KROC COMMUNITY CENTER
FINDINGS OF FACT AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

SCH No.2008071085

PREPARED FOR:

CITY OF LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD, 5TH FLOOR
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802

PREPARED BY:

SAPPHOS ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
430 NORTH HALSTEAD STREET
PASADENA, CALIFORNIA 91107

JUNE 8, 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES ***PAGE***

SECTION I
INTRODUCTION

I.A CERTIFICATION

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE KROC COMMUNITY CENTER (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2008071085)

The City of Long Beach (City) hereby certifies the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kroc Community Center, City of Long Beach, in the County of Los Angeles, California, State Clearinghouse Number 2008071085. The EIR consists of Volume I: Draft EIR, dated March 26, 2009; Volume II: Technical Appendices to the Draft EIR, dated March 26, 2009; and Volume III: Clarifications and Revisions to the Draft EIR, Comment Letters on the Draft EIR, and Response to Comments dated May 26, 2009. The EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Long Beach General Plan, and all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations that govern the management of environmental resources. The Department of Development Services, the Planning Commission, and the City Council has received, reviewed, and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, all hearings, and submissions of testimony from officials representing the City of Long Beach, the Salvation Army, Southern California Division, as well as from other agencies, organizations, and private individuals with a particular vested interest in the project.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the foregoing information, and recommendations of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, as well as any and all other information in the record, and Section I herein, the City hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code as presented in Sections II through X of these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

I.B PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located in the central part of the City of Long Beach (City) on a site known as the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field approximately 1.9 miles north of the Pacific Ocean, 2 miles east of the 710 Freeway, 1.5 miles south of the 405 Freeway, and 4.7 miles west of the 605 Freeway. The project site is located on the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute series Long Beach topographic quadrangle.[1] The elevation of the project site is 3 feet to 16 feet above mean sea level (MSL). The project is located on a roughly 19-acre site at 1900 Walnut Avenue in the City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles, California, and is directly south of the City of Signal Hill. The project site is bounded by local residential streets. These streets consist of East 20th Street and the City of Signal Hill to the north; a 12′0″ alley between Rose Avenue and Gardenia Avenue to the east; commercial parcels fronting on East Pacific Coast Highway to the south; and Walnut Avenue to the west.

[1] U.S. Geological Survey. [1964] Photo revised 1981. 7.5-Minute Series, Long Beach, California, Topographic Quadrangle. Reston, VA.

I.C PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The Salvation Army and the City identified 12 objectives that are requisite to the achievement of the project goals:

- Provide a safe recreational facility that meets the needs and interests of the residents in an underserved community.
- Provide services to individuals in the central area of the City and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill. The primary service area would be U.S. Census Tract Numbers 5733.00, 5752.02, 5751.01, 5751.02, and 5752.01 in the City, and 5734.02 in the City of Signal Hill.[2]
- Contain the passive and active recreation for a minimum of 32,000 square feet of gymnasium, 25,000 square feet for aquatic recreation, and 4 acres of playing fields.
- Have the ability to provide educational programming for a minimum of 300 adults and 100 children at one time and the capacity to serve a minimum of 100 families within the same facility.
- Offer social programs (such as job training, family resources, and health seminars) to accommodate up to 450 people at one time.
- Be accessible to public transit.
- Encourage positive social and recreational opportunities to an ethnically diverse community.
- Stimulate stability and growth in an economically challenged neighborhood.
- Create a sustainable facility that reflects the requirements of the City interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development.
- Be consistent with Kroc Foundation Grant requirements.
- Be consistent with NPDES permit requirements.
- Maintain water detention capability of approximately 160 acre feet.

I.D PROJECT ELEMENTS

The project consists of a recreational facility that includes both indoor and outdoor components. Up to 7 acres of the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site will be developed to accommodate a three-building complex of up to 170,536 square feet, atop 304,920 square feet of raised building pads. Approximately 12 acres of land located around and below the building pads will continue to serve as a flood control detention basin for the City of Signal Hill and the City. The pump station located at the southern ends of the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site will be expanded and will remain in operation. Development of the project will not conflict with the existing potable water system / sanitary sewer system.[3] Furthermore, wastewater generated and flowing from the project site will be treated by the existing sanitation system and will not require the construction or alteration of additional or existing sewage services.[4]

[2] U.S. Census. 2000. Available at: http://www.census.gov/

[3] Long Beach Water Department. 28 November 2007. Correspondence to Jefferey Winklepleck, City of Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.

[4] County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County. 21 July 2008. Correspondence to Jill Griffiths, City of Long Beach, Long Beach, CA.

