

City of Long Beach

North Village Center Redevelopment Project

Draft

Environmental Impact Report

SCH # 2008021087

Volume II: Appendices

August 2009

**North Village Center
Redevelopment Project**

Draft
Environmental Impact Report

Volume II: Appendices

State Clearinghouse No. 2008021087

Prepared by:

**City of Long Beach
Development Services**
333 W. Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90802
Contact: Mr. Craig Chalfant
(562) 570-6368

Prepared with the assistance of:

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
790 East Santa Clara Street
Ventura, California 93001

August 2009

*This report is printed on 50% recycled paper
with 50% post-consumer content.*

North Village Center Redevelopment Project EIR

Table of Contents

	Page
Volume I: Text	
Executive Summary	ES-1
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Environmental Impact Report Background	1-1
1.2 Purpose and Legal Authority	1-2
1.3 Scope and Content/Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	1-3
1.4 Lead, Responsible and Trustee Agencies	1-4
1.5 Environmental Review Process	1-4
2.0 Project Description	
2.1 Project Applicant	2-1
2.2 Project Location	2-1
2.3 Current Land Use and Regulatory Setting	2-2
2.4 Project Characteristics	2-9
2.5 Project Objectives	2-26
2.6 Required Approvals	2-26
3.0 Environmental Setting	
3.1 Regional Setting	3-1
3.2 Project Site Setting	3-1
3.3 Cumulative Projects Setting	3-2
4.0 Environmental Impact Analysis	
4.1 Aesthetics	4.1-1
4.2 Air Quality	4.2-1
4.3 Cultural Resources	4.3-1
4.4 Geology	4.4-1
4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4.5-1
4.6 Hydrology and Water Quality	4.6-1
4.7 Land Use and Planning	4.7-1
4.8 Noise	4.8-1
4.9 Population and Housing	4.9-1
4.10 Public Services	4.10-1
4.11 Transportation and Circulation	4.11-1
4.12 Utilities and Service Systems	4.12-1
5.0 Other CEQA-Required Discussions	
5.1 Growth Inducement	5-1
5.2 Irreversible Environmental Effects	5-2
5.3 Global Climate Change	5-3



Table of Contents

6.0 Alternatives 6-1

 6.1 No Project 6-1

 6.2 General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Consistent 6-2

 6.3 Historic Resources Preservation Alternative 6-8

 6.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative 6-11

7.0 References and Report Preparers

 7.1 References 7-1

 7.2 Report Preparers 7-6

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 CEQA Environmental Review Process 1-5

Figure 2-1 Regional Vicinity 2-4

Figure 2-2 Project Location 2-5

Figure 2-3 Site Boundary 2-6

Figure 2-4a Current Site Conditions 2-7

Figure 2-4b Current Site Conditions 2-8

Figure 2-5 Site Plan – Option A 2-13

Figure 2-6 Site Plan – Option B 2-15

Figure 2-7 South Street and West Block Atlantic Avenue Full Block Conceptual Elevations 2-16

Figure 2-8 Linden Avenue and West Block 59th Street Full Block Conceptual Elevations 2-17

Figure 2-9 Atlantic Avenue Conceptual Elevations 2-18

Figure 2-10 Atlantic Avenue Conceptual Elevations 2-18

Figure 2-11 59th Street and South Street Conceptual Elevations 2-19

Figure 2-12 Linden Avenue Conceptual Elevations 2-20

Figure 2-13 Linden Avenue Conceptual Elevations 2-21

Figure 2-14 Project Height Profile – Aerial View Looking Northeast 2-22

Figure 2-15 Project Height Profile – Aerial View Looking Southwest 2-23

Figure 4.1-1a Existing Visual Character of Surrounding Land Uses 4.1-2

Figure 4.1-1b Existing Visual Character of Surrounding Land Uses 4.1-3

Figure 4.1-2a Summer Solstice Shadow – June 21st 4.1-13

Figure 4.1-2b Winter Solstice Shadow – December 21st 4.1-15

Figure 4.3-1 Location of Historic Structures on and near the Project Site 4.3-6

Figure 4.3-2a Historic Structures on the Project Site 4.3-7

Figure 4.3-2b Historic Structures on the Project Site 4.3-8

Figure 4.4-1 Regional Earthquake Fault Map 4.4-4

Figure 4.7-1 Site and Surrounding Land Use Designations 4.7-4

Figure 4.7-2 Site and Surrounding Zone Designations 4.7-5

Figure 4.7-3 Redevelopment Area Boundaries 4.7-6

Figure 4.11-1 Study Area Intersections 4.11-2

Figure 4.11-2 Existing (2008) Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Level of Service 4.11-4

Figure 4.11-3 Without-Project Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Level of Service

 - Year 2011 4.11-9

Figure 4.11-4 Without-Project Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Level of Service

 - Year 2016 4.11-10

Figure 4.11-5 Project Traffic Distribution 4.11-13



Table of Contents

Figure 4.11-6 Project Peak Only Hour Traffic Volumes 2011 Phase I.....	4.11-14
Figure 4.11-7 Project Only Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes 2016 (Option A).....	4.11-15
Figure 4.11-8 Project Only Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes 2016 (Option B).....	4.11-16
Figure 4.11-9 With-Project Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Loss of Service - 2011 Phase I	4.11-20
Figure 4.11-10 With-Project Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Loss of Service - Year 2016 Phase II (Option A)	4.11-21
Figure 4.11-11 With-Project Peak-Hour Traffic Volumes and Loss of Service - Year 2016 Phase II (Option B)	4.11-22

List of Tables

Table ES-1 Existing Site Development.....	ES-2
Table ES-2 Project Statistics	ES-3
Table ES-3 Summary of Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts.....	ES-5
Table 1-1 NOP Comment Issues	1-1
Table 2-1 Site Assessor Parcel Numbers and Addresses	2-1
Table 2-2 Existing Site Characteristics.....	2-2
Table 2-3 Existing Site Development.....	2-3
Table 2-4 Project Summary	2-10
Table 2-5 Project Statistics	2-10
Table 3-1 Cumulative Projects List	3-2
Table 4.2-1 Current Federal and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4.2-4
Table 4.2-3 SCAQMD Air Quality Significance Thresholds.....	4.2-6
Table 4.2-4 SCAQMD LSTs for Construction.....	4.2-7
Table 4.2-5 Estimated Maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction of Phase I (West Block)	4.2-8
Table 4.2-6 Estimated Maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions During Construction of Phase II (East Block)	4.2-9
Table 4.2-7 Operational Emissions Associated with Proposed Project	4.2-10
Table 4.4-1 Major Active Named Faults Near the Project Site.....	4.4-5
Table 4.4-2 Liquefaction Zone Criteria.....	4.4-10
Table 4.5-1 EDR Summary Listing of Sites	4.5-6
Table 4.7-1 City of Long Beach General Plan Elements.....	4.7-2
Table 4.7-2 General Plan Policy Consistency	4.7-12
Table 4.7-3 Redevelopment Implementation Plan Policy Consistency	4.7-17
Table 4.7-4 Citywide Strategic Plan Consistency.....	4.7-17
Table 4.8-1 Exterior Noise Standards	4.8-2
Table 4.8-2 Interior Noise Standards	4.8-3
Table 4.8-3 Significance of Changes in Operational Roadway Noise Exposure	4.8-5
Table 4.8-4 Typical Noise Levels at Construction Sites	4.8-6
Table 4.8-5 Noise Levels Associated with Traffic on Area Roadways.....	4.8-9
Table 4.8-6 Parking Lot Noise Sources at 100 Feet	4.8-11
Table 4.9-1 Current and Projected Population, Housing and Employment in the City of Long Beach.....	4.9-1
Table 4.9-2 Comparison of Project Population and Housing Growth to SCAG Projections	4.9-3



Table of Contents

Table 4.10-1	Long Beach USD School Capacity and Enrollment in Project Area.....	4.10-1
Table 4.10-2	Long Beach Unified Generation Factors and Student Generation.....	4.10-4
Table 4.10-3	Projected Enrollment at Schools Serving the Proposed Project.....	4.10-5
Table 4.11-1	Level of Service Definitions	4.11-5
Table 4.11-2	Level of Service Criteria for Unsignalized Intersections	4.11-6
Table 4.11-3	Existing (Year 2008) Operating Conditions at Study Area Intersections	4.11-6
Table 4.11-4	Year 2011 Without-Project Traffic Conditions at Study Area Intersections	4.11-8
Table 4.11-5	Year 2016 Without-Project Traffic Conditions at Study Area Intersections	4.11-11
Table 4.11-6	Project Traffic Generation	4.11-23
Table 4.11-7	Year 2011 Phase I - With Project Traffic Intersections Conditions	4.11-24
Table 4.11-8	Year 2016 Phase I + Phase II (Option A) - With Project Traffic Intersections Conditions.....	4.11-25
Table 4.11-9	Year 2016 Phase I + Phase II (Option B) - With Project Traffic Intersections Conditions.....	4.11-26
Table 4.11-10	Project Added Trips at Freeway Monitoring Stations	4.11-27
Table 4.11-11	Project Parking Supply/Demand Summary	4.11-29
Table 4.11-12	Shared Parking Analysis.....	4.11-30
Table 4.11-13	Shared Parking Analysis Summary.....	4.11-31
Table 4.12-1	Current and Projected Water Supplies for the City of Long Beach	4.12-2
Table 4.12-2	LBWD’s 2007 Preferential Rights to MWD Water.....	4.12-2
Table 4.12-3	Groundwater Extracted by LBWD - AF/ Fiscal Year Ending Sept 30 ...	4.12-3
Table 4.12-4	Groundwater Projected to be Extracted by LBWD AF/Year	4.12-3
Table 4.12-5	Current Potable Demands and Dry-Year Supplies	4.12-4
Table 4.12-6	Future Potable Demands and Dry-Year Supplies	4.12-4
Table 4.12-7	Estimated Project Water Demand	4.12-9
Table 4.12-8	Current Potable Demands with Project and Dry-year Supplies	4.12-10
Table 4.12-9	Future Potable Demands with Project and Dry-year Supplies	4.12-10
Table 4.12-10	Project Estimated Wastewater Generation.....	4.12-12
Table 4.12-11	Estimated Project Solid Waste Disposal Demand	4.12-13
Table 4.12-12	Project Estimated Electricity Consumption.....	4.12-15
Table 4.12-13	Project Estimated Natural Gas Consumption.....	4.12-15
Table 5-1	Estimated Electricity Consumption.....	5-13
Table 5-2	Estimated Annual Operational Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	5-13
Table 5-3	Estimated Annual Mobile Emissions of Greenhouse Gases	5-14
Table 5-4	Combined Annual Emissions of Greenhouse Gases.....	5-14
Table 5-5	CAPCOA Suggested Quantitative Non-Zero Thresholds for Greenhouse Gas Emissions	5-16
Table 5-6	Comparison of VMT and Emissions: Infill versus Greenfield Development.....	5-16
Table 5-7	Project Consistency with Applicable Climate Action Team Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Strategies	5-17
Table 5-8	Project Consistency with Applicable Attorney General Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures.....	5-22
Table 6-1	Comparison of Project Alternatives Buildout Characteristics	6-1
Table 6-2	Alternative 3 Project Summary	6-2



Table of Contents

Table 6-3	Alternative 2 Gross Trip Generation	6-6
Table 6-4	Alternative 2 Estimated Gross Project Water Demand.....	6-7
Table 6-5	Alternative 2 Estimated Gross Wastewater Generation.....	6-7
Table 6-6	Alternative 2 Estimated Gross Solid Waste Disposal Demand	6-8
Table 6-7	Comparison of Environmental Impacts of Alternatives.....	6-12

Volume II: Appendices

Appendices

Appendix A	Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Responses to the NOP
Appendix B	Air Quality Data
Appendix C	Historic Resources Report
Appendix D	Geotechnical Report
Appendix E	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Appendix F	Noise Data
Appendix G	Traffic Study



This page intentionally left blank.



Appendix A

Initial Study/
Notice of Preparation and Responses to the Notice of Preparation

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title: North Village Center Redevelopment Project

Lead Agency: Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Blvd, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-570-6615 Phone
562-570-6215 Fax

Contact Person: Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
Telephone: (562) 570-6357 FAX: (562) 570-6068

Project Location: The project site encompasses two full blocks comprising approximately 6.3 acres on the east and west sides of Atlantic Avenue north of South Street in the North Long Beach Redevelopment Project Area in the City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles. The western block, approximately 3.15 acres, is bounded on the south by South Street, on the west by Linden Avenue and on the north by 59th Street. The east block, also approximately 3.15 acres, is bounded on the south by South Street, on the east by Lime Avenue and on the north by 59th Street. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the project location.

Project Sponsor's

Name and Address: North Long Beach Partners LLC
c/o Civic Enterprise Development LLC
400 Mt. Washington Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90065
(213) 403-0170 x1
Fax: (213) 403-0172

Existing Land Use: All improvements on the west block have been demolished except for one unoccupied structure. All improvements on the east block have been demolished except for four structures. One of these, an auto parts store, is presently occupied. The Long Beach Redevelopment Agency (RDA) owns the subject property in its entirety except for the parcel on the eastern block where the auto parts store is located.

General Plan and Zoning:

The site is divided between the following General Plan Land Use designations: Townhomes (3A), Mixed Style Homes (2), Traditional Retail Strip Commercial (8A) and Mixed Retail/Residential Strip (8R). Zoning designations are Townhouse or Row House Residential (R-3-T), Two-Family Residential (R-2-N), Neighborhood Automobile-Oriented Commercial (CNA) and Community Automobile-Oriented Commercial (CCA).



**Surrounding
Land Uses:**

The prevailing uses along Atlantic to the north and south of the Site are one- and two-story commercial buildings. The prevailing uses to the east and west of the site are mixed-density residential, including single-family and multi-family homes. The project site is within Parcel One of the ten non-contiguous subareas in the North Long Beach Redevelopment Project Area. Additionally, the project site is split along Atlantic Avenue between the De Forest (west) and California/Cherry (east) communities. These communities are characterized as residential areas with localized commercial shopping areas.



DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The proposed project is a mixed-use “village center” on an approximately 6.3-acre site in the City of Long Beach. The project site encompasses two full city blocks on either side of Atlantic Avenue between South Street and 59th Street. The project location is illustrated on Figures 1 and 2 at the end of this document. The project as proposed includes the following primary components:

- Up to 180 units of multi-family housing in a mix of row houses, courtyard units and units built atop ground floor non-residential space.
- Up to 50,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial/retail space. This space could include restaurants, and would be split between the east and west blocks.
- A public library and community center totaling approximately 30,000 square feet fronting Atlantic Avenue on the east block.

Residential and commercial components of the project would be constructed on both the east and west blocks. The proposed commercial/retail and institutional space would be oriented primarily towards Atlantic Avenue. The maximum building heights would be five stories on Atlantic Avenue and two stories on both Linden and Lime Avenues.

The existing street configuration would remain unchanged. Hullett Street, which currently terminates mid-block on Linden Avenue at the site’s western border, would “continue” eastbound through the site as a pedestrian paseo.

On the west block, each residential unit would have exclusive access to a private two-car garage built on-grade. The restaurant and other non-residential uses on the west block would be served by a combination of adjacent surface lots built internally to the block and spaces in a public “park once” structure of approximately 300 stalls on the east block. On the east block, each residential courtyard unit would have exclusive access to its own private two-car garage built on-grade. The other residential units, including the row house and units built atop ground-floor non-residential space, would have access to stalls in the “park once” structure. The non-residential space would be served by the “park once” structure. Overall, up to approximately 600 off-street parking spaces would be provided in these garages, parking lots and parking structure. The project would make use of a shared parking arrangement to minimize the number of spaces required to serve visitors to its retail/commercial, public and residential components.

