

1 RESOLUTION NO. R-

2
3 A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
4 OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH CERTIFYING THAT THE
5 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE 2810
6 EAST FIRST STREET PROJECT (STATE
7 CLEARINGHOUSE NO.2013051073) HAS BEEN
8 COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS
9 OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
10 AND STATE AND LOCAL GUIDELINES AND MAKING
11 CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS RELATIVE
12 THERETO
13

14 WHEREAS, Applicant, Alan Schwendener, has proposed the restoration of
15 his recently purchased home at 2810 East First Street ("Project"). This residence was
16 originally constructed in 1921 and was identified as a contributing structure within the
17 Bluff Heights Historic District. The project objectives are to eliminate a damaged, partially
18 disabled and blighted structure and restore/reconstruct the single family residence on a
19 previously occupied site, using the maximum amount of on-site original materials that is
20 feasible. The project intention is to develop a "new" single-family residence with modern
21 amenities while maintaining the District's historical significance, character, and quality by
22 using architectural styles, materials, and features from the 1920s, the District's period of
23 significance.

24 The Project is more fully described in the Environmental Impact Report
25 (EIR), a copy of which EIR, including the complete Proposed Project description, is
26 incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, word for word.

27 WHEREAS, Project implementation will require approval of Certificate of
28 Appropriateness by the Cultural Heritage Commission, as well as any and all building

1 permits required for construction or reconstruction. A list of discretionary and permit
2 approvals that may be required for Project implementation is set forth in the DEIR and
3 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR);

4 WHEREAS, the City began an evaluation of the proposed project by issuing
5 a Notice of Preparation (NOP) that was circulated from April 2, 2013 to May 1, 2013. A
6 Notice of Completion was prepared and filed with the State Office of Planning and
7 Research on April 2, 2013. The Draft Environmental Impact Report was completed on
8 May 24, 2013, and circulated between May 28, 2013 and July 11, 2013;

9 WHEREAS, implementation and construction of the Project constitutes a
10 "project" as defined by CEQA, Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq., and the
11 City of Long Beach is the Lead Agency for the Project under CEQA;

12 WHEREAS, it was determined during the initial processing of the Project
13 that it could have potentially significant effects on the environment, requiring the
14 preparation of an EIR;

15 WHEREAS, the City prepared full and complete responses to the
16 comments received on the DEIR, and distributed the responses in accordance with
17 Public Resources Code section 21092.5;

18 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered the
19 information in, and the comments to the DEIR and the responses thereto, as well as the
20 FEIR at a duly noticed Planning Commission meeting held on September 5, 2013, at
21 which time evidence, both written and oral, was presented to and considered by the
22 Planning Commission;

23 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has read and considered all
24 environmental documentation comprising the FEIR, including the DEIR, comments and
25 the responses to comments, and errata (if any) included in the FEIR, and has determined
26 that the FEIR considers all potentially significant environmental impacts of the Project
27 and is complete and adequate and fully complies with all requirements of CEQA;

28 WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has evaluated and considered all

1 significant impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives identified in the FEIR;
2 NOW, THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Long Beach
3 does hereby find, determine and resolve that:

4 Section 1. All of the above recitals are true and correct and are
5 incorporated herein as though fully set forth.

6 Section 2. The Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA
7 and the State CEQA Guidelines.

8 Section 3. The Final EIR, which reflects the Planning Commission's
9 independent judgment and analysis, is hereby adopted, approved, and certified as
10 complete and adequate under CEQA.

11 Section 4. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081 and State
12 CEQA Guidelines section 15091, the Planning Commission has reviewed and hereby
13 adopts the Facts and Findings regarding the environmental effects for the 2810 East 1st
14 Street Project on the attached Exhibit "A", which document is incorporated herein by
15 reference as though set forth in full, word for word.

16 Section 5. The FEIR identifies no significant environmental effects that
17 would result if the Project is approved as all potential environmental effects can feasibly
18 be avoided or mitigated and will be avoided or mitigated by the imposition of mitigation
19 measures included with the FEIR. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6,
20 the Planning Commission has reviewed and hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and
21 Reporting Program ("MMRP") as shown on the attached Exhibit "B", which document is
22 incorporated herein by reference as though set forth in full, word for word, together with
23 any adopted corrections or modifications thereto, and further finds that the mitigation
24 measures identified in the FEIR are feasible, and specifically makes each mitigation
25 measure a condition of project approval.

26 Section 6. Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15091(e), the
27 record of proceedings relating to this matter has been made available to the public at,
28 among other places, the Department of Development Services, 333 West Ocean

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
ROBERT E. SHANNON, City Attorney
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 11th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802-4664

1 Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach, California, and is, and has been, available for review
2 during normal business hours.

3 Section 7. The information provided in the various staff reports submitted
4 in connection with the Project, the corrections and modifications to the DEIR, and FEIR
5 made in response to comments and any errata which were not previously re-circulated,
6 and the evidence presented in written and oral testimony at the public hearing, do not
7 represent significant new information so as to require re-circulation of the DEIR pursuant
8 to the Public Resources Code.

9 Section 8. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption
10 by the Planning Commission, and the Planning Commission Secretary shall certify to the
11 vote adopting this resolution.

