

RESOLUTION NO. R. A. 07-2010

A RESOLUTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THAT THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE ART EXCHANGE PROJECT HAS BEEN COMPLETED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND STATE AND LOCAL GUIDELINES, MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS RELATIVE THERETO; AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach does hereby find, determine and resolve as follows:

Section 1. That on March 1, 2010, the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach, California scheduled a duly noticed public hearing on the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for that certain project entitled the Art Exchange Project ("the Project"). On said date, the Redevelopment Agency, as lead agency, conducted a public hearing at which time evidence, both written and oral, was presented to, and considered by the Redevelopment Agency. Notice of the time, place and purpose of the Redevelopment Agency's hearing was provided in accordance with applicable law.

At the conclusion of the hearing, and after reviewing and considering the information contained in the FEIR, the Redevelopment Agency

certifies that the FEIR has been completed in compliance with all aspects of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), adopts findings in accordance therewith, and adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). Copies of the Facts and Findings, as adopted by the Redevelopment Agency, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are attached hereto as Exhibit "A", and incorporated herein by this reference as though set forth in full, word for word. The Redevelopment Agency specifically finds that the FEIR has been completed in accordance with CEQA, that the Redevelopment Agency, as the decision-making body, reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR, the Technical Appendixes, and the administrative record prior to certifying the FEIR, and that the FEIR reflects the Redevelopment Agency's independent judgment and analysis with respect to the Project.

APPROVED AND ADOPTED by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach, California, on this 1st day of March, 2010.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Executive Director/Secretary

APPROVED:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

MJM:kjm 2/17/10 A10-00119  
L:\Apps\CtyLaw32\WPDocs\D008\P012\00194925.DOC

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY RESOLUTION NO. \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT "A"

**FACTS AND FINDINGS REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOR  
THE ART EXCHANGE PROJECT**

**SCH # 2009061061**

Lead Agency:  
**City of Long Beach**  
**Redevelopment Agency**  
333 W. Ocean Boulevard  
Long Beach, California 90802  
Contact: Craig Chalfant, Environmental Review Project Manager  
(562) 570-6368

March 2010

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	Introduction .....	3
II	Description of Project Proposed for Approval .....	5
III	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant in the Initial Study/Notice Of Preparation .....	7
IV	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant.....	29
V	Effects Determined To Be Less Than Significant With Mitigation .....	34
VI	Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....	36

## STATEMENT OF FACTS AND FINDINGS

### I. INTRODUCTION

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 IV and V.

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach (Long Beach Redevelopment Agency), the CEQA Lead Agency, finds and declares that the proposed Art Exchange Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the *CEQA Guidelines*. The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency finds and certifies that the EIR was reviewed and information contained in the EIR was considered prior to approving the proposed Art Exchange 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 potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed project, represents the independent judgment of the Lead Agency, and sets forth an adequate

range of alternatives to this project. The Redevelopment Agency certified the EIR at its hearing of March 1, 2010.

The Final EIR is comprised of the following elements:

- Draft Art Exchange Project Environmental Impact Report, December 2009;
- Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR, February 2010; and
- Mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

The remainder of this document is organized as follows:

- II. Description of project proposed for approval;
- III. Effects determined to be less than significant in the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation;
- IV. Effects determined to be less than significant;
- V. Effects determined to be less than significant with mitigation;
- VI. Alternatives to the proposed project.

## II. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT PROPOSED FOR APPROVAL

The approximate 15,000 square foot (0.34 acres) project site includes 100 and 150 feet of frontage along 3<sup>rd</sup> Street and Long Beach Boulevard, respectively. The project site is currently occupied by a surface parking lot and the one-story 240 Long Beach Boulevard building. The surface parking lot occupies the central and northern two-thirds of the project site. The southern one-third of the project site is occupied by the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building. This building is rectangular in shape and is approximately 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. Only the western 100 feet of this building is located within the project site. The eastern side of this building (approximately 50 feet by 150 feet) would be deconstructed during project construction and remain as undeveloped land. The entrance to the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building is located along Long Beach Boulevard in the southern portion of the project site.

The proposed project would include approximately 10,150 square feet of building area, with 5,150 square feet in new building area and reuse of 5,000 square feet within the existing 240 Long Beach Boulevard building. The maximum building elevation would be approximately 31.5 feet at the southern column of the existing building. The project would utilize the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building by renovating and reusing the front (or westernmost) 5,000 square feet (50 foot wide street frontage and 100 foot depth). The project would provide an open floor plan to take advantage of the existing clear span structural system in this building along with adjustable wall systems to create studios and other spaces that can change for future needs. The project would retain the important character-defining features of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building, which includes rehabilitating the existing Streamline Moderne facade fronting Long Beach Boulevard and preserving the rectangular massing and low-pitched hipped roof. In addition, sustainability plans for this project includes obtaining LEED certification and compliance with the City of Long Beach Green Building Code.

The project would include a centrally located multi-purpose room (or classrooms), which could be subdivided or expanded into the adjacent courtyard. The courtyard, also centrally located, could be utilized for public events. A Hot Shop for glass making, ceramics production, demonstrations and classes would be located adjacent to the courtyard. A total of approximately eight artist studios would be created to be utilized as workspace and display space. The project would also include gallery spaces of varying sizes, business office for project management and service areas for loading and proper processing of paint and other hazardous wastes. The square footages of the project components, including building area and non-building area, are listed below in the following table.

## Project Components

SITE AREA 15,000 square feet

### BUILDING AREA

Existing Building to Remain	5,000 square feet
Hot Shop	1,020 square feet
Multi-purpose Room	1,270 square feet
Studio Building	2,860 square feet

*Total Enclosed Building Area* 10,150 square feet

### BUILDING AREA BREAKDOWN

Office	260 square feet
Gallery	875 square feet
Classroom/Multi-purpose Room	1,270 square feet
Studios	4,365 square feet
Hot Shop	1,020 square feet
Restrooms	484 square feet
Circulation/Storage/Service	1,841 square feet

### NON-BUILDING AREA BREAKDOWN

Courtyard	2,544 square feet
Service/Loading Area	1,330 square feet
Other	976 square feet

*Total Non-Building Area* 4,850 square feet



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

The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency prepared an Initial Study to determine the potential significant effects of this project. In the course of this evaluation, certain impacts of the project were found to be less than significant due to the inability of a project of this scope to create such impacts or the absence of project characteristics producing effects of this type. The effects determined not to be significant are not included in primary analysis sections of the Final EIR (refer to Appendix A in the Draft EIR for this Initial Study).