The Kroc Community Center and main entrance to the facility will be situated along the western side of Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field off Walnut Avenue. A secondary access to the project site will be located at Rose Avenue off East Pacific Coast Highway. In addition, there will be an emergency-only access located on 19th Street that will also be used as a point of access to relieve traffic to and from the site during special events.

The project will be designed to complement the surrounding neighborhood and will be constructed to conform to all applicable City, County, state, and federal statutes and regulations.

I.D.1 Buildings

The Kroc Community Center recreational facility includes a three-building complex that consists of approximately 170,536-square-foot, three- to four-story buildings organized in three components:

- *Chapel / Auditorium building*. This roughly 12,455-square-foot structure will be located at the southwest corner of the project site near East Pacific Coast Highway and Walnut Avenue. This two-story building will include a lobby, lecture halls, stage, and backstage areas.

- *Administration/Education building*. The building will be roughly 73,910 square feet set back from Walnut Avenue and situated off the northeast corner of the chapel / auditorium building. This three- to four-story building will house a drop-in daycare, a 3,500-square-foot kitchen, art studios, multipurpose rooms, classrooms, a library, a computer lab, and administrative offices.

- *Recreation Center*. This two-story building will be located to the north of the administration/education building and will consist of approximately 84,171 square feet, including a gymnasium, classrooms, a fitness center, exercise rooms, a weight room, locker rooms, a game room, and an indoor therapy pool.

I.D.2 Outdoor Components

There are three primary outdoor components of the project:

- *Outdoor Recreation*. This space will consist of a playing field (discussed below) and 2 acres of gardens, play yards, and horticulture areas. The outdoor aquatics complex will include a 50-meter pool, a warm-up pool, a leisure pool with fountains and slides, and a children's area. In an effort to be consistent with Long Beach Water Department goals for water conservation, pools shall be required to be covered when not in use for extended periods of time, pools shall be equipped with a high-quality system for filtering pool water, and hot water lines shall be fitted with water recirculation systems.

- Other site amenities will include a playground, walking trails, a roughly 10,000-square-foot amphitheater, an outdoor climbing wall, a challenge course, an exterior patio, and a horticulture area.

- *Recreation "Soccer" Field*. This space will be a 4-acre field that will accommodate up to 5,000 spectators. It will be adjacent to a 10,000-square-foot amphitheater that will accommodate up to 750 spectators in a bowl-shaped seating area.[5]

- *Landscaping*. Landscaping at the project site will be consistent with the plant species and vegetation for the area. Planting of vegetation will consist of plant species that would continue to support the presence of the identified lepidopteran (specifically butterfly) species at the project site, as well as the additional wildlife that will be supported by these plants.[6] The landscaping and irrigation system will be designed for moderate to draught tolerant plants for conservation purposes.[7]

The project will offer a safe recreational space and to the underserved neighborhoods bordering the project site. The individuals served will include residents of the central area of Long Beach and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill.

I.E LEADERSHIP IN ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN ELEMENTS

The Long Beach City Council adopted interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development on November 21, 2006.[8] The interim policy applies to all new projects that apply for development entitlements and meet the policy thresholds beginning November 22, 2006, until the date that a permanent policy is adopted and becomes effective.

According to the interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development in the City, "all private development projects that receive direct city funding or benefit from other direct city incentives will be required, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, to have registered their project with the U.S. Green Building Council with the intent to achieve a minimum level of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified in their final building design or to provide third-party verification that they meet the equivalent of the minimum requirements of LEED certification in the final building design to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Building."[9]

The project will be designed in a manner that is consistent with the interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development for the City. LEED elements will be incorporated in the construction and operational phases of the project to ensure that it is eligible to attain the minimum level of LEED certification.

I.F EIR PROCESS

The City prepared an EIR for the project in accordance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Long Beach General Plan, and all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations that govern the management of environmental resources.

---

[5] Salvation Army, Southern California Division. 30 July 2007. *Kroc Facilities and Program Design*. Los Angeles, CA.

[6] Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 22 October 2008. Memorandum for the Record, 1222-004, No. 3. Pasadena, CA.

[7] Long Beach Water Department. 28 November 2007. Correspondence to Jeffery Winklepleck, City of Long Beach. Long Beach, CA.

[8] City of Long Beach. Accessed 24 November 2007. Web site. "Green Building for Private Development (Green Ribbon Committee)." Available at: http://www.ci.long-beach.ca.us/plan/pb/apd/green/default.asp#privdev

[9] City of Long Beach. Accessed 24 November 2007. Web site. "Green Building for Private Development (Green Ribbon Committee)." Available at: http://www.ci.long-beach.ca.us/plan/pb/apd/green/default.asp#privdev

The City has taken steps to encourage the public to participate the environmental process for the project. On July 16, 2008, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) for a Draft EIR for the project to the State Clearinghouse and to various federal, state, regional and local government agencies. The NOP was also distributed to residents and business owners within a quarter-mile radius of the project site and was posted in the *City of Long Beach Press-Telegram* newspaper and on the City Web site (www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp). The City attracted informative and supportive public feedback and participation when they hosted a community workshop and scoping meeting on July 28, 2008, to solicit input from the public on the elements of the project. The public review period closed on August 14, 2008. The City received eleven (11) letters of comment on the NOP. The Final EIR considered the environmental issues identified in the NOP, responses to letters of comments received on the Draft EIR, and clarifications and revisions resulting from public review of the Draft EIR.