12
13 I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Planning
14 Commission of the City of Long Beach at its meeting of _____, 2013, by the
15 following vote:

16 Ayes: Commissioners:

17
18
19 Noes: Commissioners:

20
21 Absent: Commissioners:

22
23
24
25 _____
26 Planning Commission Secretary

CITY OF LONG BEACH RESOLUTION NO. _____

EXHIBIT "A"

**FACTS AND FINDINGS REGARDING
THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOR THE
2810 EAST 1ST STREET PROJECT**

SCH # 2013041004

Lead Agency:

City of Long Beach

333 W. Ocean Boulevard

Long Beach, California 90802

Contact: Mr. Craig Chalfant, Environmental Review Project Manager
562.570.6368

August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction
II.	Description of Applicant’s Proposal.....
III.	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant in the Initial Study/ Notice of Preparation.....
IV.	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant in the EIR.....
V.	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant With Mitigation and Findings
VI.	Environmental Effects That Remain Significant and Unavoidable After Mitigation and Findings
VII.	Alternatives to the Proposed Project
VIII.	Statement of Overriding Considerations
A.	Introduction
B.	Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts
C.	Statement of Overriding Considerations

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a Lead Agency issue two sets of findings prior to approving a project that will generate a significant impact on the environment. The Statement of Facts and Findings is the first set of findings where the Lead Agency identifies the significant impacts, presents facts supporting the conclusions reached in the analysis, makes one or more of three findings for each impact, and explains the reasoning behind the agency's findings.

The following statement of facts and findings has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Public Resources Code Section 21081. CEQA *Guidelines* Section 15091 (a) provides that:

No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding.

There are three possible finding categories available for the Statement of Facts and Findings pursuant to Section 15091 (a) of the CEQA *Guidelines*.

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.*
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.*
- (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.*

These findings relevant to the Project are presented in Sections V and VI.

The Statement of Overriding Considerations is the second set of findings. Where a project will cause unavoidable significant impacts, the Lead Agency may still approve a project where its benefits outweigh the adverse impacts. Further, as provided in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Lead Agency sets forth specific reasoning by which benefits are balanced against effects, and approves the project.

The City of Long Beach, the CEQA Lead Agency, finds and declares that the 2810 East 1st Street Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA *Guidelines*. The City of Long Beach finds and certifies that the EIR was reviewed and

information contained in the EIR was considered prior to any approval associated with the proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project, herein referred to as the "Project."

Based upon its review of the EIR, the Lead Agency finds that the EIR is an adequate assessment of the proposed Project's potentially significant environmental impacts, represents the independent judgment of the Lead Agency, and sets forth an adequate range of alternatives to this Project. The City of Long Beach Planning Commission certified the EIR at its hearing of September 5, 2013.

The 2810 East 1st Street Project Final EIR is comprised of the following elements:

- Public Review Draft EIR, May 24, 2013;
- Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, August 5, 2013; and
- Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, August 5, 2013.

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

- II. Description of project proposed for approval;
- III. Environmental effects determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation;
- IV. Environmental effects determined to be less than significant;
- V. Environmental effects determined to be less than significant with mitigation and findings;
- VI. Environmental effects that remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation and findings;
- VII. Alternatives to the proposed project; and
- VIII. Statement of Overriding Considerations.

II. DESCRIPTION OF APPLICANT'S PROPOSAL

The proposed 2810 East 1st Street Project is located north of Ocean Boulevard, between Temple Avenue and Orizaba Avenue, within Long Beach's Bluff Park Historic District. The residence was originally constructed in 1921. The Applicant proposes to restore the existing structure, using over 90 percent of the onsite materials. The proposal involves the use of 100 percent of the existing foundation and over 80 percent of the existing framing. Missing doors and windows would be replaced with circa 1920s. The Project proposes various structural, interior, exterior, hardscape/landscape/fencing, driveway/walkways, and utility improvements to the property. Project construction would occur in one phase over a 12-month period, beginning Summer 2013 and ending Summer 2014. The Applicant requests approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Cultural Heritage Commission (or Planning Commission, upon appeal).

III. EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IN THE INITIAL STUDY/NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The Initial Study prepared for the Project and circulated with a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft EIR found that the proposed Project would have no impact or a less than significant impact with respect to a number of environmental topics. A determination of no environmental impact or less than significant environmental impact was made for each topic area listed below.

AESTHETICS

Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

No Impact. The Project site is located within the Bluff Park neighborhood, which is described by the *General Plan* as a scenic gateway to the City with ocean views that must be retained. However, the Project site and surrounding residential uses are not afforded views of Bluff Park or the ocean due to intervening development. Additionally, public views from a scenic vista toward the Project site are not available due to the interior location of the Project site and surrounding development. Thus, the Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

No Impact. The Project site is not located along a designated State scenic highway. Therefore, the Project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway.

Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Less Than Significant Impact. Partial demolition of the existing residence, including the prior removal of the exterior walls, interior walls, and roof occurred in 2005, resulting in the exposure of bare framing and further physical deterioration of the remaining structure. Current views of the site consist of a chain link fence with construction screening and partial views of the remaining structure. The existing partially demolished structure would be reconstructed/restored and the chain link fencing would be removed, improving the existing visual character and quality of the site. The reconstructed/restored residence and garage must comply with the residential development standards specified in Municipal Code Table 31-21A, which regulate factors of compatibility and aesthetics such as minimum building setbacks, maximum building height and maximum number of dwelling units per lot, among other development factors.