#### AESTHETICS

*Would the project:*

*Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No Impact: The proposed project will renovate and reuse the front 100 feet of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building, including rehabilitating the Streamline Moderne facade that fronts Long Beach Boulevard. The project will be considerably lower in height than many of the surrounding downtown structures.

There are no scenic vistas in the project site vicinity. The City's Scenic Routes Element to the General Plan does not identify any scenic routes in the immediate project vicinity. The nearest scenic route is Ocean Boulevard (approximately one-half mile south of the project site at the Long Beach Boulevard/Ocean Boulevard intersection). Given the relatively low height of the proposed Art Exchange building, the project would not obstruct any views of Ocean Boulevard or other downtown areas.

The project would not create any adverse effects or impair any views of existing scenic vistas. The project would result in aesthetic improvements to the project site by retaining and reusing the 240 Long Beach Boulevard front facade, integrated into a complementary new structure for art development and production.

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

No Impact: There are no State scenic highways located within the City. The only locally designated scenic route in Long Beach is along Ocean Boulevard from the Los Angeles River to the intersection with Livingston Drive, continuing along Livingston Drive to 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, then along 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and ending at the intersection with Pacific Coast Highway. The project would not obstruct or impair any views along Ocean Boulevard. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged as a result of project implementation.

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

No Impact: The proposed project would enhance the visual character of the project site by retaining and reusing the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building front facade in a complementary new structure for art development and production.

*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 downtown area is presently characterized by an abundance of street lights and commercial lighting that define a higher density, mixed use urban environment. While the project will include interior and exterior lighting to display exhibits, the spillover effects will be minimal due to the existing urban nature of the surrounding downtown area and the lack of any substantial project exterior lighting sources such as parking lot light fixtures. No glare impacts are anticipated by the project building materials, which combine stucco surfaces with glass and aluminum frame windows for the new construction with the existing brick and concrete 240 Long Beach Boulevard building. Although the new construction will include metal infill panels on the north elevation fronting 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, the metal materials would be low reflectivity surfaces.

## **AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

*Would the Project:*

*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: There are no agricultural zones within or nearby the project site. The City of Long Beach has been a fully urbanized community for over half a century. Therefore, the project would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

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

No Impact: There are no agricultural zones within or nearby the project site. The City of Long Beach has been a fully urbanized community for over half a century. Therefore, the project would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

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

No Impact: There are no agricultural zones within or nearby the project site. The City of Long Beach has been a fully urbanized community for over half a century. Therefore, the project would have no effect upon agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

## **AIR QUALITY**

*Would the Project:*

*Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located in the South Coast Air Basin, which is subject to the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is the applicable air quality attainment plan that sets forth air quality improvement targets and control strategies for meeting these targets.

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the subregion in which it is located, it is consistent with the AQMP and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP. According to SCAG projections, City population growth is expected to be six percent from 2005 to 2015 and increase another three percent from 2015 to 2020, for an annual growth rate of less than one percent per year over the next two decades. Long Beach is expected to increase in population to approximately 503,450 by the year 2010 and exceed 533,000 by 2020.

The proposed Art Exchange project does not include any residential units and is not expected to induce any significant population growth. Therefore, the project proposal would not conflict with the goals and strategies set forth in the AQMP.

*Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* defines sensitive receptors as children, elderly and individuals with illnesses that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City. However, the project site is not located near any facilities serving these types of sensitive receptors. While project deconstruction and construction activities could exceed a SCAQMD threshold on pollutants, the distance of this project site from these types of facilities would prevent expose of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

*Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding activities. Potential sources of odors during construction include use of architectural coatings and solvents as well as diesel-powered construction equipment.

SCAQMD Rule 402 prohibits the discharge of air contaminants or other materials, which includes objectionable odors, which could cause injury, detriment, nuisance or annoyance to persons or the general public. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and solvents, thereby lowering odorous emissions.

Project construction activities could result in some odors from the use of motorized construction equipment. However, construction activities would be temporary and would not result in significant odor impacts, particularly as the project would be required to adhere to Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 8.64.040 (Fumes and Odors). Art Exchange operations would not generate objectionable odors and the project would comply with City requirements applicable to maintenance of trash areas to minimize potential odors. All project construction and operations would also comply with the SCAQMD rules and regulations regarding odor control.

## **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

*Would the Project:*

*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 in downtown Long Beach on a City block with no wildlife habitat. The site and surrounding downtown area have no existing wetland, vegetative or other biological resources. There are no plans to convert the project site or any adjacent properties to wildlife habitat. Construction and operation of the Art Exchange would have no impact on any habitat resources.

*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 located in downtown Long Beach on a City block with no wildlife habitat. The site and surrounding downtown area have no existing wetland, vegetative or other biological resources. There are no plans to convert the project site or any adjacent properties to wildlife habitat. Construction and operation of the Art Exchange would have no impact on any habitat resources.

*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 located in downtown Long Beach on a City block with no wildlife habitat. The site and surrounding downtown area have no existing wetland, vegetative or other biological resources. There are no plans to convert the project site or any adjacent properties to wildlife habitat. Construction and operation of the Art Exchange would have no impact on any habitat resources.

*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 site is located in downtown Long Beach on a City block with no wildlife habitat. The site and surrounding downtown area have no existing wetland, vegetative or other biological resources. There are no plans to convert the project site or any adjacent properties to wildlife habitat. Construction and operation of the Art Exchange would have no impact on any habitat resources.

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

No Impact: The proposed Art Exchange would not alter or eliminate any existing policy or ordinance 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: The project site is located in downtown Long Beach on a City block with no wildlife habitat. The site and surrounding downtown area have no existing wetland, vegetative or other biological resources. There are no plans to convert the project site or any adjacent properties to wildlife habitat. Construction and operation of the Art Exchange would have no impact on any habitat resources. The proposed Art Exchange would not alter or eliminate any existing policy or ordinance protecting biological resources.

## CULTURAL RESOURCES

*Would the Project:*

*Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The City of Long Beach is located on the Long Beach Quadrangle in the southern margin of the Los Angeles Basin, which is largely an alluvial deposit. Prehistoric archaeological resources common to the Los Angeles Basin include habitations, special activity sites, and various artifact scatters. Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties (with the exception of parks and natural resource preserves) have been previously disturbed by grading and other prior development activities. Therefore, near-surface archaeological resources on previously developed properties that may have existed are likely to have been disturbed or removed. Furthermore, project deconstruction and construction activities would not involve extensive grading or excavation. Any grading or excavation related to this project would not be expected to occur at a lower depth than previous construction. If any previously undiscovered cultural artifacts are encountered during project construction, all construction work would be required under State law to stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of any such find.

*Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The City of Long Beach is located on the Long Beach Quadrangle in the southern margin of the Los Angeles Basin, which is largely an alluvial deposit. Prehistoric archaeological resources common to the Los Angeles Basin include habitations, special activity sites, and various artifact scatters. Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties (with the exception of parks and natural resource preserves) have been previously disturbed by grading and other prior development activities. Therefore, near-surface archaeological resources on previously developed properties that may have existed are likely to have been disturbed or removed. Furthermore, project deconstruction and construction activities would not involve extensive grading or excavation. Any grading or excavation related to this project would not be expected to occur at a lower depth than previous construction. If any previously undiscovered cultural artifacts are encountered during project construction, all construction work would be required under State law to stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of any such find.

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The City of Long Beach is located on the Long Beach Quadrangle in the southern margin of the Los Angeles Basin, which is largely an alluvial deposit. Prehistoric archaeological resources common to the Los Angeles Basin include habitations, special activity sites, and various artifact scatters. Long Beach is an urbanized community and nearly all properties (with the exception of parks and natural resource preserves) have been previously disturbed by grading and other prior development activities. Therefore, near-surface archaeological resources on previously developed properties that may have existed are likely to have been disturbed or removed. Furthermore, project deconstruction and construction activities would not involve extensive grading or excavation. Any grading or excavation related to this project would not be expected to occur at a lower depth than previous construction. If any previously undiscovered cultural artifacts are encountered during project construction, all construction work would be required under State law to stop until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the nature and significance of any such find. Given the previously developed nature of the project site, it is unlikely that future development would disturb human remains.

## GEOLOGY AND SOILS

*Would the Project 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Per Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element of the General Plan, the most significant fault system in the City is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. This fault zone runs in a northwest to southeast angle across the southern half of the City. There are three primary traversing faults within the Newport-Inglewood fault system, including the Cherry Hill fault, the Northeast Flank fault, and the Reservoir Hill fault. Other regional faults include the San Andreas fault, the Palos Verdes fault, and the Los Alamitos fault.

The project site is located less than three miles south of this fault zone. The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking anywhere in the project vicinity if a seismic event occurred along the fault. However, there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to any particular location. Given these variables it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. Construction and operation of the proposed Art Exchange would not alter existing environmental conditions related to seismic risks. The new construction along with renovation of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building would be done in full compliance with all applicable Building Code and seismic safety regulations.

*Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Less than Significant Impact: The Newport-Inglewood fault zone could create substantial ground shaking if a seismic event occurred along that fault. Similarly, a strong seismic event on any other fault system in Southern California has the potential to create considerable levels of ground shaking throughout the City. However, numerous variables determine the level of damage to a specific location. Given these variables, it is not possible to determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. However, the project would not increase the likelihood of an earthquake or increase the severity of earthquake induced seismic ground shaking.

*Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Liquefaction, which typically occurs during periods of strong ground shaking, produces a loss of strength in water saturated, low cohesion soils. This condition causes the soils to perform as a dense fluid incapable of adequately supporting structures. One of the major types of liquefaction induced ground failure is lateral spreading on mildly sloping grounds. Lateral spreading involves earth movement due to ground shaking that results in near vertical cracks with horizontal soil movement. Liquefaction induced ground failure has in the past been a major cause of earthquake damage in Southern California.

Per Plate 7 of the Seismic Safety Element, most of the City is located in areas of either minimal or low liquefaction potential. The only exceptions are in the southeastern portion of the City, where there is significant liquefaction potential, and the western portion (most of the area west of Pacific Avenue and south of the 405 freeway), where there is either moderate or significant liquefaction potential. The project site is located in an area of minimal liquefaction potential and project impacts related to seismic-related ground failure would be less than significant.

*Landslides?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Per the Seismic Safety Element, the City is relatively flat and characterized by slopes that are not considered high (less than 50 feet) or steep (generally sloping flatter than 1-1/2:1, horizontal to vertical). The State Seismic Hazard Zone map of the Long Beach Quadrangle indicates that the lack of steep terrain (except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill) results in only about 0.1 percent of the City lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for this quadrangle. The project site is flat with no steep slopes or hillsides.

*Would the Project:*



*Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

Less Than Significant Impact: All project improvements would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best management practices (BMPs), to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. The project would also be subject to the regulations set forth in Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 18.95 throughout the construction period to reduce the potential for off-site sedimentation. However, the project does not involve extensive grading or excavation and therefore soil movement and erosion impacts would be minimal.

*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 on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquation or collapse?*

Less Than Significant Impact: All project improvements would be required to adhere to all applicable construction standards regarding erosion control, including best management practices (BMPs), to minimize runoff and erosion impacts from earth-moving activities such as excavation, recontouring and compaction. The project would also be subject to the regulations set forth in Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 18.95 throughout the construction period to reduce the potential for off-site sedimentation. However, the project does not involve extensive grading or excavation and therefore soil movement and erosion impacts would be minimal.

The City contains areas of known subsidence associated with oil extraction activities. However, fluid injection into oil production areas over several decades has lowered the potential for subsidence occurrences. Soil movement from project implementation would be minimal since construction and renovation would not require extensive grading or excavation.

*Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Per the City's Seismic Safety Element, the City is divided into four predominant soil profiles, designated as Profiles A through D. The project site is located in Profile D, which is composed of interbedded units of sandstone, siltstone, and shale ranging in age from Miocene to late Pleistocene. The near surface soils consist predominately of cohesionless soils such as sand, silty sand, and sandy silt that are generally medium to very dense. These types of soils are considered less expansive than soils with higher clay content, which tend to hold water and expand during rainy periods. Therefore, the project site is not characterized by more expansive types of soils.

*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: The entire City is served by an existing sewer system and therefore has no need for septic tanks or any other alternative waste water disposal systems.