The EIR was prepared to inform public agency decision-makers and the general public about the project and its significant environmental effects, to suggest possible ways of minimizing those significant effects, and to describe a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The Draft EIR was completed and forwarded to the State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on March 27, 2009, for 45 days that ended on May 11, 2009.

A Notice of Completion (NOC) was posted at both OPR and the Los Angeles County Clerk's Office on March 27, 2009. A Public Notice of Availability (NOA) of the Draft EIR appeared in the *City of Long Beach Press-Telegram*; was mailed directly to over 50 local interested parties; was posted at the Long Beach Main Library, Burnett Neighborhood Library, Mark Twain Neighborhood Library, Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, and Long Beach City Hall; and was posted on the City of Long Beach Web site (www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp).

An electronic copy of the Draft EIR was mailed to more than 14 agency representatives. Copies of the Draft EIR were available during the public review period at five locations: Long Beach Main Library, Burnett Neighborhood Library, Mark Twain Neighborhood Library, Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, and Long Beach City Hall. In addition, the Draft EIR was posted on the City of Long Beach Web site (www.longbeach.gov/plan/pb/epd/er.asp).

The Final EIR was prepared based on the Draft EIR, comments provided in response to circulation of the Draft EIR for public review, and clarifications and revisions resulting from public review of the Draft EIR. A total of six letters of comment were received on the Draft EIR from public agencies including: California Department of Transportation, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Long Beach Water Department, Long Beach Unified School District, and the City of Signal Hill. Two additional letters were received: one from a City of Long Beach property owner and one from a City of Signal Hill resident. Upon completion of the evaluation, this Final EIR was prepared and provided to the City of Long Beach Planning Commission and City Council for certification of compliance with CEQA, and for review and consideration as part of the decision-making process for the project.

I.G GENERAL FINDINGS

The City has evaluated all environmental issues recommended by CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines during the environmental evaluation of the project.

Initial Study

The Initial Study determined that the project would not result in significant impacts to four environmental issues: agriculture resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and public services. The Initial Study was circulated for review with the NOP and included as Appendix A to the EIR.

EIR

The EIR determined that the project is not expected to result in significant impacts to one environmental issue: biological resources.

The EIR determined that the project is expected to result in significant impacts to seven (7) environmental issues that can be mitigated to below the threshold for significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures: air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, NPDES, transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems.

The EIR determined that development of the project will result in significant impacts to five (5) environmental issues that cannot be reduced to below the threshold for significance with the incorporation of mitigation measures: aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation. Mitigation measure Cultural-2 was evaluated for aesthetics; however, there remains an impact in relation to the substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, which will result from the demolition of a historical resource. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will reduce significant direct and cumulative impacts to historical resources to the maximum extent feasible; however, the demolition of this historical resource remains a significant adverse impact to cultural resources. Mitigation measure Cultural-2 was also evaluated for land use and planning. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 is expected to reduce anticipated significant impacts to land use and planning resulting from construction of the project to the maximum extent feasible; however, demolition of the historical resource remains a significant impact to land use and planning due to its conflict with the City General Plan. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-1 through Noise-9 will reduce noise impacts to below the level of significance and reduce noise levels by at least 10 dBA. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-2 and Noise-7 will further assist in attenuating construction noise levels. While implementation of mitigation measures Noise-1 through Noise-7 will reduce construction-generated noise levels, noise levels will still exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold at multiple receptors. Therefore, construction-generated noise remains a significant adverse and unavoidable impact. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 is expected to reduce anticipated significant impacts to recreation resulting from construction of the project to the maximum extent feasible; however, demolition of the historical resource remains a significant impact to recreation.