Both public and private open space would be incorporated into the project. The open space would generally be for passive use (i.e. sports courts and play fields are not proposed), but could include one or more “tot-lot” playgrounds. Restaurants in the proposed commercial/retail space would have opportunities to offer outdoor dining areas.

Structures within the project would attain LEED certification. The entire project would utilize “green” design strategies including stormwater management and use of natural light. Construction would employ recyclable, renewable and locally-sourced materials throughout the interior and exterior of the development. Management of the property would incorporate a



recycling program, regular maintenance and conservation of resources through the use of Energy Star appliances. Storm water runoff management would be implemented through the use of permeable surfaces, roof gardens, cisterns and bioswales.

Site preparation would include demolition or significant modification of all remaining structures on the site as well as grading and necessary infrastructure improvements.

Discretionary approvals by the City of Long Beach required for the project include the following:

- *Certification of an environmental impact report (Redevelopment Agency)*
- *General Plan Amendment (City Council)*
- *Zone Code Amendment (City Council)*
- *Site Plan Review (Planning Commission)*
- *Administrative Use Permit for off-street parking (Planning Commission)*

PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL WILL BE REQUIRED FOR SUBSEQUENT ACTION:

- *Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach*
- *City of Long Beach Planning Commission*
- *Long Beach City Council*

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology and Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing	



DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potential significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.



Angela Reynolds, AICP, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach, Development Services Department

2/14/08

Date



Environmental Checklist

This section analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The issue areas evaluated in this Initial Study include:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy/Mineral Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems

The environmental analysis in this section is patterned after the Initial Study Checklist recommended by the *CEQA Guidelines*, as amended, and used by the City of Long Beach in its environmental review process. For the preliminary environmental assessment undertaken as part of this Initial Study's preparation, a determination that there is a potential for significant effects indicates the need to more fully analyze the development's impacts and identify mitigation.

For the evaluation of potential impacts, the questions in the Initial Study Checklist are stated and an answer is provided according to the analysis undertaken as part of the Initial Study. The analysis considers the long-term, direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the development. To each question, there are four possible responses:

- **No Impact.** The development will not have any measurable environmental impact on the environment.
- **Less Than Significant Impact.** The development will have the potential for impacting the environment, although this impact will be below established thresholds that are considered to be significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated.** The development will have the potential to generate impacts which may be considered as a significant effect on the environment, although mitigation measures or changes to the development's physical or operational characteristics can reduce these impacts to levels that are less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** The development could have impacts, which may be considered significant, and therefore additional analysis is required to identify mitigation measures that could reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-b. The project site is located approximately seven miles from the Pacific Ocean and approximately 0.6 miles from the channelized Los Angeles River and is not located along a designated scenic corridor. The project is not expected to block views of offsite scenic resources such as the Pacific Ocean or Los Angeles River, as they are not visible from public viewing areas near the site. The project site has been previously graded and built out with commercial buildings and surface parking lots, and lacks important scenic resources such as major trees or rock outcroppings. Finally, although there are potentially historic buildings on the site, they are not visible from a state scenic highway. Therefore, development of the project would not affect any scenic vistas or scenic resources. Impacts would be less than significant and **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

c. The proposed project would change the visual character of the site from vacant lots and older one- and two-story buildings to a fully built out development. The demolition of the existing buildings and overall change in mass, height and style of development on the site would substantially alter the visual character of the site and its surroundings. The project would also introduce taller buildings and a contemporary architectural style to a neighborhood of primarily lower-profile development. Finally, the proposed new structures have the potential to cast shadows on surrounding properties, including residences, which would vary seasonally and with time of day. Changes to the visual character of the site and surroundings, and potential shade and shadow impacts, are potentially significant and **will be further analyzed in the EIR.** The analysis will include shadow modeling to illustrate the effect of building height and massing.

d. Development of the proposed project would create new sources of lighting and glare on the project site, due largely to the increased height and scale of development as well as the change in character to a more modern design and mixed-use development. Although development would be expected to comply with City lighting standards, lighting and glare could create potentially significant aesthetic impacts. Therefore, **the potential light and glare impacts will be further analyzed in an EIR.**



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. <u>AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a-c. The project site is located in a highly developed urbanized area in the City of Long Beach. Until the recent demolition of most of the structures on the site, the entire property was developed with commercial and residential structures and surface parking lots. Project development would not convert farmland, conflict with agricultural zoning or have the potential to result in the loss or conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. There would be no impact and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a-d. Construction activity on the project site would result in temporary air quality impacts due to the generation of fugitive dust (PM₁₀) and exhaust emissions associated with heavy construction vehicles. Site preparation would include demolition or significant modification of all remaining structures on site, which due to its age, may have been constructed with



asbestos-containing materials. The primary source of long-term emissions would be vehicles driven by future residents as well as future commercial-component customers. Other sources of operational emissions include stationary and area source emissions, such as the consumption of natural gas and the use of landscape maintenance equipment. Development associated with the proposed project could also result in increased carbon monoxide concentrations on congested roadways. Because project-generated emissions could potentially exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) thresholds or otherwise be potentially significant, **these issues will be analyzed in an EIR**, and mitigation measures will be provided, including adherence to the City’s regulations pertaining to air quality (Chapter 8.64 of the Municipal Code), to minimize future project-specific air quality impacts.

e. Construction activities could result in odors resulting from the use of construction equipment. However, construction activities would be temporary and would not result in significant long-term odor impacts, particularly as the project would be required to adhere to the City’s regulations pertaining to air quality (Chapter 8.64 of the Municipal Code). The proposed residential use of the property would not generate objectionable odors during normal operations, and the project would comply with City requirements applicable to maintenance of trash areas to minimize potential odors. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

a-d. The project site is in an urbanized area and lacks sensitive animal species or associated habitat. Although the Pacific Ocean is located approximately seven miles from the project site and the Los Angeles River is located approximately 0.6 miles from the site, there are no existing waterways connecting the site to the ocean or other surface water body. The project does not involve development in a federally protected wetland and does not involve improvements that would impair or interrupt hydrological flow into a wetland. No impact related to movement of fish or wildlife species or migration corridors would occur. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to animal or plant species or habitats and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

e, f. The project site is within an urbanized area that is not subject to any habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or local policy or ordinance relating to biological resource protection. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any biological resource policy or ordinance and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. The proposed project would include demolition or significant modification of all remaining structures on the site as well as grading and necessary infrastructure improvements. Three existing structures on the project site are over 50 years old and could be potential historic resources. A historic resources evaluation has been completed for the project. Therefore, **the issue of historic resources will be further analyzed in an EIR**, and mitigation will be provided, including adherence to the City’s regulations pertaining to historic resources contained in Chapter 16.52 of the Municipal Code, as warranted, to minimize impacts.



b, c, d. The project site is located within an urbanized area and has been subject to extensive disturbance over the years due to previous development; thus, any surficial archaeological resources, unique paleontological resources, unique geologic feature or human remains that may have been present at one time have likely been previously disturbed. However, the potential does exist for previously unknown resources or remains to be damaged during grading for site preparation. Potential impacts to previously unknown resources are likely mitigable, however, with standard mitigation measures and procedures to be followed if resources or remains are discovered during grading and site preparation. **These mitigation measures will be included in the cultural resources section of the EIR.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> – Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a (i –iii)-d. The proposed project has the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects relating to geology and soils, including those associated with earthquake risk, liquefaction or expansive soils. Therefore, **these issues will be further evaluated in an EIR.** Mitigation measures, including adherence to the City’s Earthquake Hazard Regulations (Chapter 18.68 of the Municipal Code), will be provided for identified significant impacts.



a.iv. As the project site is relatively flat and there are no substantial hillsides or unstable slopes within the vicinity, there is no potential for landslide hazards. **No impact would occur and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

e. The proposed development would be connected to the City sewer system and would not use on-site septic systems for wastewater treatment. **No impacts would occur and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> - Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



a-c. The proposed mixed-use redevelopment project would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials and by its nature would not introduce any unusual hazardous materials to the area. As discussed above (Section III, *Air Quality*), construction of the project would involve partial demolition of the commercial structures, which, due to their age, may contain asbestos and lead-based paints and materials. The removal of any asbestos-containing materials would be required to comply with all applicable existing rules and regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities). In addition, the proposed project would have to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations regarding lead-based materials. The California Code of Regulations, §1532.1, require testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials such that exposure levels do not exceed CalOSHA standards. Nevertheless, in order to more fully evaluate the potential for significant impacts, **this issue will be assessed in an EIR.** Mitigation measures, including adherence to the City’s regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and waste (Chapters 8.85 through 8.88 of the Municipal Code), will be provided for identified significant impacts.

d. The proposed project is in a highly urbanized area with historic commercial activity associated with a variety of businesses. Thus the potential exists for hazardous materials to be present on the site. **This impact will be analyzed in an EIR.** Mitigation measures, including adherence to the City’s regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and waste, will be provided for identified significant impacts.

e, f. The project site is located over two miles from the nearest airport/airstrip, the Long Beach Airport. **No impacts are anticipated and further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

g. The proposed project would not change the alignment of or access through streets serving the project site or surrounding area, and thus would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

h. The project site is in an urbanized area that is not subject to wildland fire hazards. **Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a, c-f. The proposed project involves the demolition of existing structures and the construction of residential buildings, a parking structure, retail/restaurant space, public library, a tot lot, and a community center. As much of the site is currently vacant and unpaved, the project is expected to result in an overall increase in impervious surfaces and thus potentially increased quantities of stormwater runoff. This runoff also has the potential to carry pollutants and sediment off the site. However, the proposed project would be required to comply with all local, state and federal requirements pertaining to preservation of water quality and reduction of runoff to offsite areas, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and the implementation of a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Provisions of the City’s regulations that protect water quality, including Chapter 18.95 of the Municipal Code, would apply. In addition, as part of a LEED Neighborhood Development strategy, the entire project would utilize green design strategies including stormwater management through the use of permeable surfaces, roof gardens and bioswales among other design strategies. Finally, earthwork for project construction would involve greater than one acre of land, and therefore,



would require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

There are no creeks, streams or formal drainage channels on or near the site. The existing drainage is relatively uncontrolled due to piecemeal development that has occurred on the site in the past and the current condition of the site resulting from recent demolition of structures.

Based on the discussion above, impacts to stormwater quantity and quality are potentially significant and **further analysis in an EIR is warranted.**

b. The proposed mixed-use development would result in a net increase in water demand due to the intensification of development on the site. Although the majority of the City’s water supply consists of imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), approximately 38% is extracted from the local basin (Long Beach Water Department, January 28, 2008). **The EIR will assess the project’s impacts to groundwater resources as part of the analysis of utilities and service systems impacts (see also Section XVI.d. below).**

g, h. According to the City of Long Beach and the Federal Emergency Management Administration Flood Insurance Rate Maps (2002), the project site is located outside the 100-year flood zone. Therefore, no significant flood impacts are anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

i, j. There are no dams or levees located within the vicinity of the project site; thus, there is no potential for flooding due to dam failure. The project site is not located near any landlocked water; therefore, impacts from seiches would not occur. The project site is located approximately seven miles from the Pacific Ocean and would not be inundated by a tsunami (General Plan Public Safety Element, 1975). Therefore, no impacts from dam or levee failures, seiches, or tsunamis are anticipated and **further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> - Would the proposal:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with an applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. The proposed project involves the redevelopment of two existing blocks. Circulation patterns around and through the site would not be blocked or otherwise substantially changed,



and the residential, commercial and institutional uses proposed uses are generally similar to those in the vicinity. The project would not physically divide the established community. No impacts would result and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

b. The proposed project includes uses not allowed in the existing zone districts (e.g. residential uses are not permitted in the CCA or CNA districts) and exceedence of development standards for the existing zone districts (e.g. buildings up to five stories are proposed in R-2-N, R-3-T CNN and CCA districts, which have two-story height limits). Because amendments to the General Plan Land Use Element and zoning designations on the site are needed, the project has the potential to conflict with policies contained in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, land use compatibility and the project’s consistency with applicable local and regional policies **will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

c. The proposed project would not conflict with an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan, as no such plans apply to the project site. No impacts would occur and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES-- Would the project:				
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. Oil is the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach. The site is not currently used for oil extraction, nor is that the proposed use; no oil extraction land uses currently exist anywhere near the project site. No impacts to mineral resources are anticipated in this regard, and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

b. Development of the proposed project would not result in the loss of the availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value locally, regionally, or to the State. Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources are anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- other agencies?
- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

A project will normally have a significant effect on the environment related to noise if it will increase substantially the ambient noise levels of adjoining areas or conflict with adopted environmental plans and goals of the community in which it is located. The City of Long Beach has adopted the State of California noise guidelines established by the Office of Noise Control and State Government Code Section 65302 (g).

In addition to the State noise guidelines, the City of Long Beach has adopted a quantitative Noise Control Ordinance, (Municipal Code Chapter 8.80). The ordinance establishes maximum permissible hourly noise levels (L₅₀) for different districts throughout the City. The project site is located in District One, which allows a maximum of 45 dBA at night and 50 dBA during the day. The City's Noise Control Ordinance also governs the time of day that construction work can be performed.

a-d. Construction activity associated with development of the proposed project would create temporary noise level increases. The grading/excavation phase of project construction tends to create the highest noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment and the use of heavy equipment that has the potential to generate groundborne vibration and groundborne noise. Noise levels associated with heavy equipment typically range from about 78 to 88 dBA at 50 feet from the source (US EPA, 1971). Operation of this equipment could generate noise levels onsite and at adjacent receptor locations that are above ambient levels and that could exceed applicable noise standards.

Noise associated with operation of the project would be consistent with those typical of a mixed-use residential building, such as music, conversations, doors slamming, and children playing. Additionally, vehicle-related noise would be audible to surrounding receptors including noise such as car doors slamming, engines starting, and car alarms. The commercial component of the proposed project would produce noise associated with loading and deliveries, which could conflict with residential uses.



The proposed project would also result in an increase in overall traffic on area roadways, including the existing traffic noise sources of South Street, Lime Avenue, East 59th Street, Linden Avenue, and Atlantic Avenue. Implementation of the proposed project would increase ambient noise levels in the project area above current conditions.