## **HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

*Would the Project:*

*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 involves deconstruction of the rear portion of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building, renovation and reuse of the front 100 feet of this building, and new construction to incorporate and complement this existing building. Deconstruction of the approximately 7,500 square feet of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building rear portion will also include reuse of the remaining building materials into the new construction. Removal of any asbestos and lead-containing materials from deconstruction activities would be subject to California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations as well as SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities). State law also requires the testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials to prevent exposure levels that would exceed CalOSHA standards. In addition, Long Beach Municipal Code Chapters 8.86 through 8.88 regulates hazardous materials handling and clean-up. Given the limited size of the building deconstruction area, reuse of existing building materials, and the State and local regulatory requirements, the project's impact potential related to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

*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 deconstruction of the rear portion of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building, renovation and reuse of the front 100 feet of this building, and new construction to incorporate and complement this existing building. Deconstruction of the approximately 7,500 square feet of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building rear portion will also include reuse of the remaining building materials into the new construction. Removal of any asbestos and lead-containing materials from deconstruction activities would be subject to California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations as well as SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos

Demolition and Renovation Activities). State law also requires the testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials to prevent exposure levels that would exceed CalOSHA standards. In addition, Long Beach Municipal Code Chapters 8.86 through 8.88 regulates hazardous materials handling and clean-up. Given the limited size of the building deconstruction area, reuse of existing building materials, and the State and local regulatory requirements, the project's impact potential related to hazardous materials would be less than significant.

*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: There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site.

*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 on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

*Be 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, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact: The Long Beach Airport is located just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The project site is located approximately three miles south of the Long Beach Airport and is not located within an airport land use plan. The proposed project would not create any airport related hazards or in any way alter airport operations.

*Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?*

No Impact: There are no private airstrips located within or adjacent to the City.

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

No Impact: The project would not involve any changes or physical alterations to any public or private streets. Furthermore, the project would not obstruct or alter any transportation routes which could be used for emergency evacuations or alter any emergency evacuation plans.

*Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires; including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?*

No Impact: The project site is in a highly urbanized community and is not located adjacent to wild lands of the type associated with wild fires. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to any significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

## **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

*Would the Project:*

*Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Pursuant to Section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program controls water pollution by regulating point sources (conveyances such as pipelines) that discharge pollutants. The City of Long Beach has its own municipal NPDES permit (NPDES No. CAS004003), which requires certain types of projects to comply with the Los Angeles County Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The types of projects subject to SUSMP requirements are hillside projects, residential subdivisions of 10 units or more, new commercial development of 100,000 square feet or more of impermeable areas, and projects located adjacent to or discharging into environmentally sensitive areas. This project would therefore not be subject to SUSMP requirements.

The State of California requires any construction activity disturbing one acre or more of soil to comply with the State General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit. The project site totals 15,000 square feet (150 feet by 100 feet) or about 0.34 acres. The project would therefore not be subject to this State permit requirement.

A limited amount of deconstruction and construction related storm runoff could result from the project. This could include typical construction related pollutants such as chemicals, paints, fuels and lubricants. However, since the project only involves deconstruction of the rear 7,500 square feet of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building and construction of approximately 5,150 square feet of new building floor area, construction related runoff of the level associated with larger development projects subject to SUSMP or State permit requirements would not occur. Furthermore, the project would be subject to Long Beach Municipal Code Section 18.95.050, Development Construction, which requires compliance with Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure project construction runoff and discharges would not violate any water quality standards. Typical construction BMPs include storm drain inlet protection, diversion of storm water flows from

disturbed areas, and construction housekeeping practices such as barricading catch basins and manholes during paving activities.

Since the project site consists entirely of impervious surfaces, there would not be a substantial increase in pollutant loadings. Compliance with local and State mandated construction and post-construction BMPs would ensure that the project would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and therefore impacts would be at a less than significant level.

*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)?*

No Impact: The City of Long Beach is a highly urbanized community with the water system infrastructure fully in place to accommodate future development. Although the majority of the City's water supply consists of imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, approximately 38% is extracted from the local basin.

The City's Seismic Safety Element has indicated that groundwater is located approximately 20-40 feet below grade at the project site. The proposed project would not impact groundwater supplies and does not involve any groundwater extraction or injection activities. Project grading and compaction of suitable fill material would be minimal and would not involve contact with groundwater supplies. The project would not result in an increase in impermeable surface areas since the project site is already completely covered by impermeable surfaces. The project would not affect any local aquifers or groundwater supplies.

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

No Impact: The City is highly urbanized with an existing drainage infrastructure system. The project would not increase the amount of permeable ground surface since the project site is fully covered by impermeable surfaces. All project site drainage would discharge into the existing storm sewer system. The project would not result in any alterations to existing drainage patterns, the existing storm sewer system, or the existing course of streams or rivers.

*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?*

No Impact: The project would not alter any existing drainage systems. The City is highly urbanized with an existing drainage infrastructure system. The project would not increase the amount of permeable ground surface since the project site is fully covered by impermeable surfaces. All project site drainage would discharge into the existing storm sewer system. The project would not result in any alterations to existing drainage patterns, the existing storm sewer system, or the existing course of streams or rivers.

*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?*

No Impact: The City's existing storm water drainage system is adequate to accommodate runoff and the project would not increase the amount of permeable ground surface at this site.

*Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would be subject to all applicable water quality standards, regulations and best management practices (BMPs). The project would not substantially degrade water quality.

*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?*

No Impact: The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and does not involve construction of any housing units or structures in any flood hazard areas.

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

No Impact: The project does not propose placing any structures within a 100-year flood hazard area or impeding or redirecting any flow of flood waters.

*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?*

No Impact: The project would not place people or structures in any flood hazard areas and there are no levees or dams in the project vicinity.

*Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*

No Impact: According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site, as well as the majority of Long Beach, is not within a zone influenced by the

inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Potential tsunami hazards are limited to properties by the coastline.

## LAND USE AND PLANNING

*Would the Project:*

*Physically divide an established community?*

No Impact: The immediate surrounding area is made up of the office, retail, restaurant and multi-family residential land uses that characterize downtown Long Beach. Former land uses on the project site included a bookstore in the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building and a liquor store in a building which has recently been demolished. Establishment of the Art Exchange land use would not physically divide this established downtown community. The project building would not physically restrict any movement of pedestrians or vehicles, would not prevent improvement of any neighboring properties, and would not create an imposing or incompatible structure. The Art Exchange building will be approximately 37 feet in height at the highest point of the roof peak. The project will be considerably lower in height than many of the surrounding downtown structures. The Art Exchange land use would not only be compatible with the mix of urban land uses that make up the downtown community, it would enhance the downtown artist network resources. The project impacts to the established downtown community would therefore be positive in nature.

*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?*

No Impact: The project site is located in General Plan Land Use District (LUD) No. 7 Mixed Use. In general, this Land Use District is intended for large, vital multi-purpose activity centers that would benefit from the synergistic effects of different land use types. The combination of land uses intended for this District include: employment centers such as retail, office, and medical facilities; higher density residences; visitor-serving facilities; personal and professional services; and recreational facilities. The proposed Art Exchange would be consistent with the intent of this District, providing visitor-serving and professional artist land uses, as well as complementary to the surrounding urban environment.