According to Municipal Code Section 2.63.040.B, the Cultural Heritage Commission would review the proposed restoration/reconstruction and issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness. Compliance with the residential development standards, which would

be verified through the City's discretionary review process, and review by the Cultural Heritage Commission, would ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and the overall Bluff Park Historic District. Therefore, Project implementation would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Less Than Significant Impact. The existing residence has been unoccupied for several years, thus, is not a contributing source of light in the area. Currently, light and glare in the Project vicinity is produced by vehicle headlights, street lighting, residential security lighting, and interior lighting associated with existing residential uses. Project implementation would introduce new sources of lighting that currently do not exist. However, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residential use that was a contributing source of light in the area. Moreover, the lighting that would be created by the Project would not be dissimilar or substantially greater than the existing residential uses in the area. Therefore, Project implementation would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use.

No Impact. The Project area is void of any agricultural uses. No areas of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance would be affected by the Project or converted to a non-agricultural use.

Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.

No Impact. The Project site is zoned Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District and not under Williamson Act Contract. No agricultural zoning applies to the site. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)).

and

Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

No Impact. The Project site is zoned Two-family Residential, Large Lot (R-2-L) District. No zoning for forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production applies to the Project site. In addition, the Project site does not contain any trees capable

of supporting ten percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, or that allow for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production.

Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

No Impact. No other changes in the existing environment would occur that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

AIR QUALITY

Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Less Than Significant Impact. The determination of 2012 AQMP consistency is primarily concerned with the long-term influence of a project on air quality in the Basin. The Project would not result in a long-term impact on the region's ability to meet State and Federal air quality standards. Also, the Project would be consistent with the 2012 AQMP goals and policies for control of fugitive dust. The Project's long-term influence would also be consistent with the SCAQMD and SCAG's goals and policies and is, therefore, considered consistent with the 2012 AQMP.

Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure. The Project would not require extensive construction activities as it plans to utilize over 90 percent of the existing on-site materials. The Project would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing quantifiable fugitive dust or exhaust emissions. Therefore, the Project would not be capable of exceeding SCAQMD construction-related significance thresholds. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

Development projects generally result in long-term air quality impacts from mobile source emissions from project-related traffic and from area and energy source-related emissions. As the Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure, the Project would not generate new vehicle trips or mobile source emissions. Additionally, the Project would not result in an increased amount of area and energy source emissions. The Project would be designed to create heating and cooling zones, and low energy lighting. Therefore, long-term operational impacts would be less than significant.

Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality

standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not result in short- or long-term air quality impacts. Therefore, cumulative construction and operational impacts associated with Project implementation would be less than significant.

Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would involve reconstruction/restoration of a single-family residence, and would not result in construction activities or operations capable of producing emissions in excess of the SCAQMD thresholds. The structure would require fumigation using Vikane Gas Fumigant. During application, the building would be enclosed in a tight tent. The building would then be ventilated before occupants can enter. Reentry to the home would be allowed when the concentration level is at or below five (5) parts per million (ppm). Therefore, the proposed fumigation activities would not expose receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project involves a residential use and does not include any uses identified by the SCAQMD as being associated with odors. The Project's construction activities would include the restoration of an existing structure which would not result in odor impacts. Therefore, Project implementation would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

No Impact. The Project site is located within an urbanized residential area and does not contain candidate, sensitive, or special status species or habitat that would support such species. The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures. No riparian habitats or sensitive natural communities are present

on the Project site. Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

No Impact. The Project site is currently developed with partially demolished residential and garage structures, and no federally protected wetlands are present. Therefore, Project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.

Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

No Impact. The Project area does not contain habitat to support any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species. The Project would not interfere with the movement of fish or wildlife.

Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

No Impact. No sensitive biological resources are located on the Project site. No policies or ordinances pertaining to biological resources are applicable to the Project other than Municipal Code Chapter 14.28, *Trees and Shrubs*. Project implementation would not disturb City trees or shrub planting within areas of public right-of-way. Thus, Project implementation would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

No Impact. Project implementation would not conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans, since no such plans apply to the Project area.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5.

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no known designated archaeological resources present on the Project site. Additionally, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residence and is surrounded by urban/developed land that has been permanently altered due to the construction of below and aboveground improvements

(i.e., buildings, parking lots, hardscapes, and utilities, etc.). The Project site has already been subject to extensive disruption and may contain artificial fill materials. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for ground-disturbing activities to impact an as yet unidentified archeological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

Less Than Significant Impact. No unique geologic feature is present on the Project site. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for ground-disturbing activities to impact an as yet unidentified paleontological resource is considered remote. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving its potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Given the highly disturbed condition of the site, the potential for Project implementation to disturb any human remains is remote. Additionally, no conditions exist that suggest human remains are likely to be found during Project construction activities. Nevertheless, if human remains were found, those remains would require proper treatment in accordance with applicable laws, including Public Resources Code Section 5097, et seq., and Health and Safety Code Sections 7050.5-7055. Compliance with applicable law regarding human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would result in less than significant environmental impacts.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault. Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact. The Project site is not affected by a State-designated AP Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault.

