on the preliminary site plan, the proposed residential units will be constructed within 50 feet of the centerline of Pacific Coast Highway. At this distance the proposed residential units would be exposed to noise levels of up to 73 dBA DNL. Standard building construction in warm climates provides 24 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are closed and 12 dBA of exterior to interior noise attenuation when windows are open (Protective Noise Levels, Environmental Protection Agency 550/9 79 100, November 1978). All new</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>construction of residential units requires some form of mechanical ventilation to ensure that proper indoor air quality is maintained even with all windows and doors closed. Therefore, with windows closed, the new residential units would be exposed to interior noise levels exceeding the 45 dBA DNL standard (73 – 24 = 49). Therefore, Mitigation Measure NOI-1 would be implemented.</p> <p>Source Document: 11, 19</p>
Energy Consumption	2	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Construction activities would consume electricity and fossil fuels but would not require consumption of natural gas. The use of construction vehicles and equipment would consume fossil fuels, such as diesel, gasoline, and oil. Water consumption during construction activities would indirectly consume electricity.</p> <p>When not in use, electric equipment would be shut off to avoid unnecessary consumption of electricity. Energy consumption during construction would be temporary and would cease upon completion of construction activities. Because of the high cost of fuel, construction and maintenance activities would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy, as construction contractors would purchase fuel from local suppliers and would conserve the use of their supplies to minimize the cost of constructing the project. Therefore, construction impacts would not result in adverse effects.</p> <p><u>Operation</u></p> <p>Operation of the mixed use building would involve consumption of electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels related to automobile use. During ongoing operation of the project, the project would consume electricity in the form of building energy use, outdoor electricity use, and electricity consumption related to indoor and outdoor water consumption. The project would comply with building energy efficiency standards, including the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6), effective January 1, 2020, which is mandatory statewide for new residential and nonresidential buildings. The 2019 Title 24 standards align the lighting and efficiency improvements to the residential standards with the American Society of Heating and Air-Conditioning Engineers national standards.</p> <p>The California Green Building Standards Code (California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 11), also called the CALGreen</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>Code, went into effect on January 1, 2020, and includes mandatory standards for low rise residential buildings. The project would comply with the CALGreen Code, which includes measures to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from buildings through site development and reducing energy and water consumption.</p> <p>As the project site is partially vacant, when compared to existing conditions, the project would increase overall energy consumption. The project would include solar-ready roofs that can be equipped with solar panels that would provide a source of on-site renewable energy. In addition, the project would provide twelve electric-vehicle parking spaces for the building and would thus promote alternative fuel consumption for vehicles. Therefore, project operation would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, and would not result in adverse effects.</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
SOCIOECONOMIC		
Employment and Income Patterns	1	<p>Currently, the site is partially developed and has minimal economic impact on the surrounding area. The project would increase available commercial real estate, and provide up to 20 work opportunities in the tenant space in the first floor of the building, as well as 4 maintenance staff work opportunities and 5 social service staff opportunities. It is expected that construction work and ongoing work within the constructed commercial space and resident amenity space would be accommodated by the existing employment pool. No adverse impacts are anticipated from the project on employment and income within the project area.</p>
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	<p>The project is expected to provide 67 units to serve low income senior residents in the area. The project would be consistent with the Long Beach Housing element and help provide affordable housing to residents within the city. No displacement is expected to occur. The project will bring in additional housing units for the area and provide additional low income housing for senior residents in the area. Currently the City of Long Beach has an estimated 18.1 percent of its population living under the poverty line. With the project site currently being partially vacant and having commercial development, no residents would be displaced during the construction of the project.</p> <p>Source document: 24, 25, 33</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	<p>The project does include housing that would not add students to the Long Beach Unified School District. The applicant would be required to pay school impact fees pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), as applicable. The closest schools include Long Beach Polytechnic High School, Roosevelt Elementary School, and Bobbie Smith Elementary School, which would all serve the residents of the project. The closest public library branch is the Long Beach Public Library – Burnett Branch, approximately 0.08 mile away, located at 560 East Hill Street. The project would develop a mixed use building with apartments, which would not generate a significant demand for libraries. Primary users of the library system are residents of the City of Long Beach. Currently the Burnett branch would be able to adequately serve the additional residents from the proposed project.</p> <p>Cultural facilities within the City of Long Beach are accessible within walking distance or via public transportation. The Homeland Cultural Arts Center is located at 1321 East Anaheim Street and the Long Beach Firefighter’s Museum is located at 1445 North Peterson Avenue. Other cultural facilities are accessible via public transportation.</p> <p>Source Document: 34, 35</p>
Commercial Facilities	2	<p>The Central Area West neighborhood around the project site consists of various land uses including commercial, residential, and public space. For example, PCHMarket is located 1 block north of the project site, and Smart and Final Extra is located .7 miles south of the project site. Additionally, PCH Beauty Supply is located 1 block to the south of the project site.</p> <p>The project is within adequate and convenient distance to retail services that provide essential items such as food, medicine, banks, and other convenience shopping. The project residents would contribute to the ongoing vitality of these types of commercial facilities.</p>
Health Care and Social Services	2	<p>The closest hospital to the project is Dignity Health – St. Mary Medical Center and is located approximately 1 mile south of the project site at 1050 Linden Ave. Additional health facilities include Memorial Care Health System (2801 Atlantic Avenue) 1.5 miles away, and the VA Long Beach Healthcare System (5901 East 7th Street), 3.9 miles away.</p>
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	<p>The project involves construction of a mixed use building with attached parking structure. Approximately 29 individuals are assumed to be employed in the building, and approximately</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>165 individuals are assumed to live in the building. CalRecycle maintains a waste characterization list of waste generation rates. The most recent information for employee disposal rates indicates a waste generation rate of 10.5 pounds of waste per employee per day, and 12.2 pounds of waste per household per day. Based on this rate, the 29 employees would generate approximately 304.5 pounds of solid waste per day along with 2,013 pounds of solid waste produced by the units per day. This increase would be within the capacity of Scholl Canyon Landfill, which currently receives 1,400 tons per day, with 2,000 tons per day of capacity available. Based on the disposal capacity of landfills serving the project site, this incremental increase in solid waste generation would not affect the availability of solid waste disposal capacity.</p> <p>Source Document: 36, 37</p>