The zoning district for this project site is PD-30, the Downtown Planned Development District. The intent of this zoning district is to build the downtown into a multi-purpose activity center of regional significance, offering a wide variety of activities that result in an attractive and exciting environment during both daytime and evening hours. PD-30 recognizes that new buildings should respect and complement existing historic structures, and encourages the development of

cultural and artistic offerings in the downtown. The project site is located in the Downtown Core portion of PD-30, which allows artist studios as a permitted land use. Therefore, this project is consistent with the intent and land use standards of PD-30.

The project site is also located in the Downtown Redevelopment Project Area, which is intended to eliminate blight and revitalize properties in downtown. Project implementation would be consistent with efforts to revitalize and invigorate the downtown area by contributing to the downtown artist network and providing an additional visitor-serving resource. The project site is not located in a historic district or in the coastal zone and is not subject to any specific plans. The project therefore would not conflict with any applicable land use plans, policies or regulations, but rather would be positive in nature.

*Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

No Impact: It is not the intent of this project to encourage or facilitate any actions that could adversely impact any existing or proposed habitat, open space, or other type of natural resource. The project site is not located in or nearby any areas subject to any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plan.

## **ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES**

*Would the Project:*

*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?*

No Impact: There are no mineral resources in or around the project site. There are no mineral resource recovery or extraction activities that would be altered or displaced by this project.

*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: There are no mineral resources in or around the project site. There are no mineral resource recovery or extraction activities that would be altered or displaced by this project.

## **NOISE**

*Would the Project:*



*Result in 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?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Building construction activities typically involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, earth-moving equipment, and depending on project site characteristics, activities that generate short-term loud noises and vibrations such as pile driving. Construction equipment can include dozers, backhoes, cranes, compaction equipment, paving equipment, tractors, and trucks. Noise produced by construction equipment will vary depending upon the type of equipment required, duration of equipment operations, and maintenance levels. Construction noise is a short term occurrence that ends with completion of construction activities. Temporary noise levels from construction at any given time of operations can range in decibels from approximately 70 dBA to 96 dBA.

All construction activities must be done in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). The project would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or be exempt from local noise controls. Per the Municipal Code, construction activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM on weekdays and federal holidays, and 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activity on Sundays is prohibited unless a special permit is approved by the City's Noise Control Officer. Per Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 8.80.130, it is unlawful for any person to willfully make or continue, or cause to be made or continued, a loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood or which causes any discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area.

Construction noise levels from the proposed project are not anticipated to be adverse due to the limited duration and daytime hours of all construction activities. The surrounding downtown urban environment is also characterized by noise levels from pedestrians, passenger vehicles, buses and light rail that are generally higher than found in more noise sensitive areas (i.e., single family neighborhoods, schools, hospitals).

*Result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Project deconstruction and construction activities would not utilize construction equipment such as pile drivers that can produce high vibration levels and would not expose persons to periodic ground borne noise or vibration.

*Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Noise levels from project deconstruction and construction activities are not expected to be significant in volume.

*Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?*

Less Than Significant Impact: Project deconstruction and construction activities have the greatest potential for substantially elevated temporary or periodic noise levels. However, all deconstruction and construction activities would be in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Section 8.80). While noise levels from project operations will vary depending on the number of people and activities at any given time, the noise levels would be typical for artist studio and art gallery land uses. No significant temporary increases in noise levels would be expected to result from project operations since the nature of this land use does not generate loud noises from vehicles, machinery or participants. There would not be traffic congestion related noises or bursts of loud voices associated more with land uses such as sporting events. Art production would also not involve loud noises emanating from heavy industrial equipment.

*Be 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, and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact: The Long Beach Airport is located just north of the 405 freeway between Cherry Avenue and Lakewood Boulevard. The project site is located approximately three miles south of the Airport and is not located within an airport land use plan. The proposed project would not create any airport related hazards or in any way alter airport operations. Art exchange participants would not be exposed to significant noise levels generated by airport operations.

*Be within the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

No Impact: There are no private airstrips located within or adjacent to the City.

## **POPULATION AND HOUSING**

*Would the Project:*

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

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the project vicinity. The project would not create any new housing units or large employment generating land uses. No new roads or infrastructure improvements are proposed as part of this project. The Art Exchange land use would not result in any substantial population growth.

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

No Impact: There are no housing units on the project site and the project would not displace any existing housing units located outside the project site or necessitate the need for replacement housing.

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

No Impact: There are no housing units on the project site and the project would not displace any residents within or outside the project site or necessitate the need for 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 closest fire station to the project site is Fire Station No. 1, located at 100 Magnolia Avenue approximately one mile southwest of the project site. Given the limited size of the project site and structure and the adequacy of existing fire protection facilities, the project is not anticipated to have any adverse impacts on fire protection services.

*Police protection?*

Less than Significant Impact: The project site is located in the South Division and served by the Long Beach Police Headquarters Station at 400 W. Broadway, approximately one mile southwest of the project site. The project would not significantly impact existing police service ratios or response times, and would not increase the demand for additional police protection services. The Police Department would review construction plans to verify adequate nighttime security lighting is provided.

*Schools?*

No Impact: The project would not create any housing units or induce substantial population growth that would add demands for additional school services.

*Parks?*

No Impact: The project does not involve new housing units or construction of new parks or recreational facilities. The project would therefore not create any new demands for parks or recreational facilities

*Other public facilities?*

No Impact: No other impacts have been identified that would require the provision of new or physically altered governmental 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?*

No Impact: The project does not involve new housing units or construction of new parks or recreational facilities. The project would therefore not create any new significant demands for parks or recreational facilities. Project implementation would also be in compliance with all applicable requirements of the local Dedication of Parks in Perpetuity Ordinance.

*Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

No Impact: The project does not involve new housing units or construction of new parks or recreational facilities. The project would therefore not create any new significant demands for parks or recreational facilities. Project implementation would also be in compliance with all applicable requirements of the local Dedication of Parks in Perpetuity Ordinance.

## TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

*Would the Project:*

*Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not anticipated to cause substantial increases in vehicle trips or traffic congestion since this type of land use typically generates vehicle trips spread more evenly throughout day and nighttime hours of operation than at concentrated peak demand periods more common with large employment centers for office or manufacturing land uses. The nature of art production does not require large concentrations of artists and this project building size could not accommodate significantly large numbers of artists and Art Exchange patrons. In addition, alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle and public transit options, are anticipated to be utilized by local artists and patrons.

*Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not anticipated to cause substantial increases in vehicle trips or traffic congestion since this type of land use typically generates vehicle trips spread more evenly throughout day and nighttime hours of operation than at concentrated peak demand periods more common with large employment centers for office or manufacturing land uses. The nature of art production does not require large concentrations of artists and this project building size could not accommodate significantly large numbers of artists and Art Exchange patrons. In addition, alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle and public transit options, are anticipated to be utilized by local artists and patrons.

*Result in 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 site is located approximately three miles south of the Long Beach Airport. Project construction and operations would have no impact on airport operations.

*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 physical changes or alterations to any streets are proposed as part of this project.

*Result in inadequate emergency access?*

No Impact: No physical changes or alterations to existing emergency access routes are proposed as part of this project.

*Result in inadequate parking capacity?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is adjacent to two public parking lots located on the same City block as the project site. The project is located near the Blue Line light rail, which runs along Long Beach Boulevard, and would be served by both local and regional public transit facilities. The project site is also located in the downtown redevelopment project area. Per Zoning Code Section 21.41.222, projects in the downtown redevelopment area are exempt from Code requirements on locations of off-site parking and guaranteed permanence of any specific parking facility. Since adequate parking facilities are available near the project site and throughout the downtown redevelopment area, no significant parking impacts would result from this project.

*Conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?*

No Impact: The project would not set forth or encourage any proposals or projects that would conflict with any adopted alternative transportation policies.

## **UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

*Would the Project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board; 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; 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; have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed; 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; be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs; or comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is not considered to be growth-inducing and therefore would not create any increased demands that would significantly impact any utility and service system providers. The City of Long Beach is an urbanized community with all public utilities and services fully in place. Local public utility and service systems providers will plan for future anticipated demand based on population growth projections and long-range planning documents such as the General Plan.

#### IV. EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency found that the proposed project would have a less than significant impact with respect to certain environmental topics discussed in the EIR without the need for mitigation. A less than significant environmental impact determination was made for each topic area listed below.

##### AIR QUALITY

*Would the Project:*

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

**Regional Construction Impacts.** Construction of the project has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from deconstruction and construction activities. Mobile source emissions would result from the use of construction equipment such as bulldozers, loaders, and cranes. During the finishing phase, paving operations and the application of architectural coatings (e.g., paints) and other building materials would release volatile organic compounds. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

The project will be in compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which regulates the control of fugitive dust from construction activities. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires the implementation of best available fugitive dust control measures during active construction periods capable of generating fugitive dust emissions from on-site earth-moving activities, construction/deconstruction activities, and construction equipment travel on paved and unpaved roads. The full text of SCAQMD Rule 403 is included in Appendix B of this EIR.

A summary of unmitigated maximum daily regional emissions by construction/deconstruction phase is presented in Table 5 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, maximum regional emissions would not exceed any applicable threshold and therefore regional construction and deconstruction air quality impacts have been determined to be less than significant.

**Localized Construction Impacts.** The unmitigated maximum daily localized emissions and localized significance thresholds are also presented in Table 5 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, maximum localized construction and deconstruction emissions would not exceed the localized screening thresholds.

Therefore, with respect to localized emissions from construction and deconstruction activities, impacts would be less than significant.

**Regional Operational Impacts.** Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would come from the generation and consumption of electricity and natural gas, and by the operation of on-road vehicles. The SCAQMD classifies pollutant emissions associated with energy demand (i.e., electricity generation and natural gas consumption) as regional stationary source emissions. Stationary source regional emissions from project operations are quantified in Table 7 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, project regional stationary emissions would be less than significant.

Operational emissions are primarily a function of vehicle trips. As discussed in Appendix D of this EIR, the project is anticipated to result in 294 average daily trips. The mobile emissions from these vehicle trips is analyzed in Table 7 of this EIR, which determined that the net increase in regional mobile emissions from project operations would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, regional operational impacts would be less than significant.

**Local Operational Impacts.** The anticipated project trip generation for peak hour trips, provided in Appendix D of this EIR, is below the City's threshold requirements for a detailed traffic impact study and therefore no traffic related impacts are anticipated at roadways and intersections within the project vicinity. Thus, it is unlikely that project operations would generate localized areas of elevated ambient levels of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants. Therefore, the impact to localized air quality from project operations is less than significant.

**Toxic Air Contaminants.** The greatest potential for toxic air contaminants emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities, which are not part of this project. Since project construction/deconstruction would take only approximately 12 months to complete, the project would not result in a long-term substantial source of toxic air contaminants. In addition, there would be no residual emissions after construction and deconstruction activities and thus no corresponding health risks. As such, project-related construction/deconstruction toxic emission impacts would be less than significant.

Typical sources of acutely and chronically hazardous toxic air contaminants include industrial manufacturing processes. The project would not include any of these potential sources. The primary sources of potential air toxins associated with project operations involve diesel particulate matter from delivery trucks (e.g., truck traffic on local streets and on-site truck idling). The increase in potential localized air toxic impacts from diesel particulate matter would be minimal, since only a limited number of heavy-duty trucks would access the project site. In



In addition, the trucks that visit the project site would not idle for extended periods of time. Based on the small incremental increase in long-term (annual average) activities of the on-site diesel truck trips, the project would not warrant a health risk assessment and potential air toxin impacts to on- and off-site receptors would be less than significant.

**Global Climate Change.** Project construction/deconstruction would emit approximately 255 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions, substantially less than the 900 annual metric ton threshold proposed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). As shown in Table 6 of this EIR, annual greenhouse gas emissions resulting from vehicle, electrical, and natural gas usage associated with project operations are estimated to be a maximum of 623 metric tons. Therefore, project construction/deconstruction and operations would be less than significant with respect to global climate change. In addition, the project design features would result in lower greenhouse gas emissions compared to buildings constructed in accordance with current applicable building standards. The project is also striving to divert 50 percent of all non-hazardous construction waste from landfills through either recycling or reuse.

*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)?*

**Regional Construction Impacts.** Construction of the project has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the project site. In addition, fugitive dust emissions would result from deconstruction and construction activities. Mobile source emissions would result from the use of construction equipment such as bulldozers, loaders, and cranes. During the finishing phase, paving operations and the application of architectural coatings (e.g., paints) and other building materials would release volatile organic compounds. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

The project will be in compliance with South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403, which regulates the control of fugitive dust from construction activities. SCAQMD Rule 403 requires the implementation of best available fugitive dust control measures during active construction periods capable of generating fugitive dust emissions from on-site earth-moving activities, construction/deconstruction activities, and construction equipment travel on paved and unpaved roads. The full text of SCAQMD Rule 403 is included in Appendix B of this EIR.