Noise associated with both temporary construction activity and long-term project operation will be analyzed in detail in an EIR. Mitigation, including adherence to the City’s Noise Ordinance, will be proposed for identified significant impacts.

e, f. The project site is located over two miles from the Long Beach Airport. Significant impacts relating to aircraft noise are not anticipated and **further analysis in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING — Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	■	□	□	□
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	□	□	□	■
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	□	□	□	■

a. The proposed project would involve the redevelopment of a mixed-use “village center” including up to 180 multi-family housing. Based on the City average of 2.91 people per household (California Department of Finance, 2007), the residential component of the project would generate a potential net increase of approximately 524 residents. This increase in population and associated infrastructure has the potential to induce growth and exceed established thresholds. **Therefore, potential impacts relating to population growth will be evaluated in an EIR.**

b, c. Implementation of the proposed project would not displace any housing or people, as the site is currently unoccupied except for a few several commercial structures. **Further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.**



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) 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:

i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a (i-iv). The proposed project would incrementally increase the demand for public services due to the increase in residential population and commercial uses at the project site. As discussed under Item XII, *Population and Housing*, the project would result add 180 dwelling units and approximately 524 residents. The added residences and commercial development could potentially affect public services and facilities. **Therefore, potential impacts relating to fire and police protection, schools and parks will be further evaluated in an EIR.**

v. The proposed project is not expected to adversely affect any services other than those described above. The project includes a new public library branch, which is expected to result in a **beneficial impact to library services; this will be discussed in the EIR.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. RECREATION —

a) 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?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



a, b. A limited amount of recreational space is proposed as part of the proposed North Village Center project. This component of the project in itself is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts beyond those of the overall proposed site development. However, the project would add up to 180 dwelling units and approximately 524 residents and would therefore increase the demand for recreational facilities in the area. **This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR as part of the public services analysis.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC — Would the project:				
a) 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)?	■	□	□	□
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	■	□	□	□
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	□	□	□	■
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g. farm equipment)?	□	□	□	■
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	□	■	□	□
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	□	■	□	□
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	□	□	■	□

a, b. The proposed project would generate an increase in vehicle trips to and from the site. Project-generated trips would have the potential to adversely affect levels of service on surrounding roadways and at area intersections. **This issue will be further evaluated in an EIR.** The traffic analysis will evaluate the project’s potential to create significant impacts relating to traffic, circulation and access. Mitigation measures will be provided if necessary.

c. The project would not necessitate any change in air traffic patterns. **Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

d. The proposed project would not involve the construction of new roadways, nor would it substantially reconfigure existing roadways. Site access including driveways and parking garage ramps would be required to conform to City standards and would be subject to City and Fire Department review to ensure that safety requirements are met. Impacts related to design



feature hazards would be less than significant and **further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

e. Emergency access to the site would be continued to be provided via five roadways: East 59th Street, Linden Avenue, East South Street, Lime Avenue, and Atlantic Avenue. All plans for site access including driveways and parking garage ramps would be subject to the review of City staff and the City of Long Beach Fire Department for compliance with fire and emergency access standards. Nevertheless, as a mid-block crossing and traffic signal is proposed on Atlantic Avenue between South and 59th Streets, impacts related to emergency access are potentially significant. **Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is warranted.**

f. The proposed project includes a parking structure, garages, and parking lots. Up to approximately 600 off-street parking spaces would be provided. The project may utilize shared parking spaces to minimize the number of spaces required to serve both the residential and commercial components. **This issue will be further evaluated in the EIR,** including a shared parking analysis as part of the traffic study if warranted.

g. No conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation modes such as bus facilities and bicycle access/parking are anticipated to occur. The proposed project involves the development of residential and commercial uses in a mixed-use development within walking distance of a variety of services and commercial opportunities. Bus service to downtown Long Beach and light rail connections is available at and near the site, including Long Beach Transit lines 52, 61, 62, 63 and 192. **Further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS — Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

a, b, e. The proposed project would intensify development on the project site and would therefore increase the generation of wastewater. To determine whether the existing wastewater conveyance infrastructure and treatment plant have sufficient available capacity to accommodate wastewater from the proposed development, **these issues will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

c. As discussed under Item VIII.a above, the proposed project would increase the area covered by impervious surfaces, potentially increasing runoff quantities. New drainage infrastructure would be also installed on site, potentially affecting off-site facilities. **This issue will be further analyzed in an EIR.**

d. The proposed project would increase the demand for water in the City. To determine whether or not water supplies and infrastructure are adequate to serve the proposed development, **this issue will be further analyzed in an EIR.** Mitigation measures will be provided for identified significant impacts where possible.

f, g. Development of the proposed project would increase the amount of solid waste generated within the City. Compliance with State waste diversion requirements and the potential effects of the increase in solid waste generation on regional landfill capacity **will be further evaluated in an EIR** and waste reduction measures will be recommended for identified significant impacts.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE —

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	■	□	□	□
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	■	□	□	□
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	■	□	□	□

a. As discussed in *Section IV. Biological Resources*, the proposed project is located in a completely urban area with sparsely located street trees. The project would not have the potential to substantially reduce habitats, wildlife populations, communities, or restrict the range of endangered plants or animals. However, the project includes demolition of potentially historic structures. An analysis of potential project impacts on historical resources **will be included in the EIR** (refer to Item V, *Cultural Resources*).

b. Review of cumulative impacts for each issue area that has been identified as potentially significant **will be included in the EIR**.

c. The proposed project has the potential to create environmental effects that could significantly affect human health or safety (refer to Items III, *Air Quality*, and VII, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*). **These issues will be studied further in an EIR**.



References

- California Department of Finance, City Demographic Information, 2007. Accessed January 17, 2008. Available at: www.dof.ca.gov
- City of Long Beach, Dept. of Planning & Building, Zoning Maps. Accessed January 28, 2008. Available at: http://www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/zd/zoning_maps.asp.
- City of Long Beach General Plan, Land Use Element, 1990.
- City of Long Beach General Plan, Noise Element, 1975.
- City of Long Beach General Plan, Public Safety Element, 1975.
- City of Long Beach Municipal Code. Accessed January 28, 2008. Available at: <http://cms.longbeach.gov/cityclerk/lbmc/lbmcintro.htm>
- Federal Emergency Management Agency, FIRM Flood Maps, 2002. Accessed January 17, 2008. Available at: <http://msc.fema.gov>
- Long Beach Redevelopment Agency Website. Accessed January 28, 2008. Available at: <http://www.longbeach.gov/cd/redevelopment/default.asp>
- Long Beach Water Department Website. Accessed January 28, 2008. Available at: <http://www.lbwater.org/>.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Noise from Construction Equipment and Operations, Building Equipment, and Home Appliances, 1971.






Source: US Bureau of the Census TIGER 2000 data and USGS, 2002.

★ Project Location





Source: National Geographic TOPOI 2004 and Rincon Consultants, Inc., 2008.



Project Location

Figure 2-2

Notice of Preparation

TO: _____ FROM: Redevelopment Agency

_____ 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
_____ Long Beach, CA 90802

**Subject: Notice of Preparation of a
Draft Environmental Impact Report**

Project Title: North Village Center Redevelopment Project

Project Sponsor: Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach

The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach will be the Lead Agency for preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project. The proposed project is a mixed use “village center” on an approximately 6.3-acre site in the City of Long Beach. The project site encompasses two full city blocks on either side of Atlantic Avenue between South Street and 59th Street. The project proposal calls for construction of up to 180 units of multi-family housing in a mix of row houses, courtyard units and units built atop ground floor non-residential space. The project also includes up to 50,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial/retail space, a public library and community center totaling approximately 30,000 square feet, and approximately 600 off-street parking spaces in private garages, surface parking lots and an above-ground parking structure.

Residential and commercial components of the project would be constructed on both the east and west blocks. The proposed commercial/retail and institutional space would be oriented primarily towards Atlantic Avenue. The maximum building heights would be five stories on Atlantic Avenue and two stories on both Linden and Lime Avenues. The existing street configuration would remain unchanged. Hulett Street, which currently terminates mid-block on Linden Avenue at the site’s western border, would “continue” eastbound through the site as a pedestrian paseo.

Structures within the project would attain LEED Certification. The entire project would utilize “green” design strategies including stormwater management, use of natural light, recycling programs and energy efficient appliances.

The City of Long Beach invites your comments as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Some state and local agencies may need to use this EIR when considering your permit or other approval of certain aspects of the project.

Probable environmental effects in the issue areas of aesthetics (including shadows, light and glare), air quality, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, transportation/ traffic and utilities/service systems have been identified in the Initial Study and will be further analyzed in this EIR. Additional information related to the project description, location, and the anticipated environmental effects are included in the Initial Study. If the Initial Study is not attached to this Notice of Preparation, it is available for public review at the Development Services Department, City Hall, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach 90802, and is also available on the City's website at www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp

Scoping Meeting. The Redevelopment Agency, in its role as Lead Agency, will hold a public scoping meeting to provide an opportunity for the public and representatives of public agencies to address the scope of the Environmental Impact Report. The Scoping Meeting for the Environmental Impact Report for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project is scheduled for **Wednesday, March 5, at 6:30 p.m.** at the following location:

**Houghton Park Community Building
6301 Myrtle Avenue (between E. Harding and E. 64th Streets), Long Beach**




Thirty-Day Comment Period: Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. The Notice of Preparation/Initial Study comment period begins on February 21, 2008 and ends on March 21, 2008.

Please send your comments by regular mail, email or fax to:

**Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Development Services Department
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802**

**Fax: (562) 570-6068
Email: Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov**

Date: February 21, 2008

Signature 

Title Environmental Officer

Telephone (562) 570-6357

Form A

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

SCH # _____

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, PO Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 916/445-0613

Project Title: _____

Lead Agency: _____ Contact Person: _____

Mailing Address: _____ Phone: _____

City: _____ Zip: _____ County: _____

Project Location:

County: _____ City/Nearest Community: _____

Cross Streets: _____ Zip Code: _____ Total Acres: _____

Assessor's Parcel No. _____ Section: _____ Twp. _____ Range: _____ Base: _____

Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: _____ Waterways: _____

Airports: _____ Railways: _____ Schools: _____

Document Type:

- | | | | | | | |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| CEQA: | <input type="checkbox"/> NOP | <input type="checkbox"/> Supplement/Subsequent EIR | NEPA: | <input type="checkbox"/> NOI | Other: | <input type="checkbox"/> Joint Document |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Early Cons | (Prior SCH No.) _____ | | <input type="checkbox"/> EA | | <input type="checkbox"/> Final Document |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Neg Dec | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIS | | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Draft EIR | | | <input type="checkbox"/> FONSI | | |

Local Action Type:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Update | <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Rezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Annexation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment | <input type="checkbox"/> Master Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Prezone | <input type="checkbox"/> Redevelopment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Element | <input type="checkbox"/> Planned Unit Development | <input type="checkbox"/> Use Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Permit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Site Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Development Type:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residential: Units _____ Acres _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Facilities: Type _____ MGD _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Office: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commercial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Mining: Mineral _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial: Sq.ft. _____ Acres _____ Employees _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Power: Type _____ Watts _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Educational _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Waste Treatment: Type _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreational _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous Waste: Type _____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Funding (approx.): Federal \$ _____ State \$ _____ Total \$ _____

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

- | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetic/Visual | <input type="checkbox"/> Flood Plain/Flooding | <input type="checkbox"/> Schools/Universities | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Forest Land/Fire Hazard | <input type="checkbox"/> Septic Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Supply/Groundwater |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Geologic/Seismic | <input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Capacity | <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland/Riparian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Archeological/Historical | <input type="checkbox"/> Minerals | <input type="checkbox"/> Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Zone | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste | <input type="checkbox"/> Growth Inducing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Drainage/Absorption | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing Balance | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic/Hazardous | <input type="checkbox"/> Landuse |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economic/Jobs | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Traffic/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Cumulative Effects |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation/Parks | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Project Description:

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Form A, continued

KEY

- S** = Document sent by lead agency
- X** = Document sent by SCH
- ✓ = Suggested distribution

Resources Agency

- Boating & Waterways
- Coastal Commission
- Coastal Conservancy
- Colorado River Board
- Conservation
- Fish & Game
- Forestry & Fire Protection
- Office of Historic Preservation
- Parks & Recreation
- Reclamation Board
- S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission
- Water Resources (DWR)

Business, Transportation & Housing

- Aeronautics
- California Highway Patrol
- CALTRANS District # 7
- Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)
- Housing & Community Development

Food & Agriculture

Health & Welfare

Health Services _____

State & Consumer Services

- General Services
- OLA (Schools)

Environmental Protection Agency

- Air Resources Board
- California Waste Management Board
- SWRCB: Clean Water Grants
- SWRCB: Delta Unit
- SWRCB: Water Quality
- SWRCB: Water Rights
- Regional WQCB # Region 4 (Los Angeles Region)

Youth & Adult Corrections

Corrections

Independent Commissions & Offices


- Energy Commission
- Native American Heritage Commission
- Public Utilities Commission
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- State Lands Commission
- Tahoe Regional Planning Agency

Other _____

Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date February 21, 2008

Ending Date March 21, 2008

Signature 

Date 2/14/08

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: Rincon Consultants, Inc.

Address: 790 East Santa Clara Street

City/State/Zip: Ventura, CA 93003

Contact: Abe Leider

Phone: (805) 641-1000

Applicant: Same as Lead Agency

Address: _____

City/State/Zip: _____

Phone: (____) _____

For SCH Use Only:

Date Received at SCH _____

Date Review Starts _____

Date to Agencies _____

Date to SCH _____

Clearance Date _____

Notes:

CKA16 C



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER
GOVERNOR

CYNTHIA BRYANT
DIRECTOR

Notice of Preparation

February 20, 2008

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: North Village Center Redevelopment Project
SCH# 2008021087

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Angela Reynolds
Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Project Analyst, State Clearinghouse

Attachments
cc: Lead Agency

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2008021087
Project Title North Village Center Redevelopment Project
Lead Agency Long Beach Redevelopment Agency

Type **NOP** Notice of Preparation
Description Development of up to 180 units of multi-family housing, up to 50,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial/retail/restaurant space, public library and community center totaling approximately 30,000 square feet, and ~600 parking spaces in private garages, and above-grade parking structure and surface lots. Demolition of existing structures.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Angela Reynolds
Agency Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
Phone (562) 570-6357 **Fax**
email
Address 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
City Long Beach **State** CA **Zip** 90802

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Long Beach
Region
Cross Streets Atlantic Avenue/South Street
Parcel No. multiple: 7125-033-916;7125
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 710 and 91
Airports
Railways Union Pacific
Waterways Los Angeles River
Schools Hamilton Middle School
Land Use Vacant land, commercial buildings. Designated/zoned for commercial uses and multi-family residential

Project Issues Aesthetic/Visual; Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Wildlife; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Conservation; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Integrated Waste Management Board; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Loans and Grants; Department of Toxic Substances Control; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4

Date Received 02/20/2008 **Start of Review** 02/20/2008 **End of Review** 03/20/2008