Strong seismic ground shaking.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site could experience strong seismic ground shaking from the Newport-Inglewood Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault or faults located elsewhere in the region. The intensity of ground shaking at the Project site would depend upon the magnitude of the earthquake, distance to the epicenter and the geology of the

area between the epicenter and the Project site. The Project must adhere to standard engineering practices and design criteria relative to seismic and geologic hazards, in accordance with Municipal Code Title 18 and standard engineering practices. Compliance with Municipal Code Title 18 would be verified through the City's development review process, which would ensure that Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving strong seismic ground shaking.

Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

No Impact. The Project site is located within an area characterized as having a minimal potential for liquefaction. Further, according to the State of California Department of Conservation, the Project site is not located within an area susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction.

Landslides.

No Impact. Since the Project area is relatively flat and not located an area of relatively steep slopes, the risk of landslides at the site is considered very low. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects involving landslides.

Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.

Less Than Significant Impact. Due to the scope and nature of the Project and surrounding area, the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Notwithstanding, the Project's construction activities must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements, which would further minimize soil erosion and loss of topsoil.

Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the Project, and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within an area identified as being susceptible to subsidence or lateral spreading. Therefore, the Project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable.

Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2004), creating substantial risks to life or property.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is located in an area designated as Profile D, which is described as containing "predominantly cohesionless, granular non-marine terrace deposits overlying Pleistocene granular marine sediments at shallow depths;

includes adjacent beach areas.” Therefore, the Project would not be located on expansive soil or create substantial risks to life or property in this regard.

Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water.

No Impact. Sewers are available for disposal of wastewater generated by the Project. Accordingly, septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would not be required or permitted.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Less Than Significant Impact. Project-related GHG emissions generally include emissions from direct and indirect sources. Direct GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities and mobile sources, while indirect sources include emissions from electricity consumption, water demand, and solid waste generation. The Project proposes to restore an existing residential structure. The Project would not require extensive construction activities as it plans to utilize over 90 percent of the existing on-site materials. The Project would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing quantifiable GHG emissions. Additionally, the restoration Project would not result in additional operational vehicle trips or mobile source emissions or an increased amount of indirect emissions. The Project would be designed to create heating and cooling zones, and low energy lighting, which would in turn reduce energy consumption and associated GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project would not generate GHG emissions that could adversely affect the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Less Than Significant Impact. No applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions apply to the Project area. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with an adopted plan, policy, or regulation pertaining to GHGs. Also, the Project would result not in substantial construction-related or operational GHG emissions. The Project would not hinder the State’s GHG reduction goals established by AB 32; therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. Further, the Project would not involve handling

hazardous materials or the generation of hazardous emissions. Therefore, the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment in this regard.

Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project involves reconstruction of a residence that is entirely surrounded by other residential uses. Given the historic and present uses of the site, as well as the surrounding land uses, Project implementation would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

No Impact. The Project involves reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Moreover, the Project site is not located within one-quarter mile of a school. Therefore, no impact would occur as a result of Project implementation.

Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

No Impact. The Project site is not located on a list of hazardous materials sites and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

No Impact. The nearest public airport (Long Beach Municipal Airport) is located approximately 2.5-mile north of the Project area. According to the *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, the Project site is situated outside of the Long Beach Airport Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working at the Project site.

For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or related facilities. Therefore, the Project would not result in an airstrip-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area.

Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

No Impact. The Project is not anticipated to result in any roadway closures or interfere with emergency response or evacuation to and from the area. Additionally, all proposed improvements would occur within the limits of the Project site.

Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

No Impact. The Project site is located within an urban area and not adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving wildland fires.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.
and
Otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project involves land-disturbing activity on an already developed site that results in the replacement of approximately 5,156 square feet of impervious surface area, which would have a footprint identical to that of previous lot improvements. Project implementation would not result in a reduction of permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Thus, the water quality issues of concern would involve stormwater and nuisance water runoff associated with construction and operation of the single-family residence.

According to Municipal Code Section 18.61.050, *Development Construction*, prior to issuance of any building or grading permit for any project, the construction plans shall include features meeting the construction activities BMPs (CA-10 through CA-12, CA-20, CA-21 and CA-23, and CA-30 through CA-32) and the applicable provisions of the erosion and sediment control BMPs (ESC-1 through ESC-56), and BMP (CD-4(2)) to ensure that every construction site meets the requirement of these regulations during the time of construction. The project's construction activities must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements, which would reduce the Project's construction-related impacts to water quality to less than significant.

The Project involves one residential unit, thus, would not require preparation of a SUSMP. The Project is subject to compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74, *Low Impact Development Standards*, which addresses water quality by requiring the use of low impact development (LID) standards in the planning and construction of development projects. Compliance with the LID standards of Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 must be demonstrated through a LID plan review. The Permit Applicant is required to submit an LID plan for review to the Department of Development Services. The LID plan must demonstrate how the Project will meet the standards and requirements of Chapter 18.74

and of the LID Best Management Practices Manual (Municipal Code Section 18.74.040, *LID Plan Review*).

According to the LID BMP Design Manual, the Project satisfies the requirements of a small scale residential development and is required to implement adequately-sized LID BMP alternatives. Specified LID BMPs have been established as prescriptive LID improvement

features to be employed on a qualifying small-scale project. The Project may choose from

two or more of the prescriptive BMPs to comply with the ordinance. Any remaining runoff that cannot feasibly be managed onsite must be mitigated by paying an offsite runoff mitigation fee in the manner and amount set forth in the schedule of fees and charges pursuant to Municipal Code Section 18.74.050.B.