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	<p>The project would require standard utilities for supporting the facilities that would be on site. The Los Angeles County Sanitation District, Joint Water Pollution Control Plant receives the city's wastewater. The Joint Water Pollution Control Plant provides advanced primary and partial secondary treatment for 261.1 million gallons of wastewater per day, with a permitted capacity for 400 million gallons of wastewater per day of wastewater.</p> <p>Generation rates based on the project uses is based on wastewater generation rates developed by the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, the project would generate an estimated net total of 11,908 gallons of wastewater per day. The project's contribution to the wastewater capacity would be less than 0.1 percent. The increase associated with the percent of the available daily capacity would not cause the wastewater treatment limits to be exceeded.</p> <p>Source Document: 38, 39</p>
Water Supply	2	<p>According to the City of Long Beach's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, the total citywide water demand for 2015 was 55,206 acre feet and would increase by 3,900 acre feet in 2040. The Urban Water Management Plan identifies water supply as adequate to meet these needs. Efforts for water conservation in California localities remain. In June 2016, the Long Beach Board of Water Commissioners declared a Stage 1 Water Supply Shortage for the City of Long Beach. This declaration put into place regulations that limit the use of water in the city including when outdoor watering can occur, and limits to use and practice for residential, business and commercial facilities. The project's incremental contribution to the future demand and new sources of</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>water supply would not be required to meet the anticipated project water needs.</p> <p>Source Document: 40</p>
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	<p>The project site is within the jurisdiction of the Long Beach Fire Department, which would provide fire protection, medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue services. The Long Beach Fire Department fire station nearest to the site is Fire Station 10, located at 1417 North Peterson Avenue, approximately 0.8 mile from the site. Police protection is provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Long Beach Police Department nearest to the project site is Long Beach Police West Division, located at 1835 Santa Fe Avenue, approximately 2.1 mile from the project site. Ambulance services are provided by the Long Beach Fire department, and provide services to the hospitals within the city limits. The closest hospital to the project is Dignity Health – St. Mary Medical Center, and is located approximately 1 mile south of the project site at 1050 Linden Ave. Additional health facilities include Memorial Care Health System (2801 Atlantic Avenue), 1.5 miles away, and the VA Long Beach Healthcare System (5901 East 7th Street), 3.9 miles away. Although the project would increase the number of buildings and individuals on site, it would be an incremental increase that would not require additional police presence or demand on site. As part of the project, police and fire impact fees would be required to be paid by the developer to offset the increase in population.</p>
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	<p>The project consists of community serving tenant and apartments, which would not add a significant amount residents to the area and increase the demand for parks. The closest park to the project site includes California Recreation Park, which is located 0.3 mile away at 1550 Martin Luther King Jr Ave. A parks and recreational facilities fee would be required to offset the increase in residential units.</p>
Transportation and Accessibility	2	<p>During construction, construction-related traffic, such as deliveries of equipment and materials and construction worker traffic, would be generated. However, construction traffic would be temporary and would not substantially interfere with the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system.</p> <p>The increase in users after completion of the project would be considered minimal and not cause additional stress on the local street and transportation systems. The project traffic volumes would not generate any significant impacts at the near-by intersections. Further, the project site is located within ½ mile of a high-quality transit corridor or within a Southern California Association of Government 2045 High-Quality Transit Area; therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>vehicle miles traveled according to the City of Long Beach <i>Draft Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines</i> (October 2018).</p> <p>Attachment: 17</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATURAL FEATURES		
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	2	<p>Review of the California Geological Survey map of the region indicates that sediment in the project site consists of artificial fill underlain by <i>Qom - Old shallow marine deposits on wave-cut surface, undivided (late to middle Pleistocene)</i>. These poorly consolidated marine deposits are composed mostly of fine- to coarse-grained sand and may locally carry common late Pleistocene molluscan fauna. Following Caltrans' paleontological sensitivity scale, these units are considered to have low potential to contain significant vertebrate, significant invertebrate, or significant plant fossils. Rock units designated as having low potential generally do not require monitoring and mitigation. Based on review of previous studies, the project would not impact any unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features.</p> <p>The City of Long Beach Water Department would provide water service to the project site and the project would not deplete groundwater supplies. According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared for the project, with depths to groundwater at about 40 feet below the ground surface. Therefore, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge.</p> <p>Source Document: 29, 41, 42, 43, 44 and Attachment: 16</p>
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	<p>The project site is disturbed and surrounded by urban development. Database searches of Information for Planning and Consultation and the Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California indicate no species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status have the potential to occur on the project site.</p> <p>Source Document: 13, 14, 15</p>
Other Factors	2	<p><u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></p> <p>In lieu of any federal guidance for assessing GHG emissions, this analysis applies the methodology of SCAQMD. For the</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<p>purposes of determining whether or not GHG emissions from affected projects are adverse, SCAQMD specifies that project emissions must include direct, indirect, and, to the extent information is available, life-cycle emissions during construction and operation. Based on this direction, construction emissions were amortized over the life of the project (defined as 30 years), added to the operational emissions, and compared to the applicable GHG significance thresholds.</p> <p>The SCAQMD's interim thresholds for commercial, residential, mixed use, and industrial development projects are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial projects – 10,000 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) per year • Residential, commercial, and mixed use projects (including parks, warehouses, etc.) – 3,000 MT CO₂e per year <p>The project is a mixed use building with attached parking structure. For purposes of this analysis, both direct and indirect GHG emissions from the project are discussed in the context of the 3,000 MT threshold levels.</p> <p><u>Construction Emissions</u></p> <p>Construction of the project would result in temporary emissions associated with diesel engine combustion from mass grading, and site preparation construction equipment would be assumed to occur for engines running at the correct fuel-to-air ratios (the ratio whereby complete combustion of the diesel fuel occurs). Construction-related GHG emissions include site preparation, excavation, and associated construction of the proposed mixed use building.</p> <p>The most recent version of the CalEEMod model (Version 2016.3.2) was used to calculate the construction emissions. Construction of the proposed project would generate 329 MT of CO₂e. Amortized over a 30-year period, the approximate life of the project, the yearly contribution to GHG from the construction of the build alternatives with an at-grade concourse would be 11 MT of CO₂e per year.</p> <p><u>Operational Emissions</u></p> <p>The operational GHG emission estimates were also calculated using CalEEMod. The following activities associated with the project could directly or indirectly contribute to the generation of GHG emissions:</p>