<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Resources Agency</u> Nadell Gayou	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region 2 Jeff Drongesen	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission Ken Lewis	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 8 Dan Kopulsky	<input type="checkbox"/> Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCCB)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Resources Agency</u> Nadell Gayou	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region 3 Robert Floerke	<input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Bay Restoration Guangyu Wang	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 9 Gayle Rosander	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 1 Cathleen Hudson North Coast Region (1)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Dept. of Boating & Waterways</u> David Johnson	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region 4 Julie Vance	<input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission Marina Brand	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 10 Tom Dumas	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 2 Environmental Document Coordinator San Francisco Bay Region (2)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>California Coastal Commission</u> Elizabeth A. Fuchs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Fish & Game Region 5</u> Don Chadwick Habitat Conservation Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Cherry Jacques	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 11 Jacob Armstrong	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 3 Central Coast Region (3)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Colorado River Board</u> Gerald R. Zimmerman	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region 6 Gabrina Gatchel Habitat Conservation Program	<u>Business, Trans & Housing</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 12 Ryan P. Chamberlain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>CalEPA</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Dept. of Conservation</u> Sharon Howell	<input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region 6 I/M Gabrina Gatchel	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans - Division of Aeronautics Sandy Hesnard	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 4 Teresa Rodgers Los Angeles Region (4)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>California Energy Commission</u> Paul Richins	<input type="checkbox"/> Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans - Planning Terri Pencovic	<input type="checkbox"/> Airport Projects Jim Lerner	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 5S Central Valley Region (5)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Cal Fire</u> Allen Robertson	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of Fish & Game M George Isaac Marine Region	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>California Highway Patrol</u> Shirley Kelly Office of Special Projects	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation Projects Ravi Ramalingam	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 5F Central Valley Region (5)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Office of Historic Preservation</u> Wayne Donaldson	<u>Other Departments</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development Lisa Nichols Housing Policy Division	<input type="checkbox"/> Industrial Projects Mike Tollstrup	<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board Sue O'Leary
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Dept of Parks & Recreation</u> Environmental Stewardship Section	<input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture Steve Shaffer Dept. of Food and Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> State Water Resources Control Board Regional Programs Unit Division of Financial Assistance	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 6 Lahontan Region (6)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Central Valley Flood Protection Board</u> Mark Herald	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of General Services Public School Construction	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 1 Rex Jackman	<input type="checkbox"/> State Water Resources Control Board Student Intern, 401 Water Quality Certification Unit Division of Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 5R Central Valley Region (5) Redding Branch Office
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm.</u> Steve McAdam	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of General Services Environmental Services Section	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 2 Marcelino Gonzalez	<input type="checkbox"/> State Water Resources Control Board Steven Herrera Division of Water Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 6V Lahontan Region (6) Victorville Branch Office
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Dept. of Water Resources</u> Resources Agency Nadell Gayou	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of Health/Drinking Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 3 Jeff Pulverman	<input type="checkbox"/> Dept. of Toxic Substances Control CEQA Tracking Center	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 7 Colorado River Basin Region (7)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Conservancy</u>	<u>Independent Commissions, Boards</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 4 Tim Sable	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Pesticide Regulation	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 8 Santa Ana Region (8)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Fish and Game</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission Debby Eddy	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 5 David Murray	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> RWQCB 9 San Diego Region (9)
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Dept. of Fish & Game</u> Scott Flint Environmental Services Division	<input type="checkbox"/> Office of Emergency Services Dennis Castrillo	<input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans, District 6 Moses Stites		
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Fish & Game Region 1</u> Donald Koch	<input type="checkbox"/> Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Caltrans, District 7</u> Vin Kumar		
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Fish & Game Region 1E</u> Laurie Hamsberger	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Native American Heritage Comm.</u> Debbie Treadway			

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 653-6251
Fax (916) 657-5390
www.nahc.ca.gov
ds_nahc@pacbell.net



February 22, 2008

Ms. Angela Reynolds

Long Beach Redevelopment Agency

333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: SCH# 2008021087: CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP) draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project: Long Beach; Los Angeles County, California

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. The Native American Heritage Commission is the state agency designated for the protection of California's Native American cultural resources. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR per the California Code of Regulations § 15064.5(b)(c) (CEQA Guidelines). In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE),' and if so, to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess the project-related impacts on historical resources, the Commission recommends the following action:

- √ Contact the appropriate California Historic Resources Information Center (CHRIS). Contact information for the 'Information Center' nearest you is available from the State Office of Historic Preservation in Sacramento (916/653-7278). The record search will determine:
 - If a part or the entire (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded in or adjacent to the APE.
 - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- √ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.
- √ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) for:
 - * A Sacred Lands File (SLF) search of the project area and information on tribal contacts in the project vicinity who may have information on cultural resources in or near the APE. Please provide us site identification as follows: USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle citation with name, township, range and section. This will assist us with the SLF.
 - Also, we recommend that you contact the Native American contacts on the attached list to get their input on the effect of potential project (e.g. APE) impact. In many cases a culturally-affiliated Native American tribe or person will be the only source of information about the existence of a cultural resource.
- √ Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.
 - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5 (f) of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
 - Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.


√ Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains or unmarked cemeteries in their mitigations plans.

- CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(d) requires the lead agency to work with the Native Americans identified by this Commission if the Initial Study identifies the presence or likely presence of Native American human remains within the APE. CEQA Guidelines provide for agreements with Native American groups, identified by the NAHE, to ensure the appropriate and dignified treatment of Native American human remains and any associated grave goods.
- Health and Safety Code §7050.5, Public Resources Code §5097.98 and CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(d) mandate procedures to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

√ Lead agencies should consider avoidance, as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15370 when significant cultural resources are discovered during the course of project planning or execution.

Please feel free to contact me at (916) 653-6251 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Dave Singleton", is written over a large, stylized, handwritten "S" that spans across the signature and extends upwards.

Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Attachment: Native American Contact List.

Cc: State Clearinghouse

**Native American Contacts
Los Angeles County
February 22, 2008**

LA City/County Native American Indian Comm
Ron Andrade, Director
3175 West 6th Street, Rm. 403
Los Angeles , CA 90020
(213) 351-5324
(213) 386-3995 FAX

Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council
Robert Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural Resources
5450 Slauson, Ave, Suite 151 PMB Gabrielino Tongva
Culver City , CA 90230
gtongva@verizon.net
562-761-6417 - voice
562-925-7989 - fax

Ti'At Society
Cindi Alvitre
6515 E. Seaside Walk, #C Gabrielino
Long Beach , CA 90803
calvitre@yahoo.com
(714) 504-2468 Cell

Gabrieleno/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
PO Box 693 Gabrielino Tongva
San Gabriel , CA 91778
ChiefRBwife@aol.com
(626) 286-1632
(626) 286-1758 - Home
(626) 286-1262 Fax

Gabrielino/Tongva Council / Gabrielino Tongva Nation
Sam Dunlap, Tribal Secretary
761 Terminal Street; Bldg 1, 2nd floor Gabrielino Tongva
Los Angeles , CA 90021
office @tongvatribes.net
(213) 489-5001 - Officer
(909) 262-9351 - cell
(213) 489-5002 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH#2008021087; CEQA Notice of Preparation (NOP); draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project; Long Beach Redevelopment Agency; Los Angeles County, California.



Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental Protection



Department of Toxic Substances Control

Maureen F. Gorsen, Director
5796 Corporate Avenue
Cypress, California 90630



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

March 19, 2008

Ms. Angela Reynolds
Environmental Officer
Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 3rd Floor
Long Beach, California 90802

NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE NORTH VILLAGE CENTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, LONG BEACH, LOS ANGELES COUNTY (SCH#2008021087)

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has received your submitted Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the above-mentioned project. The following project description is stated in your document: "Development of up to 180 units of multi-family housing, up to 50,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving commercial/retail/restaurant space, public library and community center totaling approximately 30,000 square feet, and ~600 parking spaces in private garages, and above-grade parking structure and surface lots. Demolition of existing structures." DTSC has the following comments; please address if applicable.

- 1) The EIR should identify the current or historic uses at the project site that may have resulted in a release of hazardous wastes/substances, and any known or potentially contaminated sites within the proposed Project area. For all identified sites, the EIR should evaluate whether conditions at the site may pose a threat to human health or the environment. Following are the databases of some of the pertinent regulatory agencies:
 - National Priorities List (NPL): A list maintained by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA).
 - Envirostor: A Database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, accessible through DTSC's website (see below).
 - Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS): A database of RCRA facilities that is maintained by U.S. EPA.

- Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS): A database of CERCLA sites that is maintained by U.S.EPA.
 - Solid Waste Information System (SWIS): A database provided by the California Integrated Waste Management Board which consists of both open as well as closed and inactive solid waste disposal facilities and transfer stations.
 - Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) / Spills, Leaks, Investigations and Cleanups (SLIC): A list that is maintained by Regional Water Quality Control Boards.
 - Local Counties and Cities maintain lists for hazardous substances cleanup sites and leaking underground storage tanks.
 - The United States Army Corps of Engineers, 911 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, 90017, (213) 452-3908, maintains a list of Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS).
- 2) The EIR should identify the mechanism to initiate any required investigation and/or remediation for any site that may be contaminated, and the government agency to provide appropriate regulatory oversight. If necessary, DTSC would require an oversight agreement in order to review such documents. Please see comment No. 14 below for more information.
 - 3) All environmental investigations, sampling and/or remediation for the site should be conducted under a Workplan approved and overseen by a regulatory agency that has jurisdiction to oversee hazardous substance cleanup. The findings of any investigations, including any Phase I or II Environmental Site Assessment Investigations should be summarized in the document. All sampling results in which hazardous substances were found should be clearly summarized in a table.
 - 4) Proper investigation, sampling and remedial actions overseen by the respective regulatory agencies, if necessary, should be conducted at the site prior to the new development or any construction. All closure, certification or remediation approval reports by these agencies should be included in the EIR.
 - 5) If any property adjacent to the project site is contaminated with hazardous chemicals, and if the proposed project is within 2,000 feet from a contaminated site, then the proposed development may fall within the "Border Zone of a Contaminated Property." Appropriate precautions should be taken prior to construction if the proposed project is within a Border Zone Property.

- 6) If buildings or other structures, asphalt or concrete-paved surface areas are being planned to be demolished, an investigation should be conducted for the presence of other related hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints or products, mercury, and asbestos containing materials (ACMs). If other hazardous chemicals, lead-based paints or products, mercury or ACMs are identified, proper precautions should be taken during demolition activities. Additionally, the contaminants should be remediated in compliance with California environmental regulations and policies.
- 7) Project construction may require soil excavation or filling in certain areas. Sampling may be required. If soil is contaminated, it must be properly disposed and not simply placed in another location onsite. Land Disposal Restrictions (LDRs) may be applicable to such soils. Also, if the project proposes to import soil to backfill the areas excavated, sampling should be conducted to ensure that the imported soil is free of contamination.
- 8) Human health and the environment of sensitive receptors should be protected during the construction or demolition activities. If it is found necessary, a study of the site and a health risk assessment overseen and approved by the appropriate government agency and a qualified health risk assessor should be conducted to determine if there are, have been, or will be, any releases of hazardous materials that may pose a risk to human health or the environment.
- 9) If it is determined that hazardous wastes are, or will be, generated by the proposed operations, the wastes must be managed in accordance with the California Hazardous Waste Control Law (California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.5) and the Hazardous Waste Control Regulations (California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Division 4.5). If it is determined that hazardous wastes will be generated, the facility should also obtain a United States Environmental Protection Agency Identification Number by contacting (800) 618-6942.
- 10) Certain hazardous waste treatment processes or hazardous materials, handling, storage or uses may require authorization from the local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). Information about the requirement for authorization can be obtained by contacting your local CUPA.
- 11) If the project plans include discharging wastewater to a storm drain, you may be required to obtain an NPDES permit from the overseeing Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB).
- 12) If during construction/demolition of the project, the soil and/or groundwater contamination is suspected, construction/demolition in the area should cease and appropriate health and safety procedures should be implemented.

Ms. Angela Reynolds
March 19, 2008
Page 4

- 13) If the site was used for agricultural, livestock or related activities, onsite soils and groundwater might contain pesticides, agricultural chemical, organic waste or other related residue. Proper investigation, and remedial actions, if necessary, should be conducted under the oversight of and approved by a government agency at the site prior to construction of the project.
- 14) EnviroStor is a database primarily used by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and is accessible through DTSC's website. DTSC can provide guidance for cleanup oversight through an Environmental Oversight Agreement (EOA) for government agencies, or a Voluntary Cleanup Agreement (VCA) for private parties. For additional information on the EOA or VCA, please see www.dtsc.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/Brownfields, or contact Maryam Tasnif-Abbasi, DTSC's Voluntary Cleanup Coordinator, at (714) 484-5489.
- 15) In future CEQA documents please provide the contact person's email address. Also, if the project title changes, please provide historical project title(s).

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Tong Qiao, Project Manager, at tqiao@dtsc.ca.gov or by phone at (714) 484-5470.

Sincerely,



Greg Holmes
Unit Chief
Southern California Cleanup Operations Branch - Cypress Office

cc: Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 3044
Sacramento, California 95812-3044
state.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov.

CEQA Tracking Center
Department of Toxic Substances Control
Office of Environmental Planning and Analysis
1001 I Street, 22nd Floor, M.S. 22-2
Sacramento, California 95814
gmoskat@dtsc.ca.gov

CEQA#2082

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 7, REGIONAL PLANNING

IGR/CEQA BRANCH

100 MAIN STREET, MS # 16

LOS ANGELES, CA 90012-3606

PHONE: (213) 897-3747

FAX: (213) 897-1337

*Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!*

IGR/CEQA No. 080238AL, NOP
North Village Center Redevelopment Project
Vic. LA-710/PM 12.01, LA-91/PM R12.09
SCH # 2008021087

March 6, 2008

Ms. Angela Reynolds
Long Beach Redevelopment Agency
333 W. Ocean Blvd., 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the above referenced project. The proposed project is to demolish existing structures, and to develop up to 180 units of multi-family housing, up to 50,000 square feet of commercial/retail/restaurant space, public library, and community center.

To assist us in our efforts to evaluate the impacts of this project on State transportation facilities, a traffic study in advance of the DEIR should be prepared. We wish to refer the project's traffic consultant to our traffic study guide website:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/operationalsystems/reports/tisguide.pdf>

and we list here some elements of what we generally are expecting in the traffic study:

1. Presentations of assumptions and methods used to develop trip generation, trip distribution, choice of travel mode, and assignments of trips to State Route 710 and 91.
2. Consistency of project travel modeling with other regional and local modeling forecasts and with travel data. The IGR/CEQA office may use indices to check results. Differences or inconsistencies must be thoroughly explained.
3. Analysis of ADT, AM and PM peak-hour volumes for both the existing and future conditions in the affected area. This should include freeways, interchanges, and intersections, and all HOV facilities. Interchange Level of Service should be specified (HCM2000 method requested). Future conditions would include build-out of all projects (see next item) and any plan-horizon years.

4. Inclusion of all appropriate traffic volumes. Analysis should include traffic from the project, cumulative traffic generated from all specific approved developments in the area, and traffic growth other than from the project and developments. That is, include: existing + project + other projects + other growth.
5. Discussion of mitigation measures appropriate to alleviate anticipated traffic impacts. These mitigation discussions should include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - Description of Transportation Infrastructure Improvements
 - **Financial Costs, Funding Sources and Financing**
 - Sequence and Scheduling Considerations
 - Implementation Responsibilities, Controls, and Monitoring

We request that traffic mitigation involving Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures are thoroughly justified. Utilization of transit lines and vehicles, and of all facilities, should be realistically estimated. Improvements involving dedication of land or physical construction may be favorably considered.

6. Specification of developer's percent share of the cost, as well as a plan of realistic mitigation measures under the control of the developer. The following ratio should be estimated: additional traffic volume due to project implementation is divided by the total increase in the traffic volume (see Appendix "B" of the Guidelines). That ratio would be the project equitable share responsibility.

We note for purposes of determining project share of costs, the number of trips from the project on each traveling segment or element is estimated in the context of forecasted traffic volumes which include build-out of all approved and not yet approved projects, and other sources of growth. Analytical methods such as select-zone travel forecast modeling might be used.

The Department as commenting agency under CEQA has jurisdiction superceding that of MTA in identifying the freeway analysis needed for this project. Caltrans is responsible for obtaining measures that will off-set project vehicle trip generation that worsens Caltrans facilities and hence, it does not necessarily adhere to the CMP guide of 150 or more vehicle trips added before freeway analysis is needed. MTA's Congestion Management Program in acknowledging the Department's role, stipulates that Caltrans must be consulted to identify specific locations to be analyzed on the State Highway System. Therefore State Route(s) mentioned in item #1 and its facilities must be analyzed per the Department's Traffic Impact Study Guidelines.