A summary of unmitigated maximum daily regional emissions by construction/deconstruction phase is presented in Table 5 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, maximum regional emissions would not exceed any applicable threshold and therefore regional construction and deconstruction air quality impacts have been determined to be less than significant.

**Localized Construction Impacts.** The unmitigated maximum daily localized emissions and localized significance thresholds are also presented in Table 5 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, maximum localized construction and deconstruction emissions would not exceed the localized screening thresholds. Therefore, with respect to localized emissions from construction and deconstruction activities, impacts would be less than significant.

**Regional Operational Impacts.** Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would come from the generation and consumption of electricity and natural gas, and by the operation of on-road vehicles. The SCAQMD classifies pollutant emissions associated with energy demand (i.e., electricity generation and natural gas consumption) as regional stationary source emissions. Stationary source emissions from project operations are quantified in Table 7 of this EIR. As shown in this Table, project regional stationary emissions would be less than significant.

Operational emissions are primarily a function of vehicle trips. As discussed in Appendix D of this EIR, the project is anticipated to result in 294 average daily trips. The mobile emissions from these vehicle trips is analyzed in Table 7 of this EIR, which determined that the net increase in regional mobile emissions from project operations would not exceed the SCAQMD thresholds for all criteria pollutants. Therefore, regional operational impacts would be less than significant.

**Local Operational Impacts.** The anticipated project trip generation for peak hour trips, provided in Appendix D of this EIR, is below the City's threshold requirements for a detailed traffic impact study and therefore no traffic related impacts are anticipated at roadways and intersections within the project vicinity. Thus, it is unlikely that project operations would generate localized areas of elevated ambient levels of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants. Therefore, the impact to localized air quality from project operations is less than significant.

**Toxic Air Contaminants.** The greatest potential for toxic air contaminants emissions would be related to diesel particulate emissions associated with heavy equipment operations during grading and excavation activities, which are not part of this project. Since project construction/deconstruction would take only approximately 12 months to complete, the project would not result in a long-term substantial source of toxic air contaminants. In addition, there would be no residual emissions after construction and deconstruction activities and thus no

corresponding health risks. As such, project-related construction/deconstruction toxic emission impacts would be less than significant.

Typical sources of acutely and chronically hazardous toxic air contaminants include industrial manufacturing processes. The project would not include any of these potential sources. The primary sources of potential air toxins associated with project operations involve diesel particulate matter from delivery trucks (e.g., truck traffic on local streets and on-site truck idling). The increase in potential localized air toxic impacts from diesel particulate matter would be minimal, since only a limited number of heavy-duty trucks would access the project site. In addition, the trucks that visit the project site would not idle for extended periods of time. Based on the small incremental increase in long-term (annual average) activities of the on-site diesel truck trips, the project would not warrant a health risk assessment and potential air toxin impacts to on- and off-site receptors would be less than significant.

**Global Climate Change.** Project construction/deconstruction would emit approximately 255 metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions, substantially less than the 900 annual metric ton threshold proposed by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA). As shown in Table 6 of this EIR, annual greenhouse gas emissions resulting from vehicle, electrical, and natural gas usage associated with project operations are estimated to be a maximum of 623 metric tons. Therefore, project construction/deconstruction and operations would be less than significant with respect to global climate change. In addition, the project design features would result in lower greenhouse gas emissions compared to buildings constructed in accordance with current applicable building standards. The project is also striving to divert 50 percent of all non-hazardous construction waste from landfills through either recycling or reuse.

## V. EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION

The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the EIR, the Technical Appendices and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 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 EIR in the following category: Cultural Resources. The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts that can be mitigated are listed below. The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency finds that the potentially significant adverse impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level after implementation of the mitigation measure identified in the EIR.

### CULTURAL RESOURCES

*Would the Project:*

*Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?*

Under the proposed project, several of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building's identified character-defining features would be altered. The rear portion of the building would be removed (approximately 150 by 50 feet) along with two industrial window openings and brick parapet on the building's south elevation. The existing spatial relationships of the property would be altered by the removal of the rear portion of the building as well as the addition of new construction to the north and a new rear addition to the east of the building. Other alterations to character-defining building fabric would include removal of the existing skylights and installation of new skylights in the existing roof, and the creation of two new stylistically compatible doors, two sectional doors and one window opening on the building's east elevation. The existing brick on the north and south elevations would be restored or replaced in-kind. The Streamline Moderne west facade would be restored and repainted in a historically appropriate manner or a new historically and stylistically compatible storefront constructed to replace the non-original 1960s storefront, which is in poor condition and beyond repair.

While the proposed project would retain and preserve a large portion of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building and the key character-defining building features, the combined effect of these proposed alterations would materially impair character-defining features that convey the building's historical significance, therefore resulting in a potentially substantial adverse change to this property.

The historical significance of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building would be preserved through the proposed project which would retain and rehabilitate the majority of the important character-defining features in accordance with the Secretary of the

Interior's Standards. The following mitigation measure would reduce the level of potential impacts by recording the building's existing character-defining features prior to the commencement of any construction or deconstruction activities, and by documenting the building in its entirety, including the rear section of the building that would be deconstructed as a result of the proposed project. This documentation would ensure that important information about the property history would be made available to existing and future generations through permanent archival documentation.

**Mitigation Measure 4.2-1: Recordation.** The project applicant shall prepare a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level III documentation. The HABS document shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who satisfies the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History, Architectural History, or Architecture*, pursuant to 36 CFR 61. This document shall be prepared in accordance with HABS Level III format and shall briefly record the history of the property, as well as important contributions to the patterns and trends of local history with which the property is associated, as appropriate. The property's physical condition, both historic and current, shall be documented through site plans; historic maps and photographs; original as-built drawings if available; large format photographs; and written data and text. Field photographs and notes shall also be included. All documentation components shall be completed in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation* (HABS standards). The HABS documentation shall be submitted to the National Park Service for transmittal to the Library of Congress, and archival copies shall be sent to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department and the Long Beach Public Library.

After implementation and completion of this mitigation measure, the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project on the historic property located at 240 Long Beach Boulevard would be minimized and reduced to a less than significant level.

As this mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level, the mitigated project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact on historic resources in the project vicinity, regardless of other development activity that may be occurring. Further, there appears to be no other development proposals for the alteration of historic resources with a similar historical or architectural context or associations such that, in combination with the proposed project, the deconstruction/alteration of historic resources would result in a cumulatively substantial adverse change in the significance of historic resources in the immediate project vicinity. Due to the unique nature of historic resources and the level of local, State and federal regulatory requirements applicable to historic resources, the cumulative effects of individual projects that may occur in the future would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. For these reasons, the cumulative impacts on historic resources would be less than significant.