Overall, the Project must meet the requirements of the MS4 Permit Order issued by the LARWQCB for the City of Long Beach, LBSWMP, and Municipal Code Chapter 18.74, which includes the LID BMP Design Manual requirements. Compliance with this established regulatory framework would reduce the Project's long-term impacts to water quality to less than significant levels.

Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted).

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation would generate a nominal increase in water demand. Therefore, Project implementation would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. Additionally, the Project would not interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level, since it is not located within a groundwater recharge area. Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact involving groundwater supplies.

Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation would not reduce the onsite permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Additionally, compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 18.74 requirements that specify BMPs, would minimize erosion/siltation and ensure less than significant impacts to water quality. Therefore, Project implementation would not substantially alter the site's drainage pattern, or the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site.

Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

and

Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

and

Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation would not reduce the permeable surfaces, since the proposed conditions would be similar to existing conditions. Moreover, the Project site has historically been developed with a single-family residential use that was a contributing source of storm water in the area. Thus, Project implementation would not create or contribute runoff water which would result in flooding on- or off-site or exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems.

Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map.

and

Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not place housing or other structures within a Special Flood Hazard Area.

Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is not located within the inundation area of a levee or dam, or the City's coastal areas that are subject to coastal storm surges. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to a significant risk involving flooding associated with the failure of a levee or dam.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

Physically divide an established community.

No Impact. Due to the built-out nature of the surrounding area, and since all proposed improvements would occur within the property limits, Project implementation would not physically divide an established community.

Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan,

local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project site is designated Land Use District (LUD) 2, Mixed Style Homes District. The Project proposes restoration/reconstruction of the partially demolished single-family residence that exists on the property, thereby retaining the District's single-family home profile. Additionally, review by the Cultural Heritage Commission would ensure for architectural compatibility with the District. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the relevant Bluff Park Neighborhood policies and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

The Project site is located within the Bluff Park Historic District. Therefore, no environmental change to the property is permitted unless a certificate of appropriateness has been issued authorizing such change. The Cultural Heritage Commission would review the proposed restoration/reconstruction and issue or deny a Certificate of Appropriateness. The Certificate would be issued only if the Project complies with criteria specified in Municipal Code Section 2.63.040.B.

Compliance with the residential development standards, which will be verified through the City's discretionary review process, and review by the Cultural Heritage Commission, would ensure compatibility with adjacent uses and the overall Bluff Park Historic District. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the Municipal Code and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the jurisdiction of a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Therefore, Project implementation would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

No Impact. There is no enclosed body of water that is located in the vicinity of the Project site, thus, there is not risk of potential seiche. According to the California Geological Survey Los Angeles County Tsunami Inundation Maps, the Project site is not located within a tsunami inundation area. Additionally, potential risk from mudflow (i.e., mudslide, debris flow) does not exist within the Project area, as steep slopes are not located on or in proximity to the Project site. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people or structures to potential hazards from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

and

Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan.

No Impact. No known mineral resources or oil extraction operations occur in the Project area. Therefore, Project implementation would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value.

NOISE

Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

and

A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project.

and

A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity above levels existing without the Project.

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed restoration/reconstruction would take place during daytime hours, and would not require earthwork activities or the use of heavy equipment capable of producing excessive noise. Therefore, Project construction would not exceed the City's noise standards as established in Municipal Code Chapter 8.80. Impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

The Project would not involve any sources of substantial mobile or stationary noise. Upon Project completion, noise in the Project area would be similar to existing conditions. Impacts in this regard are less than significant.

Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would not require the use of heavy equipment capable of producing groundborne vibration. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels.

No Impact. According to the *Long Beach Airport - Airport Influence Area Map*, the Project site is situated outside of the Long Beach Airport Planning Area Boundary/Airport Influence Area. Therefore, Project implementation would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the Project expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels.

No Impact. The Project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or related facilities. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive airstrip-related noise levels.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).

Less Than Significant Impact. Project implementation could result in a population increase of approximately three (3) persons. The potential population growth would be nominal, representing less than one-tenth of one percent increase over the City's existing 2012 population of 464,662 persons. Therefore, Project implementation would not induce substantial population growth in the City.

Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

No Impact. The Project involves reconstruction of one partially demolished single-family residence. The Project would not displace existing housing, thus, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

No Impact. The existing residence is partially demolished, thus, is vacant. Therefore, the Project would not displace persons or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the Project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose new or physically altered fire protection facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for fire protection services. Additionally, because the Project proposes infill redevelopment that is similar to the existing uses, the Project would not increase LBFD response times to the Project site or surroundings, or require construction of new or physically altered fire protection facilities. The Project's design must comply with Municipal Code Chapter 18.48, *Fire Code*, which would further minimize potential impacts involving fire protection. The Project would result in a less than significant impact involving fire protection services.

Police protection.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for police protection services. Additionally, because the Project proposes infill redevelopment that is similar to the existing uses, the Project would not increase LBPD response times to the Project site or surroundings, or require construction of new or physically altered police protection facilities. The Project would result in a less than significant impact involving fire protection services.

Schools.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose new or physically altered school facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in LBUSD's student population. As a result, it is anticipated that the LBUSD schools would have the capacity to accommodate these students and construction of new or physically altered school facilities would not be required. Therefore, Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact to LBUSD school facilities.