We look forward to reviewing the traffic study. We expect to receive a copy from the State Clearinghouse when the DEIR is completed. However, to expedite the review process, and clarify any misunderstandings, you may send a copy in advance to the undersigned.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (213) 897-6696 or Alan Lin the project coordinator at (213) 897-8391 and refer to IGR/CEQA No. 080238AL.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Elmer Alvarez". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "E".

ELMER ALVAREZ
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse



South Coast Air Quality Management District

21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

February 29, 2008

Ms. Angela Reynolds
Environmental Officer
Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Blvd., 3rd Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The SCAQMD's comments are recommendations regarding the analysis of potential air quality impacts from the proposed project that should be included in the draft environmental impact report (EIR). Please send the SCAQMD a copy of the Draft EIR upon its completion. **In addition, please send with the draft EIR all appendices or technical documents related to the air quality analysis and electronic versions of all air quality modeling and health risk assessment files. Without all files and supporting air quality documentation, the SCAQMD will be unable to complete its review of the air quality analysis in a timely manner. Any delays in providing all supporting air quality documentation will require additional time for review beyond the end of the comment period.**

Air Quality Analysis

The SCAQMD adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook in 1993 to assist other public agencies with the preparation of air quality analyses. The SCAQMD recommends that the Lead Agency use this Handbook as guidance when preparing its air quality analysis. Copies of the Handbook are available from the SCAQMD's Subscription Services Department by calling (909) 396-3720. Alternatively, the lead agency may wish to consider using the California Air Resources Board (CARB) approved URBEMIS 2007 Model. This model is available on the SCAQMD Website at: www.urbemis.com.

The Lead Agency should identify any potential adverse air quality impacts that could occur from all phases of the project and all air pollutant sources related to the project. Air quality impacts from both construction (including demolition, if any) and operations should be calculated. Construction-related air quality impacts typically include, but are not limited to, emissions from the use of heavy-duty equipment from grading, earth-loading/unloading, paving, architectural coatings, off-road mobile sources (e.g., heavy-duty construction equipment) and on-road mobile sources (e.g., construction worker vehicle trips, material transport trips). Operation-related air quality impacts may include, but are not limited to, emissions from stationary sources (e.g., boilers), area sources (e.g., solvents and coatings), and vehicular trips (e.g., on- and off-road tailpipe emissions and entrained dust). Air quality impacts from indirect sources, that is, sources that generate or attract vehicular trips should be included in the analysis.

The SCAQMD has developed a methodology for calculating PM_{2.5} emissions from construction and operational activities and processes. In connection with developing PM_{2.5} calculation methodologies, the SCAQMD has also developed both regional and localized significance thresholds. The SCAQMD requests that the lead agency quantify PM_{2.5} emissions and compare the results to the recommended PM_{2.5} significance thresholds. Guidance for calculating PM_{2.5} emissions and PM_{2.5} significance thresholds can be found at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/PM2_5/PM2_5.html.

In addition to analyzing regional air quality impacts the SCAQMD recommends calculating localized air quality impacts and comparing the results to localized significance thresholds (LSTs). LST's can be used in addition to the recommended regional significance thresholds as a second indication of air quality impacts when preparing a CEQA document. Therefore, when preparing the air quality analysis for the proposed project, it is recommended that the lead agency perform a localized significance analysis by either using the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD or performing dispersion modeling as necessary. Guidance for performing a localized air quality analysis can be found at <http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/LST/LST.html>.

It is recommended that lead agencies for projects generating or attracting vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles, perform a mobile source health risk assessment. Guidance for performing a mobile source health risk assessment ("Health Risk Assessment Guidance for Analyzing Cancer Risk from Mobile Source Diesel Idling Emissions for CEQA Air Quality Analysis") can be found on the SCAQMD's CEQA web pages at the following internet address: http://www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mobile_toxic/mobile_toxic.html. An analysis of all toxic air contaminant impacts due to the decommissioning or use of equipment potentially generating such air pollutants should also be included.

Mitigation Measures

In the event that the project generates significant adverse air quality impacts, CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized during project construction and operation to minimize or eliminate significant adverse air quality impacts. To assist the Lead Agency with identifying possible mitigation measures for the project, please refer to Chapter 11 of the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook for sample air quality mitigation measures. Additional mitigation measures can be found on the SCAQMD's CEQA web pages at the following internet address: www.aqmd.gov/ceqa/handbook/mitigation/MM_intro.html Additionally, SCAQMD's Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust, and the Implementation Handbook contain numerous measures for controlling construction-related emissions that should be considered for use as CEQA mitigation if not otherwise required. Other measures to reduce air quality impacts from land use projects can be found in the SCAQMD's Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning. This document can be found at the following internet address: <http://www.aqmd.gov/prdas/aqguide/aqguide.html>. In addition, guidance on siting incompatible land uses can be found in the California Air Resources Board's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective, which can be found at the following internet address: <http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/handbook.pdf>. Pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines §15126.4 (a)(1)(D), any impacts resulting from mitigation measures must also be discussed.

Data Sources

SCAQMD rules and relevant air quality reports and data are available by calling the SCAQMD's Public Information Center at (909) 396-2039. Much of the information available through the Public Information Center is also available via the SCAQMD's World Wide Web Homepage (<http://www.aqmd.gov>).

The SCAQMD is willing to work with the Lead Agency to ensure that project-related emissions are accurately identified, categorized, and evaluated. Please call Charles Blankson, Ph.D., Air Quality Specialist, CEQA Section, at (909) 396-3304 if you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,



Steve Smith, Ph.D.

Program Supervisor, CEQA Section

Planning, Rule Development and Area Sources

SS:CB:AK

LAC080226-02AK

Control Number



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
<http://dpw.lacounty.gov>

DEAN D. EFSTATHIOU, Acting Director

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

March 24, 2008

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO FILE: LD-0

Ms. Angela Reynolds
Environmental Officer
Development Services Department
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR A
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT (DEIR) REPORT
NORTH VILLAGE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT
CITY OF LONG BEACH**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the notice of preparation for the above DEIR. We offer the following comments for your consideration.

Drainage

In order to adequately assess/address the drainage and water quality concerns, a Drainage Concept/Hydrology Report is suggested and should be submitted for review and approval by the County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works.

As stated in the Notice of Preparation, There is a possibility of increased storm water run-off due to the increase in impervious area. This increase could be directed toward the County-maintained storm drain located on the southeast end of the project and needs to be analyzed to determine if the storm drain has capacity. This can best be done through a Drainage Concept/Hydrology Report.

With the new developments could come a change in the drainage patterns. This change could cause an increase in flow to the County-maintained storm drain. Analysis is required for any increase to determine if the storm drain has capacity. This can best be done through a Drainage Concept/Hydrology Report.

The proposed Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan should also be submitted as part of the Drainage Concept/Hydrology Report.

Ms. Angela Reynolds
March 24, 2008
Page 2

When approved, the results of the Drainage Concept/Hydrology Report and the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan should be included in the Environmental Impact Report. Additionally, the drainage concept should address the changes in drainage including, but not limited to, increases in runoff, any change in drainage patterns, and the capacity of existing storm drain facilities.

Solid Waste

Solid waste generated in Los Angeles County currently exceeds the available permitted daily landfill capacity. The construction and demolition of the proposed project and the operation over the life of the project will increase the generation of solid waste and negatively impact the solid waste management infrastructure. Therefore, the proposed environmental document should identify what measures will be implemented to mitigate the impact. Mitigation measures may include the recycling of construction and demolition debris and the development of infrastructure in the project to facilitate recycling.

The California Solid Waste Reuse and Recycling Access Act of 1991, as amended, requires each development project to provide an adequate storage area for collection and removal of recyclable materials. The environmental document should include/discuss standards to provide adequate recyclable storage areas for collection/storage of recyclable and green waste materials for this project.

Hazardous Waste

The existing Hazardous Waste Management infrastructure in this County is inadequate to handle the hazardous waste currently being generated. The proposed project may generate household hazardous waste, which could adversely impact existing Hazardous Waste Management infrastructure. This issue should be addressed and mitigation measures provided. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, providing new homeowners/tenants with educational materials on the proper management and disposal of household hazardous waste. The project proponent may contact Public Works for available educational materials by calling 1(888) CLEAN LA.

When it is ready, please send three copies of the DEIR to:

Mr. Conal McNamara, AICP
County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Land Development Division
P.O. Box 1460
Alhambra, CA 91802-1460

Ms. Angela Reynolds
March 20, 2008
Page 3

If the DEIR is available electronically or on-line, please forward it or the link to Mr. McNamara at cmcnamara@dpw.lacounty.gov.

If you have any questions, please contact Mr. McNamara at (626) 458-4948.

Very truly yours,

DEAN D. EFSTATHIOU
Acting Director of Public Works



DENNIS HUNTER
Assistant Deputy Director
Land Development Division

CDM:la
P:\ldpub\CEQA\CDMLong Beach - North Village Center Redevelopment Project NOP.doc



BUSINESS DEPARTMENT - Business Services
Facilities Development & Planning Branch
Donald K. Allen Building Services Facility
2425 Webster Ave., Long Beach, CA 90810
(562) 997-7550 Fax (562) 595-8644

March 18, 2008

Via Fax, Email and U.S. Mail

Craig Chalfant
Department of Planning and Building
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th floor
Long Beach, California, 90802

RE: Comments on Proposed North Village Center Redevelopment Project, Notice of Preparation/Initial Study, Long Beach, California

Dear Mr. Craig Chalfant,

The Long Beach Unified School District (District), appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Initial Study (IS) prepared by the City of Long Beach for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project (Project). The NOP/IS describes the Project and the preliminary analysis of potential impacts to the environment, including the identification of impacts that will be addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

We trust that the City will prepare a DEIR that includes a comprehensive evaluation of the Project and the potential impacts on the environment, including various topical studies. The District is particularly interested in seeing that the analyses in the DEIR adequately address any potential impacts that the Project may have on school facilities. The District understands that the proposed Project will include 180 multi-family residential dwelling units and up to 50,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, a library and a community center totaling 30,000 square feet, in addition to 600 parking spaces in private garages, surface parking and in an above-ground parking structure. As you know, the District is legally responsible for providing high quality public education to the K-12 students generated by the Project. In an effort to assist you in your analysis, the following two tables provide the current generation rate per the District's 2007 Fee Justification Study, and the current enrollment and capacity for the schools that would service the project.

LBUSD Student Generation Factors		
School Level	Single family Detached Units	Multi family Attached Units
Elementary	0.2528	0.1956
Middle	0.14	0.1018
High School	0.1937	0.1206
Total	0.5865	0.418

Long Beach USD School Capacity and Enrollment				
School Name	Address	Grade Level	Capacity	Enrollment as of Feb 2008
Bret Harte Elementary	1671 E. Phillips St. Long Beach, CA 90805	K-5	1275	1031
Colin Powell Academy	150 Victoria St. Long Beach, CA 90805	K-8	1455	1248
Charles Lindbergh Middle School	1022 E. Market St. Long Beach, CA 90805	6-8	1668	1010
David Starr Jordan Freshman Academy	171 Bort St. Long Beach, CA 90805	9	1170	983
David Starr Jordan High School	6500 Atlantic Long Beach, CA 90805	9-12	4038	3040
Note: Capacity number is an estimate only and may be affected by site utilization				

Although the capacity and enrollment information provided in the table may seem to reflect that the District has capacity at these sites, it should be noted that many site utilization variables are **not** accounted for in this number. For example, many sites have special education programs using classroom space, conference periods at the upper grade levels, and childcare and Headstart programs that use classroom space which affects the available capacity at the site. Therefore, the capacity number listed for these sites is only an estimate. In addition, many schools in the District have been feeling the affect of multi-track schools converting to a more traditional schedule of one track, meaning all the students are on the campus at the same time, and the District has off loaded some of these students to other schools that have space available. Also, in the current 2007/08 school year, the District has seen a slight increase in students at the elementary level, whereas the trend in previous years was a decline in enrollment at this level.

From the District's perspective, the DEIR can best address the impacts of the Project on school facilities by including a detailed and thorough discussion of the number of potential students generated by the Project, what type and how many school facilities these students would require, and how such facilities may be funded by the developer.

Once again, we thank the City of Long Beach for the opportunity to comment on the North Village Center Redevelopment Project NOP. Please place the District on the distribution list for the DEIR as well as all other public meetings for this project. We look forward to reviewing the DEIR and trust that our participation in the environmental review process will help ensure that potential impacts will be addressed adequately.

If you have any questions regarding the District's comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at (562) 997-7550.

Sincerely,



Carri M. Matsumoto
Executive Director, Facilities Development & Planning

CM:sa

Cc: Chris Steinhauser, LBUSD Superintendent of Schools
Kim Stallings, LBUSD Chief Business and Financial Officer
Karl Rodenbaugh, The Planning Center
Facilities Branch File



March 20, 2008

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Development Services Department
333. W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

Southern California Edison (SCE) appreciates the opportunity to review and provide comment on the Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project. The Notice of Preparation describes the proposed project as a redevelopment project on two full city blocks on both sides of Atlantic Avenue between South Street and 59th Street. The project will allow for up to 180 units of multi-family in the form of row houses, courtyard units and units above ground floor non-residential uses. The project will also include 50,000 square feet of commercial and a 30,000 square foot community center/public library area. Six hundred new parking spaces will be provided in private garages, on surface parking lots and in an above-ground parking structure.

SCE's comments regarding the proposed project address electric service provision potential impacts to existing SCE facilities and the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) process for implementing the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for electrical infrastructure projects under their jurisdiction. Our comments are provided below under the following headings: Electric Service Provision; Impacts to SCE Facilities, and CPUC CEQA Requirements.

Electric Service Provision

SCE is the provider of electricity for this project. This letter is to advise the City of Long Beach and the project developer that the electrical loads of the project have been determined to be within the parameters of the projected load growth which SCE is planning to meet in this area.

SCE undertakes expansion and/or modification of its electric systems and infrastructure to serve the load growth of existing customers and new projects. Since SCE's electrical system is provided by a network of facilities (SCE's electrical distribution, transmission, and generation systems), SCE appreciates your notifying us of these development plans in order to assist us in determining the future electrical needs of this area.

If the project is within the projected load growth for this area, SCE is basically stating that the total system demand is expected to continue to increase annually; however, excluding any unforeseen problems, SCE's plans for new distribution resources indicate that our ability to serve all customers' loads within this area are in accordance with SCE's Design Standards, rules and tariffs, and will be adequate for the next ten years. SCE completes all work in accordance with the rules and tariffs as authorized by the CPUC and other governing entities. Any cumulative impacts related to electric service would be addressed through this process.

Please note the developer will be responsible for the costs of any new distribution and/or line extension work, per SCE's CPUC-approved tariff Rules 15 and/or 16, and of any relocation of facilities required to accommodate the distribution line and/or service extensions required by SCE to serve the project. In addition, it is essential the developer review and/or discuss with SCE what measures can be taken to assure optimal conservation measures within this project's boundaries that will contribute to the overall energy savings goals of SCE and California.