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas, Electricity, and Water Use: Natural gas use results in the emissions of two GHGs: methane (CH₄; the major component of natural gas) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) from the combustion of natural gas. Electricity use can result in GHG production if the electricity is generated by combusting fossil fuel. Annual electricity emissions were estimated using the reported GHG emissions per kilowatt-hour for Southern California Edison; the supplier would provide electricity for the project. • Solid Waste Disposal: Solid waste generated by the project could contribute to GHG emissions in a variety of ways. Landfilling and other methods of disposal use energy for transporting and managing the waste, and they produce additional GHGs to varying degrees. Landfilling, the most common waste management practice, results in the release of CH₄ from the anaerobic decomposition of organic materials. CH₄ is 21 times more potent a GHG than CO₂. However, landfill CH₄ can also be a source of energy. In addition, many materials in landfills do not decompose fully, and the carbon that remains is sequestered in the landfill and not released into the atmosphere. • Motor Vehicle Use: Transportation associated with the project would result in GHG emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels in vehicle trips. The project would result in GHG emissions through the vehicular traffic generated. <p>Combined Emissions: The annual CalEEMod calculations for GHG emissions indicate project operations would result in average annual emissions of 1,016 metric tons of CO₂e per year.</p> <p>The total annual GHG emissions of 1,027 MT of CO₂e, from construction and operations, is less than the SCAQMD's interim screening threshold of 3,000 MT of CO₂e per year. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in individual or cumulative adverse effects from GHG emissions.</p>