Parks.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose new or physically altered park or recreational facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for parkland and usage of existing parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur regarding parkland demand, and usage of existing parks and recreational facilities.

Other public facilities.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not propose new or physically altered public facilities. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in the demand for the City's public facilities.

RECREATION

Would the Project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to *Parks* discussion above.

Does the Project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to Parks discussion above.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit.

and

Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in nominal increases in traffic volumes and usage of alternative modes of transportation (mass transit, bicycle, and pedestrian). Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the City's General Plan regarding the circulation system and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in traffic volumes, thus, would not add 50 or more trips, during either the AM or PM peak hour, at any CMP-monitored intersection. Therefore, no further CMP traffic analysis is warranted and a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

No Impact. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which due to its nature and scope, would not Result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

No Impact. No roadway or intersection improvements are proposed. The Project proposes to reconstruct a partially demolished single-family residence within a fully developed residential neighborhood. Therefore, Project implementation would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.

Result in inadequate emergency access.

No Impact. The Project is not anticipated to result in any roadway closures or interfere with emergency access. Additionally, all proposed improvements would occur within the limits of the Project site.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would nominally increase the site's wastewater generation, with a resultant increase in the demand for wastewater treatment. The Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation. General Plans are used by the RWQCB when issuing NPDES permits. Therefore, it is not anticipated that Project implementation would cause an exceedance of the wastewater treatment requirements.

Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.

and

Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the Project that it has adequate capacity to serve the Project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Less Than Significant Impact.

Water

Water Demand. The Project proposes reconstruction of a single-family residence, which would result in a nominal increase in water demand. The increase in water demand is not considered substantial, since the Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for evaluating a service area's future water demands.

Water Treatment. The Project would result in a negligible increase in water demand, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing water treatment facilities. Therefore, Project implementation would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities.

Water Conveyance. The Project would result in a negligible increase in water demand, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing water conveyance facilities. The Applicant would be responsible for construction of all water conveyance facilities pursuant to current Uniform Codes, City Ordinances, and Public Works standards. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of new water conveyance facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Wastewater

Wastewater Generation. Project implementation would result in a negligible increase in wastewater generation, which would place an incremental increase in the demand for wastewater conveyance and treatment facilities. The Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for issuance of the County Sanitation's NPDES wastewater discharge permits.

Wastewater Conveyance. The Project would result in a negligible increase in wastewater generation, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on the existing wastewater conveyance facilities. The Applicant would be responsible for construction of all wastewater conveyance facilities pursuant to current Uniform Codes, City Ordinances, and Public Works standards. Therefore, the Project would not require the construction of new wastewater conveyance facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Wastewater Treatment. The Project's increase in wastewater generation is not considered substantial, since the Project is consistent with the site's General Plan land use designation and City General Plans form the basis for issuance of the NPDES wastewater discharge permits. Project implementation would not cause the treatment plant's operating capacities to be exceeded. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project does not satisfy the criteria pursuant to Senate Bills 610 or 221 for preparation of a Water Supply Assessment. Moreover, the Project would result in a negligible increase in the demand for water. Therefore, sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project from existing entitlements and resources, and new or expanded entitlements are not needed.

Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the Project's solid waste disposal needs.

Less Than Significant Impact. The Project would result in a negligible increase in solid waste generation, thus, resulting in a negligible impact on landfills' capacity. The Project's solid waste disposal needs would be accommodated within permitted capacities.

Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Less Than Significant Impact. Participation in the City's recycling programs would ensure that the Project would not conflict with federal, state, and local statutes and

regulations related to solid waste. A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

IV. EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IN THE EIR

Only one environmental topic (Cultural [Historical] Resources) was discussed in the EIR. The City of Long Beach found that there were no other environmental topics, where the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact, without the need for mitigation.

V. EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION AND FINDINGS

The City of Long Beach, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, the Technical Appendices, and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code 21081 (a)(1) and *CEQA Guidelines* 15091 (a)(1), that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project which would avoid or substantially lessen to below a level of significance the following potentially significant environmental effects identified in the Final EIR in the following category:

- Cultural [Historical] Resources.

The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that can be mitigated are listed below. The City of Long Beach finds that these potentially significant adverse impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level after implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. The Draft EIR is incorporated by reference.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5.

The subject property does not qualify as a historical resource that could be potentially impacted by the Project. Since no historical resources will be demolished, altered, or relocated as a result of the Project, the Project would have no direct impacts on historical resources. However, the Project may have indirect impacts on historical resources. The Bluff Park Historic District constitutes a historical resource that could be visually impacted by the Project. In addition, contributing structures in the immediate vicinity of the Project site are historical resources that could be visually impacted by the Project. The setting and relationship between these resources could be negatively impacted by a project that does not accurately restore the historic character and appearance of the subject property, which could result in disruption of the architectural cohesiveness of the neighborhood.

Based on the analysis according to the Standards for Restoration, the Project is not entirely consistent with the Standards for Restoration, and therefore it could result in a substantial adverse change to the historic district and nearby contributing structures, unless mitigated. The indirect impacts the Project could have on the historical resources in the study area would be mitigated to a less than significant level through the adoption of the specified Mitigation Measures, which would ensure compliance with the Standards for Restoration. Implementation of the recommended measures would ensure that the Project complies with the Standards. Therefore, with mitigation, the Project would have a less than significant impact on the historical resources in the study area.