Impacts to Existing SCE Facilities

In the event the project impacts SCE facilities or its land related rights, please forward five (5) sets of plans depicting SCE's facilities and associated land rights to the following location:

Real Estate Operations
Southern California Edison Company
14799 Chestnut Street, Westminster, CA 92683

CPUC CEQA Requirements

If development plans result in the need to build new or relocate existing SCE electrical facilities that operate at or above 50 kV, the SCE construction may have environmental consequences subject to CEQA provisions, as implemented by the CPUC (acting as the Lead Agency). If those environmental consequences are identified and addressed by the local agency in the CEQA process for the larger project, SCE may not be required to pursue a later, separate, mandatory CEQA review through the CPUC's General Order 131-D (GO 131-D) Permit to Construct process. If the SCE facilities are not adequately addressed in the Draft EIR and the new facilities could result in significant environmental impacts, the required additional CEQA review SCE would otherwise have to do with the CPUC could delay approval and construction of the SCE power line and substation portion of the project. If this project requires the construction of new or the

relocation of existing electrical facilities operating at or above 50 kV, we strongly recommend including the required facilities in the scope of the Draft EIR for this project.

SCE appreciates the opportunity to assist you in the preparation of the Draft EIR for the North Village Center Redevelopment Project and look forward to reviewing the Draft EIR upon its completion. If you have any questions or need assistance, please call me at (562) 981-8215.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Constance Turner". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Constance Turner
Region Manager
Southern California Edison Company


Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB

To "Fran Grable" <FGrable@prodigy.net>

cc Janet Surber/CH/CLB@CLB, Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB,
Lee Mayfield/CH/CLB@CLB

03/03/2008 10:26 AM

bcc

Subject Re: REDEVELOPMENT OF LIME AVENUE - 58TH TO 59TH


Thank you for your comments. They will be taken into consideration in the Environmental Impact Report

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service
"Fran Grable" <FGrable@prodigy.net>



"Fran Grable"
<FGrable@prodigy.net>

03/02/2008 04:37 PM

To "angela reynolds" <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>

cc <Janet_Surber@longbeach.gov>

Subject REDEVELOPMENT OF LIME AVENUE - 58TH TO 59TH

I WAS SO DISAPPOINTED WHEN I REALIZED YOUR AGENCY TORE DOWN PERFECTLY GOOD REVENUE PRODUCING PROPERTIES AND NOW ARE CONSIDERING BUILDING SOME LIVING SPACE AGAIN.

WE WERE LED TO BELIEVE THAT THE ORIGINAL IDEA WAS FOR BUSINESSES ALONG ATLANTIC AVENUE FROM 58TH TO 59TH, AND A LIBRARY PLUS A RECREATION CENTER WAS TO BE ON THE WEST SIDE OF LIME AVENUE BETWEEN 58TH AND 59TH.

IT IS SAD TO SEE SUCH THINGS LIKE THIS OCCUR AND BRING ABOUT USE OF FUNDS THAT COULD BE USED FOR SOME OTHER "GOOD" PURPOSE. DUE TO MY DISABILITY I AM UNABLE TO ATTEND THE MEETING, BUT THERE ARE OTHER PEOPLE ON MY BLOCK WHO WERE EXTREMELY DISAPPOINTED REGARDING THIS TURN OF EVENTS.

I OWN A PROPERTY AT 5826 LIME AVENUE AND A PROPERTY AT 5846 LIME AVENUE, SO AM VERY INTERESTED IN WHAT YOU INTEND TO DO THAT WILL DIRECTLY AFFECT ME, AS WELL AS MY LIVING ATMOSPHERE.

I WILL APPRECIATE BEING APPRISED OF ANY "POTENTIALLY" POSITIVE DECISION ON THE PART OF THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY.

FRANCES E. GRABLE

Page #	Topic	Comment
3	Description of Project	Building a Village Center, not a highrise downtown; RFP requirements Initial response from developer; Building heights
7	Aesthetics	Shadow effects of tall buildings; effects of lighting and glare
8-9	Air Quality	Buildings may contain asbestos including historically significant; Vehicles would be primary source of long term air problems
10	Cultural Resources	Identified as potentially containing asbestos, lead based paints because of age of structures
14	Hydrology and Water Quality	Use of Roof Gardens necessary to provide open space; If overcrowding results in higher crime, we need to provide as much open space as possible as a deterrent of crime and enhancement of quality of life.
16	Land Use and Planning	We do not need 4 and 5 story buildings to provide the requested number of units.
18	Noise	It is understandable that current noise levels will increase. However, noise levels need to be monitored and ordinance enforced
18	Population	This is a village center – not a highrise downtown; 24 units per acre only
19	Recreation	Addition of Roof Gardens will lessen the demand for recreation space.
20	Transportation	Impact of increased traffic to and from site and its effect of air quality, services, etc.
23	Mandatory Findings	Sparsely located street trees; Adequate Landscaping mandatory to whole project along all streets, on all residential lots.
	Conclusion	Build according to the RFP; hold developer to initial response; demand a well designed project; get on with it!

Linden @ Osgood



LINDEN @ OSGOOD
South

LINDEN @ 59th NORTH



Abe Leider

From: Craig Chalfant [Craig_Chalfant@longbeach.gov]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:58 AM
To: Abe Leider
Cc: Lee Mayfield; Aldo Schindler
Subject: Fw: NOP Comment on North Village Center Redevelopment Project

FYI

Craig Chalfant
Comprehensive Planning Division
Long Beach Development Services
(562) 570-6368
craig_chalfant@longbeach.gov

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CD/CLB on 03/24/2008 01:22 PM -----

adrian morales <kasatongva@verizon.net>

To Angela_Reynolds@longbeach.gov

cc

03/24/2008 12:46 PM

Subject North Village Center Redevelopment Project

On behalf of the Gabrieleno / Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, this letters intent is to respond formally to the North Village Center Redevelopment Projects Notice of Preparation / Initial Study Process.

The highly significant Traditional Cultural Properties of Haungna and Puvungna may be impacted by the undertaking of this project. Both sites hold highly sacred religious values to Gabrieleno / Tongva descendants. Although the site boundaries of both properties are uncertain, the project excavations may disturb any human remains, and cultural resources of significance interred outside of formal cemeteries or properties.

At this point in the CEQA process, being the historical community tribe of the Los Angeles basin, and the direct lineal descendants to the Native American ancestors of both Traditional Cultural Properties, the San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians is requesting that additional mitigation measures should be incorporated in the Notice of Preparation / Initial Study process, also the city of Long Beach continues formal consultation with our tribe in regards to the North Village Center Redevelopment Project.

Sincerely,
Adrian Morales
Director of Cultural Resource Management
Gabrieleno / Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
Contact (626) 203 - 6247

Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB

To Craig Chalfant/CH/CLB@CLB

cc

bcc

03/04/2008 02:29 PM

Subject Fw: COMMENT -NOTICE OF PREPARATION/INITIAL STUDY

Angela Reynolds, AICP
Planning Officer
Planning & Building Department
City of Long Beach
(562) 570-6357

Building a Great City, Delivering Exceptional Service

----- Forwarded by Angela Reynolds/CH/CLB on 03/04/2008 02:29 PM -----



terry walters
<tinahawaii25@hotmail.com>
>

To <angela_reynolds@longbeach.gov>

cc <tinahawaii25@hotmail.com>

03/04/2008 11:27 AM

Subject COMMENT -NOTICE OF PREPARATION/INITIAL STUDY

Only having approximately 600 off-street parking spaces is our
MAIN CONCERN. We do not think that will be enough parking spaces.

We have an apartment building on East Hullett Street. We already have problems with no parking.

When the Redevelopment Project is completed and there is "**not**"
enough parking spaces, people will park their cars on East Hullett Street, walk across Linden, using the pedestrian paseo to Atlantic.

Very Concerned Property Owner
Terry Walker

Need to know the score, the latest news, or you need your Hotmail@-get your "fix". Check it out.

Appendix B

Air Quality Data

Combined Summer Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Collong Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Documents\ADE\IRV\appendices\Air Quality\MNV OPERATIONAL
Urbemis: urb924

Project Name: North Village Overall Operations

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	4.32	1.34	8.52	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,543.11
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	4.30	1.09	8.36	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,237.29
Percent Reduction	0.46	18.66	1.88	NaN	0.00	0.00	19.82

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	28.67	28.91	287.61	0.38	61.78	12.05	36,983.93
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	26.82	27.00	268.61	0.35	57.69	11.25	34,539.37
Percent Reduction	6.45	6.61	6.61	7.89	6.62	6.64	6.61

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	32.99	30.25	296.13	0.38	61.81	12.08	38,527.04
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	31.12	28.09	276.97	0.35	57.72	11.28	35,776.66
Percent Reduction	5.67	7.14	6.47	7.89	6.62	6.62	7.14

6/4/2009 2:47:51 PM

Area Source Mitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Mitigated

Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
Natural Gas	0.07	0.99	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,223.25
Hearth - No Summer Emissions							
Landscape	0.61	0.10	7.73	0.00	0.03	0.03	14.04
Consumer Products	3.13						
Architectural Coatings	0.49						
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	4.30	1.09	8.36	0.00	0.03	0.03	1,237.29

Area Source Changes to Defaults

Operational Mitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Mitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Condo/townhouse general	2.58	2.59	26.94	0.04	5.86	1.14	3,510.65
Library	6.39	6.31	62.59	0.08	13.36	2.61	8,005.98
High turnover (sit-down) rest.	2.35	2.04	20.23	0.02	4.05	0.79	2,452.94
Regnl shop, center	10.28	10.85	107.34	0.14	23.43	4.57	13,986.37
Strip mall	5.22	5.21	51.51	0.07	10.99	2.14	6,583.43
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	26.82	27.00	268.61	0.35	57.69	11.25	34,539.37

Operational Settings:

6/4/2009 2:47:51 PM

Includes correction for passby trips

Includes the following double counting adjustment for internal trips:

Residential Trip % Reduction: 2.49 Nonresidential Trip % Reduction: 0.17

Analysis Year: 2016 Temperature (F): 80 Season: Summer

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Summary of Land Uses

Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
Condo/townhouse general	3.81	6.73	dwelling units	61.00	410.40	3,629.99
Library		53.91	1000 sq ft	30.00	1,617.27	8,277.15
High turnover (sit-down) rest.		126.94	1000 sq ft	5.40	685.45	2,508.92
Regnl shop. center		115.17	1000 sq ft	22.00	2,533.64	14,515.87
Strip mall		159.96	1000 sq ft	8.60	1,375.65	6,807.57
					6,622.41	35,739.50

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto	53.6	1.1	98.7	0.2
Light Truck < 3750 lbs	6.8	2.9	94.2	2.9
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs	22.8	0.4	99.6	0.0
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs	10.0	1.0	99.0	0.0
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs	1.5	0.0	86.7	13.3
Like-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs	0.5	0.0	60.0	40.0
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs	0.9	0.0	22.2	77.8
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

Vehicle Type	Vehicle Fleet Mix					Diesel
	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst			
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0		
Urban Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0		
Motorcycle	2.3	69.6	30.4	0.0		
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0		
Motor Home	0.8	0.0	87.5	12.5		

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	12.7	7.0	9.5	13.3	7.4	8.9
Rural Trip Length (miles)	17.6	12.1	14.9	15.4	9.6	12.6
Trip speeds (mph)	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1			

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)

Library	5.0	2.5	92.5
High turnover (sit-down) rest.	5.0	2.5	92.5
Regain shop. center	2.0	1.0	97.0
Strip mall	2.0	1.0	97.0

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Collong Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Documents\ADEIR\Appendices\Air Quality\NV OPERATIONAL
Urbemis.urb924

Project Name: North Village Overall Operations

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

6/4/2009 2:49:04 PM

Summary Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.91	0.26	1.88	0.00	0.06	0.06	289.45
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	0.90	0.21	1.86	0.00	0.06	0.06	233.63
Percent Reduction	1.10	19.23	1.06	Nan	0.00	0.00	19.28

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	5.52	5.65	52.35	0.07	11.28	2.20	6,537.09
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	5.16	5.28	48.88	0.05	10.54	2.05	6,105.00
Percent Reduction	6.52	6.55	6.63	28.57	6.56	6.82	6.61

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOX</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	6.43	5.91	54.23	0.07	11.34	2.26	6,826.54
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	6.06	5.49	50.74	0.05	10.60	2.11	6,338.63
Percent Reduction	5.75	7.11	6.44	28.57	6.53	6.64	7.15

6/4/2009 2:49:04 PM

Area Source Mitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Mitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
Natural Gas	0.01	0.18	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	223.24
Hearth	0.12	0.01	0.33	0.00	0.05	0.05	7.83
Landscape	0.11	0.02	1.41	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.56
Consumer Products	0.57						
Architectural Coatings	0.09						
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	0.90	0.21	1.86	0.00	0.06	0.06	233.63

Area Source Changes to Defaults

Operational Mitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Mitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Condo/townhouse general	0.48	0.51	4.86	0.01	1.07	0.21	620.54
Library	1.23	1.23	11.40	0.01	2.44	0.48	1,415.13
High turnover (sit-down) rest.	0.46	0.40	3.71	0.00	0.74	0.14	433.73
Regnl shop. center	1.98	2.12	19.52	0.02	4.28	0.83	2,471.92
Strip mall	1.01	1.02	9.39	0.01	2.01	0.39	1,163.68
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	5.16	5.28	48.88	0.05	10.54	2.05	6,105.00

Operational Settings:

Includes correction for passby trips

Includes the following double counting adjustment for internal trips:

Residential Trip % Reduction: 2.49 Nonresidential Trip % Reduction: 0.17

Analysis Year: 2016 Season: Annual

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Summary of Land Uses

Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
Condo/townhouse general	3.81	6.73	dwelling units	61.00	410.40	3,629.99
Library		53.91	1000 sq ft	30.00	1,617.27	8,277.15
High turnover (sit-down) rest.		126.94	1000 sq ft	5.40	685.45	2,508.92
Regal shop, center		115.17	1000 sq ft	22.00	2,533.64	14,515.87
Strip mall		159.96	1000 sq ft	8.60	1,375.65	6,807.57
					6,622.41	35,739.50

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto	53.6	1.1	98.7	0.2
Light Truck < 3750 lbs	6.8	2.9	94.2	2.9
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs	22.8	0.4	99.6	0.0
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs	10.0	1.0	99.0	0.0
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs	1.5	0.0	86.7	13.3
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs	0.5	0.0	60.0	40.0
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs	0.9	0.0	22.2	77.8
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.5	0.0	0.0	100.0

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motorcycle	2.3	69.6	30.4	0.0
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home	0.8	0.0	87.5	12.5

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	12.7	7.0	9.5	13.3	7.4	8.9
Rural Trip Length (miles)	17.6	12.1	14.9	15.4	9.6	12.6
Trip speeds (mph)	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1			

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)

Library	5.0	2.5	92.5
High turnover (sit-down) rest.	5.0	2.5	92.5
Regnl shop. center	2.0	1.0	97.0
Strip mall	2.0	1.0	97.0

Combined Summer Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Collong Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Documents\ADEIR\Appendices\Air Quality\NV\WB\Block Demo +
const.urb924

Project Name: NV West demo and const

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

6/4/2009 2:53:02 PM

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
2010 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	4.32	40.93	19.95	0.02	32.10	1.93	34.02	6.71	1.77	8.48	4,490.86
2011 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	1.39	10.20	10.67	0.01	0.04	0.62	0.66	0.01	0.57	0.58	1,770.67
2012 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	14.49	9.39	10.14	0.01	0.04	0.55	0.59	0.01	0.51	0.52	1,770.57

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	3.36	0.72	4.98	0.00	0.02	0.02	846.69

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	9.96	14.35	126.30	0.13	21.45	4.18	12,754.43

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	13.32	15.07	131.28	0.13	21.47	4.20	13,601.12

Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
-----	-----	----	-----	-----------	--------------	------	------------	---------------	-------	-----

6/4/2009 2:53:02 PM

Time Slice 4/14/2010-5/7/2010	2.67	26.27	13.24	<u>0.02</u>	10.67	1.38	12.05	2.23	1.27	3.50	3,297.04
Active Days: 18											
Demolition 04/14/2010-	2.67	26.27	13.24	0.02	10.67	1.38	12.05	2.23	1.27	3.50	3,297.04
05/07/2010											
Fugitive Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.58	0.00	10.58	2.20	0.00	2.20	0.00
Demo Off Road Diesel	1.14	7.68	4.68	0.00	0.00	0.59	0.59	0.00	0.54	0.54	700.30
Demo On Road Diesel	1.49	18.53	7.47	0.02	0.08	0.79	0.87	0.03	0.72	0.75	2,472.40
Demo Worker Trips	0.03	0.06	1.09	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	124.34
Time Slice 5/10/2010-6/18/2010	<u>4.32</u>	<u>40.93</u>	<u>19.95</u>	0.02	<u>32.10</u>	<u>1.93</u>	<u>34.02</u>	<u>6.71</u>	<u>1.77</u>	<u>8.48</u>	<u>4,490.86</u>
Active Days: 30											
Mass Grading 05/10/2010-	4.32	40.93	19.95	0.02	32.10	1.93	34.02	6.71	1.77	8.48	4,490.86
06/18/2010											
Mass Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32.02	0.00	32.02	6.69	0.00	6.69	0.00
Mass Grading Off Road Diesel	3.00	24.99	12.46	0.00	0.00	1.25	1.25	0.00	1.15	1.15	2,247.32
Mass Grading On Road Diesel	1.28	15.88	6.40	0.02	0.07	0.67	0.74	0.02	0.62	0.64	2,119.20
Mass Grading Worker Trips	0.03	0.06	1.09	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	124.34
Time Slice 11/15/2010-12/10/2010	2.97	16.96	11.70	0.00	0.02	1.43	1.44	0.01	1.31	1.32	1,634.83
Active Days: 20											
Asphalt 11/15/2010-12/10/2010	2.97	16.96	11.70	0.00	0.02	1.43	1.44	0.01	1.31	1.32	1,634.83
Paving Off-Gas	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	2.64	15.97	9.18	0.00	0.00	1.39	1.39	0.00	1.27	1.27	1,272.04
Paving On Road Diesel	0.07	0.86	0.34	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.03	114.11
Paving Worker Trips	0.07	0.13	2.17	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	248.69

6/4/2009 2:53:02 PM

Time Slice 12/13/2010-12/31/2010	1.51	11.03	11.25	0.01	0.04	0.66	0.70	0.01	0.60	0.62	1,770.80
Active Days: 15											
Building 12/13/2010-02/11/2012	1.51	11.03	11.25	0.01	0.04	0.66	0.70	0.01	0.60	0.62	1,770.80
Building Off Road Diesel	1.21	9.16	4.81	0.00	0.00	0.58	0.58	0.00	0.53	0.53	893.39
Building Vendor Trips	0.14	1.56	1.23	0.00	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.00	0.06	0.06	282.55
Building Worker Trips	0.17	0.31	5.20	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.02	594.86
Time Slice 1/3/2011-12/30/2011	<u>1.39</u>	<u>10.20</u>	<u>10.67</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.62</u>	<u>0.66</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.57</u>	<u>0.58</u>	<u>1,770.67</u>
Active Days: 260											
Building 12/13/2010-02/11/2012	1.39	10.20	10.67	0.01	0.04	0.62	0.66	0.01	0.57	0.58	1,770.67
Building Off Road Diesel	1.11	8.51	4.68	0.00	0.00	0.54	0.54	0.00	0.50	0.50	893.39
Building Vendor Trips	0.13	1.41	1.14	0.00	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.00	0.05	0.06	282.56
Building Worker Trips	0.15	0.28	4.85	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.02	594.73
Time Slice 1/2/2012-2/10/2012	1.29	<u>9.39</u>	<u>10.14</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.04</u>	<u>0.55</u>	<u>0.59</u>	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.51</u>	<u>0.52</u>	<u>1,770.57</u>
Active Days: 30											
Building 12/13/2010-02/11/2012	1.29	9.39	10.14	0.01	0.04	0.55	0.59	0.01	0.51	0.52	1,770.57
Building Off Road Diesel	1.03	7.87	4.56	0.00	0.00	0.49	0.49	0.00	0.45	0.45	893.39
Building Vendor Trips	0.12	1.26	1.06	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	282.56
Building Worker Trips	0.14	0.26	4.52	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.02	594.63
Time Slice 2/14/2012-4/13/2012	<u>14.49</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>0.41</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>0.00</u>	<u>53.65</u>
Active Days: 44											
Coating 02/14/2012-04/15/2012	14.49	0.02	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.65
Architectural Coating	14.48	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.65

Phase Assumptions

Phase: Demolition 4/14/2010 - 5/7/2010 - Default Demolition Description

Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 252700

Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 25200

6/4/2009 2:53:02 PM

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 583.33

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 1 hours per day

2 Tractors/loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Mass Grading 5/10/2010 - 6/18/2010 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 3.15

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 0.37

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 240 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 500

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Paving 11/15/2010 - 12/10/2010 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 1.5

Off-Road Equipment:

4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Paving Equipment (104 hp) operating at a 0.53 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Tractors/loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

Phase: Building Construction 12/13/2010 - 2/11/2012 - Default Building Construction Description

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Cranes (399 hp) operating at a 0.43 load factor for 4 hours per day

6/4/2009 2:53:02 PM

2 Forklifts (145 hp) operating at a 0.3 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Architectural Coating 2/14/2012 - 4/15/2012 - Default Architectural Coating Description

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Collong Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Document\ADEIR\Appendices\Air Quality\NV\WB\Block Demo +
const.urb924

Project Name: NV West demo and const

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

6/4/2009 2:53:33 PM

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
2010 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.13	1.10	0.62	0.00	0.58	0.06	0.64	0.12	0.06	0.18	126.67
2011 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.18	1.33	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.09	0.00	0.07	0.08	230.19
2012 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.34	0.14	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	27.74

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.73	0.13	1.20	0.00	0.05	0.04	161.45

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	1.89	2.80	22.74	0.03	3.91	0.76	2,254.44

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM2.5	CO2
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	2.62	2.93	23.94	0.03	3.96	0.80	2,415.89

Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
-----	-----	----	-----	-----------	--------------	------	------------	---------------	-------	-----

6/4/2009 2:53:33 PM

2011	0.18	1.33	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.09	0.00	0.07	0.08	230.19
Building 12/13/2010-02/1/2012	0.18	1.33	1.39	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.09	0.00	0.07	0.08	230.19
Building Off Road Diesel	0.14	1.11	0.61	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.06	0.06	116.14
Building Vendor Trips	0.02	0.18	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	36.73
Building Worker Trips	0.02	0.04	0.63	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	77.31
2012	0.34	0.14	0.16	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	27.74
Building 12/13/2010-02/1/2012	0.02	0.14	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	26.56
Building Off Road Diesel	0.02	0.12	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	13.40
Building Vendor Trips	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.24
Building Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.92
Coating 02/14/2012-04/15/2012	0.32	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.18
Architectural Coating	0.32	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.18

Phase Assumptions

Phase: Demolition 4/14/2010 - 5/7/2010 - Default Demolition Description

Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 252700

Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 25200

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 583.33

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 1 hours per day

2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Mass Grading 5/10/2010 - 6/18/2010 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 3.15

6/4/2009 2:53:33 PM

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 0.37

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 240 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 500

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Paving 11/15/2010 - 12/10/2010 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 1.5

Off-Road Equipment:

4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Paving Equipment (104 hp) operating at a 0.53 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

Phase: Building Construction 12/13/2010 - 2/11/2012 - Default Building Construction Description

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Cranes (399 hp) operating at a 0.43 load factor for 4 hours per day

2 Forklifts (145 hp) operating at a 0.3 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Architectural Coating 2/14/2012 - 4/15/2012 - Default Architectural Coating Description

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100

6/4/2009 2:53:33 PM

Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Summary of Three Acre Site Example Results By Phase and Equipment

Demolition of Existing 17,700 Square Foot Structure

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.0			3.47	5.52	0.46	0.43
Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.0			12.02	25.00	1.12	1.00
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.0			6.39	11.56	0.93	0.83
Haul Trucks			2	50	2.56	8.37	0.399	0.367
Total Onsite Emissions					24.4	*	2.9	2.6
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Site Preparation

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Scrapers	2	8.0			21.24		2.49	2.02
Graders	1	7.0			4.50		0.93	0.59
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	4.0			1.60		1.94	0.57
Haul Trucks			5	25	3.21		0.499	0.459
Water Trucks			3	26	2.00		0.31	0.285
Total Onsite Emissions					32.5	*	6.2	3.9
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Grading

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Graders	1	8.0			5.14	12.19	1.43	1.05
Scrapers	1	8.0			10.62	24.50	1.01	0.66
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	7.0			2.80	5.06	2.11	0.72
Haul Trucks			5	0.1	0.01	0.04	0.0020	0.002
Water Trucks			3	4.4	0.34	1.10	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					18.9	*	4.6	2.5
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Building of 95,000 Square Foot Structure

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Forklifts	2	7.0			3.31	7.78	0.42	0.39
Cranes	1	8.0			4.56	12.23	0.54	0.50
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	6.0			2.40	4.34	0.34	0.31
Generator Sets	1	8.0			2.70	5.37	0.33	0.30
Electric Welders	3	8.0			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Haul Trucks			30	0.1	0.08	0.25	0.012	0.011
Water Trucks			3	4.5	0.35	1.13	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					13.4	*	1.7	1.6
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Summary of Three Acre Site Example Results By Phase and Equipment

Architectural Coating and Asphalt Paving of Parking Lot

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Pavers	1	8.0			4.60	8.26	0.59	0.54
Paving Equipment	1	8.0			3.63	7.52	0.52	0.48
Rollers	2	8.0			6.84	13.07	0.92	0.85
Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	3.0			0.13	0.19	0.01	0.01
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.0			3.19	5.78	0.45	0.41
Haul Trucks			9	0.1	0.02	0.08	0.004	0.004
Water Trucks			3	4.5	0.35	1.13	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					18.8	*	2.5	2.3
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Combined Summer Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Col\Long Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Documents\A\DEIR\Appendices\Air Quality\NV\EB\block Demo + const.urb924

Project Name: NV East demo and const

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
2013 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	3.70	33.58	17.23	0.02	35.51	1.51	37.01	7.43	1.39	8.81	4,793.54
2014 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	2.54	13.93	10.88	0.01	0.03	1.10	1.12	0.01	1.02	1.02	1,723.43
2015 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	33.08	6.64	7.67	0.01	0.03	0.38	0.41	0.01	0.35	0.36	1,508.98

Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
-----	-----	----	-----	-----------	--------------	------	------------	---------------	-------	-----

6/4/2009 2:56:09 PM

Time Slice 4/8/2013-6/14/2013	1.63	14.34	8.50	0.02	10.64	0.76	11.40	2.22	0.70	2.92	2,308.02
Active Days: 50											
Demolition 04/08/2013-06/14/2013	1.63	14.34	8.50	0.02	10.64	0.76	11.40	2.22	0.70	2.92	2,308.02
Fugitive Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.58	0.00	10.58	2.20	0.00	2.20	0.00
Demo Off Road Diesel	0.91	6.35	4.40	0.00	0.00	0.44	0.44	0.00	0.41	0.41	700.30
Demo On Road Diesel	0.69	7.94	3.22	0.01	0.05	0.32	0.37	0.02	0.29	0.31	1,483.44
Demo Worker Trips	0.03	0.05	0.88	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	124.28
Time Slice 6/17/2013-8/22/2013	<u>3.70</u>	<u>33.58</u>	<u>17.23</u>	<u>0.02</u>	<u>35.51</u>	<u>1.51</u>	<u>37.01</u>	<u>7.43</u>	<u>1.39</u>	<u>8.81</u>	<u>4,793.54</u>
Active Days: 35											
Mass Grading 06/17/2013-08/02/2013	3.70	33.58	17.23	0.02	35.51	1.51	37.01	7.43	1.39	8.81	4,793.54
Mass Grading Dust	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	35.42	0.00	35.42	7.40	0.00	7.40	0.00
Mass Grading Off Road Diesel	2.55	20.56	11.10	0.00	0.00	0.99	0.99	0.00	0.91	0.91	2,247.32
Mass Grading On Road Diesel	1.12	12.97	5.25	0.02	0.08	0.52	0.60	0.03	0.48	0.50	2,421.94
Mass Grading Worker Trips	0.03	0.05	0.88	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	124.28
Time Slice 12/16/2013-12/31/2013	2.69	14.79	11.11	0.00	0.02	1.20	1.21	0.01	1.10	1.11	1,723.45
Active Days: 12											
Asphalt 12/16/2013-01/03/2014	2.69	14.79	11.11	0.00	0.02	1.20	1.21	0.01	1.10	1.11	1,723.45
Paving Off-Gas	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	2.19	13.60	8.91	0.00	0.00	1.15	1.15	0.00	1.05	1.05	1,272.04
Paving On Road Diesel	0.09	1.09	0.44	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	202.86
Paving Worker Trips	0.05	0.10	1.76	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	248.56

6/4/2009 2:56:09 PM

Time Slice 1/1/2014-1/3/2014 Active Days: 3	2.54	13.93	10.88	0.00	0.02	1.10	1.12	0.01	1.02	1.02	1.723.43
Asphalt 12/16/2013-01/03/2014	2.54	13.93	10.88	0.00	0.02	1.10	1.12	0.01	1.02	1.02	1,723.43
Paving Off-Gas	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	2.06	12.89	8.85	0.00	0.00	1.06	1.06	0.00	0.98	0.98	1,272.04
Paving On Road Diesel	0.08	0.95	0.39	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.04	202.86
Paving Worker Trips	0.05	0.09	1.64	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	248.53
Time Slice 1/6/2014-12/31/2014 Active Days: 258	1.02	7.35	7.99	0.01	0.03	0.40	0.43	0.01	0.37	0.38	1,509.02
Building 01/06/2014-01/09/2015	1.02	7.35	7.99	0.01	0.03	0.40	0.43	0.01	0.37	0.38	1,509.02
Building Off Road Diesel	0.88	6.70	4.39	0.00	0.00	0.37	0.37	0.00	0.34	0.34	893.39
Building Vendor Trips	0.05	0.48	0.45	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	139.44
Building Worker Trips	0.09	0.18	3.15	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.02	476.19
Time Slice 1/1/2015-1/9/2015 Active Days: 7	0.95	6.64	7.67	0.01	0.03	0.38	0.41	0.01	0.35	0.36	1,508.98
Building 01/06/2014-01/09/2015	0.95	6.64	7.67	0.01	0.03	0.38	0.41	0.01	0.35	0.36	1,508.98
Building Off Road Diesel	0.83	6.06	4.31	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.35	0.00	0.32	0.32	893.39
Building Vendor Trips	0.04	0.42	0.42	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	139.45
Building Worker Trips	0.08	0.16	2.94	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.02	476.14
Time Slice 1/12/2015-2/27/2015 Active Days: 35	33.08	0.02	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.28
Coating 01/12/2015-02/27/2015	33.08	0.02	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.28
Architectural Coating	33.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	53.28