Additional Studies Performed:

1. Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for 925-945 East Pacific Coast Highway, July 2019
2. Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., Phase II Subsurface Investigation Report for 901 East Pacific Coast Highway, July 2019
3. Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update for 901 East Pacific Coast Highway, November 2019
4. Veneklasen Associates, Inc., Preliminary Assessment of Environmental Noise, April 2020
5. Geocon West, Inc., Geotechnical Investigation, November 2019

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

1. June 18, 2019: Ground Penetrating Radar Systems (subcontractor to Partner Engineering and Science, Inc.), conducted borings for Phase II
2. July 16, 2019: Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., site reconnaissance for Phase I ESA for 925-945 East Pacific Coast Highway
3. October 9, 2019: Geocon, field exploration for Geotechnical Investigation
4. November 8, 2019: Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., site reconnaissance for Phase I ESA for 901 East Pacific Coast Highway

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

Source List:

1. Los Angeles County. 2004. *Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Plan*. Available at: http://planning.lacounty.gov/assets/upl/data/pd_alup.pdf. Accessed April 2, 2020
2. United States Fish and Wildlife. 2019. Coastal Barriers Resources System Mapper. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/cbra/Maps/Mapper.html>. Accessed April 2, 2020
3. Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2008. Flood Insurance Rate Map. Available at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search#searchresultsanchor>. Accessed April 2, 2020
4. Air Resources Board (ARB). 2016. *Ambient Air Quality Standards*. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2020-03/aaqs2_0.pdf. Accessed June 3, 2020
5. California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod). 2016. California Emissions Estimator Model Version 2016.3.2. Available at: <http://www.caleemod.com/>. Accessed July 14, 2020
6. South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). 1993. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*. [http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-\(1993\)](http://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/ceqa/air-quality-analysis-handbook/ceqa-air-quality-handbook-(1993)). Accessed June 3, 2020
7. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2020a. *Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants* (Green Book). Available at: <https://www.epa.gov/green-book>. Accessed June 3, 2020.
8. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2020b. General Conformity *De Minimis* Tables. Available: <https://www.epa.gov/general-conformity/de-minimis-tables>. Accessed June 3, 2020.
9. Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 2000. *A General Location Guide for Ultramafic Rocks in California—Areas More Likely to Contain Naturally Occurring Asbestos*. ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/ofr/ofr_2000-019.pdf. Accessed June 3, 2020.
10. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 2020. Coastal Zone Management Program. Available at: <https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/>. Accessed April 2, 2020
11. California Department of Toxic Substance Control. 2020. EnviroStor Database. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed June 3, 2020
12. California State Water Resources Control Board. 2020. Geotracker. Available at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed June 3, 2020

13. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2020. *Information for Planning and Consultation*. Available at: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/> Accessed May 28, 2020
14. California Native Plant Society. 2020. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Available at: <http://www.rareplants.cnps.org>. Accessed May 28, 2020
15. California Environmental Protection Agency. 2020. CalEPA Regulated Site Portal. Available at: <https://siteportal.caepa.ca.gov/nsite>. Accessed June 3, 2020
16. California Department of Conservation. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed April 2, 2020
17. South Central Coastal Information Center. 2020. Record Search Results for the PCH MLK Affordable Housing Project, prepared May 27, 2020
18. United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2009. HUD Noise Guidebook. Available at: <https://www.hudexchange.info/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/>. Accessed June 3, 2020
19. Federal Highway Administration. 2006. FHWA Construction Noise Model User's Guide. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/rcnm/rcnm.pdf. Accessed June 3, 2020
20. United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2017. Sole Source Aquifer Data. Available at: <https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/national-sole-source-aquifer-gis-layer>. Accessed June 3, 2020
21. United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. National Wetlands Inventory Wetlands Mapper. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>. Accessed June 3, 2020
22. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. 2019. *National Wild and Scenic River Systems in the U.S.* Available at: <https://www.rivers.gov/index.php>. Accessed June 3, 2020
23. California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment. 2018. CalEnviroScreen 3.0. Available at: <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data>. Accessed June 3, 2020
24. United States Census Bureau. 2000. Profile of General Demographic Characteristics. Available at: <https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/2001/dec/2kh06.pdf?#>. Accessed June 3, 2020
25. United States Census Bureau. 2019. Quick Facts: Long Beach city, California. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/longbeachcitycalifornia,US/PST045218>. Accessed June 3, 2020
26. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 1980. *Long Beach General Plan Program*, Local Coastal Program element. Available at: <http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/general-plan/local-coastal-program>. Accessed April 2, 2020
27. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 2019. *City of Long Beach General Plan*, Land Use Element. Available at:

- <http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/planning/advance/1ueude/land-use-element-final-adopted-december-2019> Accessed June 3, 2020
28. City of Long Beach, Long Beach Planning Department. 2020. City of Long Beach Zoning. Available at:
<https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?layers=4c54ad877a704fab9add29b4bd07bbff>. Accessed April 2, 2020
 29. Saucedo, George J., H. Gary Greene, Michael P. Kennedy, and Stephen P. Bezore. 2016. Geologic Map of the Long Beach 30' x 60' Quadrangle, California. Version 2.0. California Geological Survey, California Department of Conservation.
 30. Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group. 2015. *Coordinated Integrated Monitoring Program for the Dominguez Channel Watershed Management Area Group*. Available at: https://www.lastormwater.org/wp-content/files_mf/dcdraftcimp2014.pdf Accessed April 2, 2020
 31. Long Beach Development Services. 2013. *Low Impact Development Best Management Practices Design Manual*, 2nd edition. Available at:
<http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/orphans/lid/lid-bmp-manual--2nd-ed-final-121813> Accessed April 2, 2020
 32. City of Long Beach. 2001. *Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan*. Available at:
<http://www.longbeach.gov/pw/resources/stormwater-management/lb-stormwater-plan/> Accessed April 2, 2020
 33. City of Long Beach. 2014. 2013-2021 Housing Element. Available at:
http://www.longbeach.gov/globalassets/lbds/media-library/documents/orphans/adopted-2013-2021/adopted-housing-element_revised-cover-with-border-a. Accessed April 2, 2020
 34. Long Beach Unified School District. 2019. School Finder. Available at:
<http://www.lbschools.net/Schools/finder.cfm>. Accessed April 2, 2020
 35. Long Beach Public Library. 2019. Library Locations. Available at:
<http://longbeach.gov/library/visit/locations/>. Accessed April 2, 2020
 36. California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2016. California's 2016 Per Capita Disposal Rate Estimate. Available at:
<https://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/lgcentra/goalmeasure/disposalrate/mostrecent> Accessed April 4, 2020
 37. City of Glendale. 2014. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Scholl Canyon Landfill Expansion*, Volume 1 of 2. March. Prepared by Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, Whittier.
 38. Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. 2015. Service Area. Available at:
<https://www.lacsd.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=4445> Accessed June 3, 2020
 39. Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. N.d. Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use. Available at:
<https://www.lacsd.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?blobid=3531> Accessed June 3, 2020
 40. City of Long Beach. 2015. City of Long Beach. *Urban Water Management Plan*. Available at:

<https://lbwater.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/LBWD-2015-UWMP-FINAL-Board-Adopted-3.pdf>. Accessed April 3, 2020

41. Addicott W. O. 1964. *Pleistocene Invertebrates from the Dume Terrace, Western Santa Monica Mountains, California*. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of Sciences 63(3):141-150,
42. California Department of Transportation. 2017. "Paleontology." Standard Environmental Reference, Environmental Handbook, Volume 1, Chapter 8. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/environmental-analysis/standard-environmental-reference-ser/volume-1-guidance-for-compliance/ch-8-paleontology> Accessed June 3, 2020
43. Delong, James H. 1939. *The Paleontology and Stratigraphy of the Pleistocene at Signal Hill, California*. Master's thesis, California Institute of Technology. Available at: <https://thesis.library.caltech.edu/5582/> Accessed June 3, 2020
44. Smith, Brooks. 2013. Paleontological Resources Assessment, California State University Long Beach Foundation Project. Prepared by LSA Associates for the City of Long Beach