Finding

- *Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Draft EIR.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The Project's potential indirect impacts on historical resources associated with visual impacts to the Bluff Park Historic District and contributing structures in the Project's immediate vicinity have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level by virtue of mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR.

Mitigation Measures:

- CUL-1 Qualified Preservation Professional: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the City shall require that a Preservation Professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History or Historic Architecture review and approve all project plans. The City shall approve the selection of the Preservation Professional. The Preservation Professional shall operate under the direction of the Project sponsor. The City shall not approve plans or materials related to the Project without the prior approval of the Preservation Professional.
- CUL-2 Compliance to Standard 3: During construction, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to ensure that work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and/or conserve materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research. This may include visually differentiating new work from old work (e.g., window replacement), consolidating historic materials to the most important and/or visually distinctive areas (e.g., roof tile), and/or documenting the placement of historic and non-historic materials and features (e.g., framing members).
- CUL-3 Compliance to Standard 6: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine the extent of deterioration in existing features and the feasibility of repairing deteriorated features. Appropriate treatments for deteriorated features shall be determined according to the applicable Preservation Briefs and the Preservation Tech Notes that are provided by the National Park Service in its Technical Preservation Services. Specifically, the Project sponsor and the Preservation Professional shall investigate the existing foundation, framing, roof tiles, and windows. All treatments of deteriorated features shall be carefully documented.
- CUL-4 Compliance to Standard 7: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine the appropriate replacements for missing features. This shall include careful study of photographic and physical evidence of the subject building, as well as careful study of other buildings (such as 5624 Magnolia Avenue in Riverside, California) that are known to be very similar to the subject property in its intact state. Wherever possible, the Project shall include replacement of missing features with new ones that are historically

compatible. In addition, the Project sponsor shall replace all existing non-original windows at the primary façade with replacements that are historically compatible with the original design of the building. All replacement features shall be carefully documented.

- CUL-5 Compliance to Standard 8: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine appropriate chemical and physical treatments, and to undertake them using the gentlest means possible. This shall include, but may not be limited to, treatment of a structural fumigant to eradicate structure-infesting insects.

VI. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE AFTER MITIGATION AND FINDINGS

The EIR for the 2810 East 1st Street Project did not identify any potentially significant environmental impacts, which cannot be fully mitigated. There are no significant and unavoidable impacts.

VII. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The Draft EIR, in Section 7.0, Alternatives (incorporated by reference), discusses the environmental effects of alternatives to the proposed project. A description of these alternatives, a comparison of their environmental impacts to the proposed Project, and the City's findings are listed below. These alternatives are compared against the project relative to the identified project impacts, summarized in Sections V and VI, above, and to the project objectives, as stated in Section 3.5, Project Goals/Objectives, of the EIR. In making the following alternatives findings, the City of Long Beach certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the EIR, including the information provided in the comments on the Draft EIR and the responses thereto.

A. NO PROJECT/NO BUILD ALTERNATIVE

The current structure exists only as bare wood framing, with several windows remaining in their frames, on a concrete foundation. Termite damage and dry rot are also present in the framing. Under the No Project/No Build Alternative, the site would remain in its current condition. The single-family residence would not be reconstructed/restored to its historic exterior appearance and character. The existing historic materials, features, and elements would not be restored and those that were destroyed or lost would not be reconstructed. None of the proposed Project components would be implemented with the No Project/No Build Alternative.

Finding

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of housing and public facilities and for revitalization as discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, render this alternative infeasible.*

Facts in Support of Finding

This alternative would not meet any of the Project's basic objectives, including:

- Eliminate a damaged, partially disabled and blighting structure from the Bluff Park Historic District.
- Restore/reconstruct the single family residence on a previously occupied site, using the maximum amount of on-site original materials that is feasible.
- Develop a "new" single-family residence with modern amenities while maintaining the District's historical significance, character, and quality by using architectural styles, materials, and features from the 1920s, the District's period of significance.

B. NO PROJECT/EXISTING ZONING ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative involves maximum build-out under the property's underlying R-2-L zoning restrictions. This Alternative would involve complete demolition of

all on-site improvements and the construction of a two-story, 35-foot-tall single-family development measuring 5,144 square feet plus garage.

Finding

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of housing and public facilities and for revitalization as discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, render this alternative infeasible.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The No Project/Existing Zoning Alternative would attain only one Project objective: to eliminate a damaged, partially disabled and blighting structure from the Bluff Park Historic District. This alternative would not meet the following basic Project objectives:

- Restore/reconstruct the single family residence on a previously occupied site, using the maximum amount of on-site original materials that is feasible.
- Develop a “new” single-family residence with modern amenities while maintaining the District’s historical significance, character, and quality by using architectural styles, materials, and features from the 1920s, the District’s period of significance.

C. MARCH 2011 PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The March 2011 Project Alternative would involve complete demolition of all on-site improvements and construction of a two-story, 29-foot-tall single-family development measuring 3,689 square feet plus garage and workshop.

Finding

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of housing and public facilities and for revitalization as discussed in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, render this alternative infeasible.*

Facts in Support of Finding

The March 2011 Project Alternative would attain only one Project objective: to eliminate a damaged, partially disabled and blighting structure from the Bluff Park Historic District. This alternative would not meet the following basic Project objectives:

- Restore/reconstruct the single family residence on a previously occupied site, using the maximum amount of on-site original materials that is feasible.
- Develop a “new” single-family residence with modern amenities while maintaining the District’s historical significance, character, and quality by using architectural styles, materials, and features from the 1920s, the District’s period of significance.