Phase Assumptions

Phase: Demolition 4/8/2013 - 6/14/2013 - Default Demolition Description

6/4/2009 2:56:09 PM

Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 1120000

Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 25200

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 350

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 1 hours per day

2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Mass Grading 6/17/2013 - 8/2/2013 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 3.15

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 0.71

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 240 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 571.43

Off-Road Equipment:

1 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Paving 12/16/2013 - 1/3/2014 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 2

Off-Road Equipment:

4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day

1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Paving Equipment (104 hp) operating at a 0.53 load factor for 8 hours per day

1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day

1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

Phase: Building Construction 1/6/2014 - 1/9/2015 - Default Building Construction Description

6/4/2009 2:56:09 PM

Off-Road Equipment:

- 1 Cranes (399 hp) operating at a 0.43 load factor for 4 hours per day
- 2 Forklifts (145 hp) operating at a 0.3 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Architectural Coating 1/1/2015 - 2/27/2015 - Default Architectural Coating Description

- Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100
- Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50
- Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250
- Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100
- Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250
- Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: L:\ESP\LA Collong Beach\08-62230 Long Beach North Village Redev EIR\Document\ADEIR\Appendices\Air Quality\NV\EBlock Demo + const urb924

Project Name: NV East demo and const

Project Location: Los Angeles County

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
2013 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.12	1.03	0.58	0.00	0.89	0.05	0.94	0.19	0.05	0.23	151.93
2014 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.14	0.97	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	197.25
2015 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.58	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.21

Construction Unmitigated Detail Report:

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 Dust	PM10 Exhaust	PM10	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	PM2.5	CO2
-----	-----	----	-----	-----------	--------------	------	------------	---------------	-------	-----

6/4/2009 2:56:43 PM

2014	0.14	0.97	1.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	197.25
Asphalt 12/16/2013-01/03/2014	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.59
Paving Off-Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Paving Off Road Diesel	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.91
Paving On Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.30
Paving Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.37
Building 01/06/2014-01/09/2015	0.13	0.95	1.03	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.05	194.66
Building Off Road Diesel	0.11	0.86	0.57	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.04	0.04	0.04	115.25
Building Vendor Trips	0.01	0.06	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.99
Building Worker Trips	0.01	0.02	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	61.43
2015	0.58	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.21
Building 01/06/2014-01/09/2015	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.28
Building Off Road Diesel	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.13
Building Vendor Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.49
Building Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.67
Coating 01/12/2015-02/27/2015	0.58	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.93
Architectural Coating	0.58	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Coating Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.93

Phase Assumptions

Phase: Demolition 4/8/2013 - 6/14/2013 - Default Demolition Description
 Building Volume Total (cubic feet): 1120000
 Building Volume Daily (cubic feet): 25200
 On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 350
 Off-Road Equipment:

6/4/2009 2:56:43 PM

- 1 Concrete/Industrial Saws (10 hp) operating at a 0.73 load factor for 8 hours per day
- 1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 1 hours per day
- 2 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 6 hours per day

Phase: Mass Grading 6/17/2013 - 8/2/2013 - Default Mass Site Grading/Excavation Description

Total Acres Disturbed: 3.15

Maximum Daily Acreage Disturbed: 0.71

Fugitive Dust Level of Detail: Low

Onsite Cut/Fill: 240 cubic yards/day; Offsite Cut/Fill: 0 cubic yards/day

On Road Truck Travel (VMT): 571.43

Off-Road Equipment:

- 1 Graders (174 hp) operating at a 0.61 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Rubber Tired Dozers (357 hp) operating at a 0.59 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day
- 1 Water Trucks (189 hp) operating at a 0.5 load factor for 8 hours per day

Phase: Paving 12/16/2013 - 1/3/2014 - Default Paving Description

Acres to be Paved: 2

Off-Road Equipment:

- 4 Cement and Mortar Mixers (10 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Pavers (100 hp) operating at a 0.62 load factor for 7 hours per day
- 1 Paving Equipment (104 hp) operating at a 0.53 load factor for 8 hours per day
- 1 Rollers (95 hp) operating at a 0.56 load factor for 7 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 7 hours per day

Phase: Building Construction 1/6/2014 - 1/9/2015 - Default Building Construction Description

Off-Road Equipment:

- 1 Cranes (399 hp) operating at a 0.43 load factor for 4 hours per day
- 2 Forklifts (145 hp) operating at a 0.3 load factor for 6 hours per day
- 1 Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes (108 hp) operating at a 0.55 load factor for 8 hours per day

6/4/2009 2:56:43 PM

Phase: Architectural Coating 1/1/2015 - 2/27/2015 - Default Architectural Coating Description

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Residential Interior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 50

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 6/30/2008 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Residential Exterior Coatings begins 7/1/2008 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 100

Rule: Nonresidential Interior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Rule: Nonresidential Exterior Coatings begins 1/1/2005 ends 12/31/2040 specifies a VOC of 250

Summary of Three Acre Site Example Results By Phase and Equipment

Demolition of Existing 80,000 Square Foot Structure

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	8.0			3.47	5.52	0.46	0.43
Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8.0			12.02	25.00	1.28	1.03
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	2	8.0			6.39	11.56	1.09	0.86
Haul Trucks			8	50	10.26	33.48	1.597	1.469
Total Onsite Emissions					32.1	*	4.4	3.8
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Site Preparation

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Scrapers	2	8.0			21.24		2.49	2.02
Graders	1	7.0			4.50		0.93	0.59
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	4.0			1.60		1.94	0.57
Haul Trucks			5	25	3.21		0.499	0.459
Water Trucks			3	26	2.00		0.31	0.285
Total Onsite Emissions					32.5	*	6.2	3.9
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Grading

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Graders	1	8.0			5.14	12.19	1.43	1.05
Scrapers	1	8.0			10.62	24.50	1.01	0.66
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	7.0			2.80	5.06	2.11	0.72
Haul Trucks			5	0.1	0.01	0.04	0.0020	0.002
Water Trucks			3	4.4	0.34	1.10	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					18.9	*	4.6	2.5
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Building of 62,710 Square Foot Structure

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Forklifts	2	7.0			3.31	7.78	0.42	0.39
Cranes	1	8.0			4.56	12.23	0.54	0.50
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	6.0			2.40	4.34	0.34	0.31
Generator Sets	1	8.0			2.70	5.37	0.33	0.30
Electric Welders	3	8.0			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Haul Trucks			30	0.1	0.08	0.25	0.012	0.011
Water Trucks			3	4.5	0.35	1.13	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					13.4	*	1.7	1.6
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

* See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.

Summary of Three Acre Site Example Results By Phase and Equipment

Architectural Coating and Asphalt Paving of Parking Lot

Vehicle Description	No. of Vehicle	Hours	Trips	Length	CO	NOx	PM10	PM2.5
Pavers	1	8.0			4.60	8.26	0.59	0.54
Paving Equipment	1	8.0			3.63	7.52	0.52	0.48
Rollers	2	8.0			6.84	13.07	0.92	0.85
Cement and Mortar Mixers	1	3.0			0.13	0.19	0.01	0.01
Tractors/Loaders/Backhoes	1	8.0			3.19	5.78	0.45	0.41
Haul Trucks			9	0.1	0.02	0.08	0.004	0.004
Water Trucks			3	4.5	0.35	1.13	0.05	0.05
Total Onsite Emissions					18.8	*	2.5	2.3
Localized Significance Threshold					827	66	7	5
Exceed Significance?					NO	*	NO	NO

** See Urbemis 2007 modeling results for this calculation.*

Greenhouse Gas Emission Worksheet

Operational Emissions

North Village

Electricity Generation *	(kWh)		Project units	Project Usage
Commercial consumption	16,750	per KSF	66	1,105,500
Residential Consumption	7,000	per unit	61	427,000
			Total	1,532,500

* Generation Factor Source: CAPCOA, January 2008. CEQA and Climate Change.

Total Project Annual kWh: **1,532,500** kWh/year
 Project Annual MWh: **1,533** MWh/year

Emission Factors:

CO2 *	804.54 lbs/MWh/year
CH4 **	0.0067 lbs/MWh/year
N2O **	0.0037 lbs/MWh/year

Total Annual Operational Emissions (metric tons) =
(Electricity Use (kWh) x EF)/2,204.62 lbs/metric ton

Conversion to Carbon Dioxide Equivalency (CO2e) Units based on Global Warming Potential (GWP)

CH4	21 GWP
N2O	310 GWP
1 ton (short, US) =	0.90718474 metric ton

Annual Operational Emissions:

	Total Emissions	Total CO2e Units
CO2 emissions, electricity:	616.5 tons	559.3 metric tons CO2e
CO2 emissions***:	289.0 tons	262.2 metric tons CO2e
CH4 emissions:	0.0047 metric tons	0.1 metric tons CO2e
N2O emissions:	0.0026 metric tons	0.8 metric tons CO2e
Project Total		822.3 metric tons CO2e

References

* Table C.1: EPA eGRID CO2 Electricity Emission Factors by Subregion (Year 2000)

** Table C.2: Methane and Nitrous Oxide Electricity Emission Factors by State and Region (Average years 2001-1003)

*** URBEMIS Annual Emissions output for Area Source emissions; includes natural gas combustion for heating.

Sources: California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, January 2009.
 Third Assessment Report, 2001, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks, 1990-2000 (April 2002).

Greenhouse Gas Emission Worksheet

Mobile Emissions

North Village

From URBEMIS 2007 Vehicle Fleet Mix Output:

Daily Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT): 36,992 (Net: Proposed - Existing)
 Annual VMT: 13,502,080

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	CH4 Emission Factor (g/mile)*	CH4 Emission (g/mile)	N2O Emission Factor (g/mile)*	N2O Emission (g/mile)
Light Auto	53.4%	0.04	0.02136	0.04	0.02136
Light Truck < 3750 lbs	6.8%	0.05	0.0034	0.06	0.00408
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs	22.9%	0.05	0.01145	0.06	0.01374
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs	10.1%	0.12	0.01212	0.2	0.0202
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs	1.5%	0.12	0.0018	0.2	0.003
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs	0.5%	0.09	0.00045	0.125	0.000625
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs	0.9%	0.06	0.00054	0.05	0.00045
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.5%	0.06	0.0003	0.05	0.00025
Other Bus	0.1%	0.06	0.00006	0.05	0.00005
Urban Bus	0.1%	0.06	0.00006	0.05	0.00005
Motorcycle	2.3%	0.09	0.00207	0.01	0.00023
School Bus	0.1%	0.06	0.00006	0.05	0.00005
Motor Home	0.8%	0.09	0.00072	0.125	0.001
Total			0.05439		0.065085

* from Table C.4: Methane and Nitrous Oxide Emission Factors for Mobile Sources by Vehicle and Fuel Type (g/mile).

Assume Model year 2000-present, gasoline fueled.

Source: California Climate Action Registry General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Version 3.1, January 2009.

Total Emissions (metric tons) =

Emission Factor by Vehicle Mix (g/mi) x Annual VMT(mi) x 0.000001 metric tons/g

Conversion to Carbon Dioxide Equivalency (CO2e) Units based on Global Warming Potential (GWP)

CH4 21 GWP
 N2O 310 GWP
 1 ton (short, US) = 0.90718474 metric ton

Annual Mobile Emissions:

	Total Emissions	Total CO2e units
CO2 Emissions* :	6,693.0 tons CO2	6,071.8 metric tons CO2e
CH4 Emissions:	0.7344 metric tons CH4	15.4 metric tons CO2e
N2O Emissions:	0.8788 metric tons N2O	272.4 metric tons CO2e

Project Total: 6,359.6 metric tons CO2e

* From URBEMIS 2007 results for mobile sources

Appendix C

Cultural Resources Report

Historic Resources Report North Village Center EIR Long Beach, CA

29 August 2008
rev. 22 October 2008
rev. 13 January 2009

Prepared by:



Prepared for:

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
790 E. Santa Clara Street
Ventura CA, 93001

Executive Summary

This report was prepared for the purpose of assisting the City of Long Beach in their compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as it relates to historic resources, in connection with the development of the North Village Center project. The project site consists of four city blocks bounded by 59th Street on the north, South Street on the south, Linden Avenue on the west and Lime Avenue on the east. [Figure 1]

This project will result in the demolition of all buildings remaining on the project site and the construction of up to 170 units of housing, approximately 50,000 square feet of retail/commercial space, a public library of approximately 25,000 square feet and a community center of approximately 10,000 square feet, public and private open space, private and public parking facilities, and offsite improvements.

This report assesses the historical and architectural significance of potentially significant historic properties in accordance with the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) Criteria for Evaluation, and City of Long Beach Landmark criteria. A determination will be made as to whether adverse environmental impacts on historic resources, as defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, may occur as a consequence of the proposed project, and recommend the adoption of mitigation measures, as appropriate.

This report was prepared by San Buenaventura Research Associates of Santa Paula, California, Judy Triem, Historian; and Mitch Stone, Preservation Planner, for Rincon Consultants, Inc., and is based on a field investigation and research conducted in August, 2008. The conclusions contained herein represent the professional opinions of San Buenaventura Research Associates, and are based on the factual data available at the time of its preparation, the application of the appropriate local, state and federal regulations, and best professional practices.

Summary of Findings

The proposed project was found to have the potential to have a significance and adverse impact on three historic resources located on the project site (Class I). Mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce these impacts. The residual impacts after mitigation were found to remain significant and adverse. The project was found to have the potential to adversely impact the integrity of the setting of historic resources located within the immediate vicinity of the projects site. These impacts were determined to be less than significance (Class III).

Report Contents

1.	Administrative Setting	1
	Long Beach Landmark Criteria	
2.	Impact Thresholds and Mitigation	3
3.	Historical Setting	3
	General Historical Context	
	Site-Specific Context	
4.	Potential Historic Resources	5
	Previously Identified Historic Resources	
	Non-historic Properties on Project Site	
	Identified Historic Resources in Project Vicinity	
5.	Project Impacts	8
6.	Project Alternatives	9
7.	Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts	9
	Background	
	Project Mitigation	
	Impacts After Mitigation	
8.	Selected Sources	12




Figure 1. Project Location [Source: USGS 7.5' Quadrangle, Long Beach, CA 1964]

1. Administrative Setting

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of project impacts on historic resources, including properties “listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources [or] included in a local register of historical resources.” A resource is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources if it meets any of the criteria for listing, which are:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (PRC §5024.1(c))

By definition, the California Register of Historical Resources also includes all “properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places,” and certain specified State Historical Landmarks. The majority of “formal determinations” of NRHP eligibility occur when properties are evaluated by the State Office of Historic Preservation in connection with federal environmental review procedures (Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966). Formal determinations of eligibility also occur when properties are nominated to the NRHP, but are not listed due to a lack of owner consent.

The criteria for determining eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) have been developed by the National Park Service. Eligible properties include districts, sites, buildings and structures,

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

According to the NRHP standards, in order for a property which is found to significant under one or more of the criteria to be considered eligible for listing, the “essential physical features” which define the property’s significance must be present. The standard for determining if a property’s essential physical features exist is known as *integrity*, which is defined as “the ability of a property to convey its significance.” The integrity evaluation is broken down into seven “aspects.”

The seven aspects of integrity are: *Location* (the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred); *Design* (the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property); *Setting* (the physical environment of a historic property); *Materials* (the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property); *Workmanship* (the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history or prehistory); *Feeling* (a property’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time), and; *Association* (the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property).

The relevant aspects of integrity depend upon the NRHP criteria applied to a property. For example, a property nominated under Criterion A (events), would be likely to convey its significance primarily through integrity of