## VI. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The EIR, in Section 8.0 *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 IV. and V., above, and to the project objectives, as stated in Section 3.0 *Project Description* of the EIR. In making the following alternatives findings, the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency 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 EIR and the responses thereto.

### A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative assumes that the proposed improvements are not implemented and that the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building and the entire project site remains in its present condition.

#### Finding

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including project objectives as discussed in the EIR, render this alternative infeasible.*

#### Facts in Support of Finding

This alternative would not meet the objectives of the proposed project. It should also be noted that implementation of the No Project alternative would not preclude future development on the site and/or renovations or expansions of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building, including those that would be exempt from CEQA and/or the City's discretionary review.

The No Project Alternative would avoid the proposed project's significant impacts relating to historic resources. However, the No Project Alternative would not provide revitalization of the site as outlined in the following project objectives listed in Section 3.0 of the EIR:

1. Create a permanent artist workspace facility that maximizes the opportunity for art education and production.
2. Provide an artist location that establishes a critical linkage between downtown and the East Village Arts District.
3. Provide an artist location that maximizes nearby access to alternative modes of transportation, including pedestrian, bicycle and public transit options.

4. Provide a location and structural features that allow for high visibility of artwork and takes advantage of vehicular and pedestrian activity along Long Beach Boulevard and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.
5. Promote downtown as a regional source for quality art education and production.
6. Allow for the adaptive reuse of the existing historic 240 Long Beach Boulevard building.
7. Establish a model for artists to directly market art to the public and establish networking opportunities promoting the City's art community.
8. Provide opportunities for visitors to experience a creative environment and observe artists producing work, purchase art, and attend classes and cultural events.
9. Provide an open courtyard for performance art (dance, music, etc.) as well as special events and exhibits.

Since the No Project Alternative would not involve any new development and would maintain the existing 240 Long Beach Boulevard building in its currently unoccupied state, this Alternative would not meet any of the project objectives (with the exception of Project Objective No. 6 since this Alternative would not preclude other future reuse of this building). The findings for the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

#### **B. 240 LONG BEACH BOULEVARD BUILDING ONLY ALTERNATIVE**

This Alternative would reuse the front or westernmost 5,000 square feet of the existing 240 Long Beach Boulevard building similar to the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this Alternative would deconstruct the eastern side of the building (approximately 150 feet by 50 feet) to remain as undeveloped land. This Alternative would not include any new buildings. The reused portion of 240 Long Beach Boulevard building would include fewer studios and reduced gallery space as compared to the project. No classroom or hot shop would be included in this Alternative.

#### **Finding**

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including project objectives as discussed in the EIR, render this alternative infeasible.*

#### **Facts in Support of Finding**

Material changes and alterations to the existing building under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project, although this Alternative would still result in significant

impacts to this building that would require similar mitigation. Since this Alternative would result in the adaptive reuse of the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building to a similar extent as the proposed project and would provide new art production facilities, this Alternative would support some of the project objectives. However, the number of studios and gallery space would be reduced and the classroom and hot shop would be eliminated under this Alternative. Overall, by reducing or eliminating the art production and educational facilities under this Alternative when compared to the proposed project, the project objectives would generally be met to a lesser degree than the proposed project and in some cases, the project objectives would not be met at all.

The findings for the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

**C. 240 LONG BEACH BOULEVARD BUILDING PLUS REDUCED NEW CONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVE**

This Alternative would reuse the front or westernmost 5,000 square feet of the existing 240 Long Beach Boulevard building similar to the proposed project. However, only 3,000 square feet in new construction would occur, as compared to 5,150 square feet in the proposed project. This Alternative would not include the hot shop or classroom uses, and the studio and gallery space would be reduced in comparison to the proposed project.

**Finding**

- *Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including project objectives discussed in the EIR, render this alternative infeasible.*

**Facts in Support of Finding**

Material changes and alterations to the 240 Long Beach Boulevard building under this Alternative would be less than the proposed project, although this Alternative would still result in potentially significant impacts that would require similar mitigation. Since this Alternative would result in the adaptive reuse of this existing building to a similar extent as the proposed project and would provide new art production facilities, this Alternative would support some of the project objectives. However, since the number of studios and gallery space would be reduced and the classroom and hot shop would be eliminated under this Alternative, this Alternative would maximize the opportunity for education and production to a lesser extent than the proposed project. Overall, by reducing or eliminating the art production and educational facilities under this Alternative when compared to the proposed project, the project objectives would generally be met to a lesser degree than the proposed project and in some cases, the project objectives would not be met at all.



The findings for the proposed project set forth in this document and the overriding social, economic and other considerations provide support for the proposed project and the elimination of this alternative from further consideration.

# **Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**

for the

## **Art Exchange Project**

**SCH # 2009061061**

Lead Agency:

**City of Long Beach**

**Redevelopment Agency**

333 W. Ocean Boulevard

Long Beach, California 90802

Contact: Craig Chalfant, Environmental Review Project Manager  
(562) 570-6368

March 2010

## **MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

CEQA requires that a reporting or monitoring program be adopted for the conditions of project approval that are necessary to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is designed to ensure compliance with adopted mitigation measures during project implementation. Specifications are made herein that identify the action required and the monitoring that must occur. In addition, a responsible City department is identified for verifying compliance with the conditions set forth in this Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

### **Mitigation Measure**

**Mitigation Measure 4.2-1: Recordation.** The project applicant shall prepare a Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Level III documentation. The HABS document shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who satisfies the *Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History, Architectural History, or Architecture*, pursuant to 36 CFR 61. This document shall be prepared in accordance with HABS Level III format and shall briefly record the history of the property, as well as important contributions to the patterns and trends of local history with which the property is associated, as appropriate. The property's physical condition, both historic and current, shall be documented through site plans; historic maps and photographs; original as-built drawings if available; large format photographs; and written data and text. Field photographs and notes shall also be included. All documentation components shall be completed in accordance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation* (HABS standards). The HABS documentation shall be submitted to the National Park Service for transmittal to the Library of Congress, and archival copies shall be sent to the City of Long Beach Development Services Department and the Long Beach Public Library.

### **Monitoring Implementation Phase**

Prior to the commencement of any project construction or deconstruction activities.

### **Enforcement Agency**

Long Beach Department of Development Services

### **Monitoring Agency**

Long Beach Department of Development Services