VIII. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines provide in part the following:

- CEQA requires that the decision maker balance the benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
- Where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects that are identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the EIR and/or other information in the record. This statement may be necessary if the agency also makes the finding under Section 15091 (a)(2) or (a)(3) of the *CEQA Guidelines*.
- If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the Notice of Determination (Section 15093 of the *CEQA Guidelines*).

The City of Long Beach, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR for the 2810 East 1st Street Project, Responses to Comments, and the public record, is not required to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, since the Project would not result in a significant unavoidable adverse impact.

B. SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

There are no significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

C. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Long Beach must adopt discretionary actions to approve the 2810 East 1st Street Project. Analysis in the EIR for this Project has concluded that all potential significant adverse Project impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level through mitigation measures in the Final EIR. Analysis in the EIR for this Project has also concluded that the Project would not result in unavoidable adverse impacts.



11.0 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

The California Environment Quality Act (CEQA) was amended in 1989 to add Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, which requires a public agency to adopt a monitoring and reporting program for assessing and ensuring compliance with any required mitigation measures applied to proposed development. As stated in Section 21081.6:

“ . . . the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted, or made a condition of project approval, in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.”

Section 21081.6 provides general guidelines for implementing mitigation monitoring programs and indicates that specific reporting and/or monitoring requirements, to be enforced during project implementation, shall be defined when adopting an EIR.

The mitigation monitoring table that follows lists those mitigation measures that may be included as conditions of approval for the Project. These measures correspond to those outlined and discussed in Draft EIR Section 5.1. To ensure that the mitigation measures are properly implemented, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been devised, which identifies the milestone and responsibility for monitoring each measure. The City of Long Beach will have the responsibility for implementing the Program and the City's various departments will have the primary responsibility for monitoring and reporting implementation of the mitigation measures.



MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

	Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Timing	Monitoring Procedure	Implementing Party/Agency	Verification of Compliance		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
CUL-1	<p>Qualified Preservation Professional: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the City shall require that a Preservation Professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in Architectural History or Historic Architecture review and approve all project plans. The City shall approve the selection of the Preservation Professional. The Preservation Professional shall operate under the direction of the Project sponsor. The City shall not approve plans or materials related to the Project without the prior approval of the Preservation Professional.</p>	Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness	Verification of Preservation Professional's Review and Approval of Project Plans	Department of Development Services			
CUL-2	<p>Compliance to Standard 3: During construction, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to ensure that work needed to stabilize, consolidate, and/or conserve materials and features will be physically and visually compatible, identifiable upon close inspection, and properly documented for future research. This may include visually differentiating new work from old work (e.g., window replacement), consolidating historic materials to the most important and/or visually distinctive areas (e.g., roof tile), and/or documenting the placement of historic and non-historic materials and features (e.g., framing members).</p>	<p>During Construction</p> <p>Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness</p>	Ongoing Verification of Preservation Professional's Ongoing Consultation	<p>Preservation Professional</p> <p>Department of Development Services</p>			
CUL-3	<p>Compliance to Standard 6: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine the extent of deterioration in existing features and the feasibility of repairing deteriorated features. Appropriate treatments for deteriorated features shall be determined according to the</p>	<p>During Construction</p> <p>Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness</p>	Ongoing Verification of Preservation Professional's Determination	<p>Preservation Professional</p> <p>Department of Development Services</p>			



Mitigation Measure	Monitoring Phase/Timing	Monitoring Procedure	Implementing Party/Agency	Verification of Compliance		
				Initials	Date	Remarks
<p>applicable Preservation Briefs and the Preservation Tech Notes that are provided by the National Park Service in its Technical Preservation Services. Specifically, the Project sponsor and the Preservation Professional shall investigate the existing foundation, framing, roof tiles, and windows. All treatments of deteriorated features shall be carefully documented.</p> <p>Compliance to Standard 7: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine the appropriate replacements for missing features. This shall include careful study of photographic and physical evidence of the subject building, as well as careful study of other buildings (such as 5624 Magnolia Avenue in Riverside, California) that are known to be very similar to the subject property in its intact state. Wherever possible, the Project shall include replacement of missing features with new ones that are historically compatible. In addition, the Project sponsor shall replace all existing non-original windows at the primary façade with replacements that are historically compatible with the original design of the building. All replacement features shall be carefully documented.</p>	<p>During Construction</p> <p>Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Verification of Preservation Professional's Determination Regarding Appropriate Replacements</p>	<p>Preservation Professional Department of Development Services</p>			
				CUL-4		
<p>Compliance to Standard 8: Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness, the Project sponsor shall work closely with the Preservation Professional to determine appropriate chemical and physical treatments, and to undertake them using the gentlest means possible. This shall include, but may not be limited to, treatment of a structural fumigant to eradicate structure-infesting insects.</p>	<p>During Construction</p> <p>Prior to Issuance of Certificate of Appropriateness</p>	<p>Ongoing</p> <p>Verification of Preservation Professional's Determination Regarding Appropriate Chemical/Physical Treatments,</p>	<p>Preservation Professional Department of Development Services</p>			
				CUL-5		



This page intentionally left blank.