Attachments:

1. Airport Hazards Worksheet
2. Flood Insurance Worksheet
3. Air Quality Worksheet
 - a. CalEEMod Results
 - b. Record of Non-Applicability for Clean Air Act Conformity
4. Coastal Zone Management Worksheet
5. Site Contamination Multi Family Worksheet
 - a. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Update for 901 East Pacific Coast Highway
 - b. Phase II Subsurface Investigation Report for 901 East Pacific Coast Highway
 - c. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for 925-945 East Pacific Coast Highway
6. Endangered Species Worksheet
7. Explosive and Flammable Facilities Worksheet
8. Farmlands Protection Worksheet
9. Floodplain Management Worksheet
10. Historic Resources Worksheet
11. Noise Abatement and Control Worksheet
 - a. HUD DNL Calculator
12. Sole Source Aquifers Worksheet
13. Wetlands Protection Worksheet
14. Wild and Scenic River Worksheet
15. Environmental Justice Worksheet
16. Geotechnical Investigation Report
17. Focused Traffic Assessment for the Mercy Housing Project

List of Permits Obtained:

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

- Zone Change of three existing parcels (four lots) on Pacific Coast Highway from Regional CHW to CCN.

- A Conditional Use Permit to permit the operation of the senior housing development.
- Site plan review of a four-story, mixed-use building with a height of 52 feet, 6 inches and containing 75,668 square feet of building area.
- Zoning incentives/waivers, height increase to allow one additional story, 3-foot wide front yard setback (Pacific Coast Highway) instead of a 15-foot setback, 5-foot wide side yard setback (Martin Luther King Junior Avenue) instead of 10-foot setback, 20-foot wide residential buffer setback (alley), Open Space reduction, per California Government Code §65915 and §65915.7.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

In October 2019, the project developer hosted a community meeting at St. Mary Tower, a senior affordable housing complex approximately 0.8 mile from the project site. The project developer sent out over 1,000 mailers to every occupant and property owner within 1,000 feet of the project site, as well as local stakeholders and community groups. The mailer included invitations to the meetings and project fact sheets in Spanish and English. In addition to the community meeting, the project developer met with nearly a dozen local community groups and institutions including the local high school, Long Beach City College, Long Beach’s homeless service agency, Pacific Gateway Employment Center, Long Beach Senior Center, two neighborhood groups, Dignity Health, and the local council member’s office.

In light of the COVID-19 Stay at Home Order, the project developer set up a website for the project to keep residents and stakeholders informed on the project’s progress (<https://www.longbeachsenior.org/>). Additional in-person meetings and outreach will be planned as the Stay at Home Order is lifted.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

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

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

As identified above under Clean Air Act, the project would not exceed the federal *de minimis* threshold pursuant to the 1990 amendments to the Federal Clean Air Act or local SCAQMD for construction or operation. These thresholds are designed with development of the entire air basin

in mind and thus are not cumulative in nature. As the project is below these thresholds, the project's contribution to potential cumulative impacts would be minimal.

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

With respect to Historic Resources, ground disturbance for the project would occur only in areas that have already been heavily disturbed by prior development and land use activities. A review of historic aerial photographs and topographic maps show that the proposed project area has been developed with residential land uses since at least the early 1920s. The west half of the project site is currently occupied by an automotive repair business and an automotive spray booth. The east half of the project site has been vacant since 2010. The project is not anticipated to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

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

Offsite Alternative:

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

Reduced Project:

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

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

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

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

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

For Noise Control and Abatement, the project would result in minor adverse, but mitigatable, impacts. No impacts are potentially significant to the extent that an Environmental Impact Statement would be required. The project would result primarily in less than significant impacts to the environment, with beneficial socioeconomic and health care impacts.

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

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure
Noise Abatement and Control	Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Noise Reduction Windows and doors with a Sound Transmission Class of 32 or higher shall be installed in the residential uses facing Anaheim Street.

Determination:

Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Finding of Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.



Preparer Signature: _____ Date: 7/20/20

Name/Title/Organization: Jenny Vick, Environmental Deputy Project Manager, HDR Engineering, Inc.

Certifying Officer Signature:  _____ Date: 7/20/20

Name/Title: Christopher Koontz, Deputy Director Development Services

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