Alternatives

The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services evaluated three alternatives to the project: the Reduced Site Alternative, the Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative. Under the Reduced Site Alternative, the project would be constructed at the location, but at a reduced scale of 15 percent less than the 19-acre project site. The Alternate Site Alternative would involve the development of the project recreational facility on a portion of the roughly 55-acre former Sports Park site located in the City. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative proposes the renovation of several facilities: Rotary Centennial; Martin Luther King, Jr. Park; Signal Hill Park; MacArthur Park; California Recreation Center; Orizaba Park maintained

by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine; and a private gym, all located within a 1-mile radius of the roughly 74,000-person underserved community residents of the City and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill. In addition, the No Project Alternative, as required by CEQA, was analyzed. The No Project Alternative was determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

In accordance with Section 21081.6 (a) (1) of CEQA, the City has prepared a mitigation monitoring program for those measures required to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

In accordance with Section 21081.6 (a) (2) of CEQA, the City has specified the location and custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the record of decision used in the decision-making process for the project.

In accordance with Section 21082.1 (c) (1), the City has independently reviewed and analyzed the information contained in the reports and environmental documents required by CEQA; has circulated draft documents, which reflect its independent judgment; and finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of City.

The City has prepared a Statement of Overriding Considerations for impacts to five environmental issues that cannot be reduced to below the threshold for significance: aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation.

This report constitutes the required findings and statement pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

SECTION II
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT ARE NOT SIGNIFICANT

The analysis undertaken in support of the Initial Study and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kroc Community Center (project) determined that there are five environmental issue areas related to the California Environmental Quality Act that are not expected to have significant impacts resulting from implementation of the project. Based on the results of the Initial Study completed on July 16, 2008, it was determined that the proposed project would not be expected to have significant impacts on four environmental issue areas: agriculture resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and public services. These issue areas, therefore, were not carried forward for detailed analysis in support of the EIR. In addition, as a result of the EIR analysis, it was determined that implementation of the project is not expected to result in significant impacts related to biological resources.

II.A AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

Significant Impact:

None

Finding:

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to agriculture resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Facts:

The above finding is made based on the analysis included in Section 2.0, *Environmental Checklist*, and Section 3.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of the Initial Study for the Kroc Community Center. There are no Prime Farmlands, Unique Farmlands, or Farmlands of Statewide Importance present within or nearby the project site. No Farmlands will be converted to nonagricultural use, and the project will not conflict with zoning for agriculture or any Williamson Act contracts.

II.B BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Significant Impact:

None

Finding:

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to biological resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Facts:

The above finding is made based on the analysis included in Section 3.3, *Biological Resources*, of the EIR. Implementation of the project will not result in significant impacts to

any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species; to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities; to federally protected wetlands; to the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or corridors; or that impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, or the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan. The project will not result in significant impacts to species related to biological resources considered locally important species, as landscaped vegetation within residential and commercial areas adjacent to the project site provide more than sufficient nectaring and larval food sources for the small number of locally important butterfly species, including the Eufala skipper (*Lerodea eufala*), expected to be present at the project site. In addition, the planting of suitable host plants to support local lepidopteran species, including the Eufala skipper, into the landscaped areas of the project has been incorporated as an element of the project.

II.C MINERAL RESOURCES

Significant Impact:

None

Finding:

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to mineral resources. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Facts:

The above finding is made based on the analysis included in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the Initial Study for the Kroc Community Center. There are no mineral resource areas of value to the region or to the residents of the state within the project area. Further, the project will not 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.

II.D POPULATION AND HOUSING

Significant Impact:

None

Finding:

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to population and housing. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Facts:

The above finding is made based on the analysis included in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the Initial Study for Kroc Community Center. The project has been designed to provide educational, social, and recreation services to families that predominately live in the Cities

of Long Beach and Signal Hill. Therefore, the project will not result in direct or indirect population growth. The project does not include construction of new homes or businesses and does not extend infrastructure into areas not currently served by roads or other infrastructure. The project does not include the construction of any new housing units and is not expected to alter the need for residential development in the project area. Finally, the project will not result in the displacement of any residents.

II.E PUBLIC SERVICES

Significant Impact:

None

Finding:

The project is not expected to result in significant impacts to public services. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

Facts:

The above finding is made based on the analysis included in Sections 2.0 and 3.0 of the Initial Study the Kroc Community Center. The project has been designed to provide educational, social, and recreation services to families that predominately live in the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill. The project will partially address existing unmet supply for recreation facilities in the City of Long Beach. The project is not expected to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities. Implementation of the project will maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, and other performance objectives for the public services of fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, and other public facilities.

SECTION III
POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CAN BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

The analysis undertaken in support of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kroc Community Center (project) determined that 7 of the 12 environmental issues expected to be subject to significant impacts as result of the project will be reduced to below the level of significance with the incorporation of the specified mitigation measures: air quality, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), transportation and traffic, and utilities and service systems.

III.A AIR QUALITY

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in significant impacts to air quality related to maximum daily PM_{10} emissions, $PM_{2.5}$ emissions, NO_X emissions, and fugitive dust impact.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to air quality.

The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, the Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. While the No Project Alternative was capable of avoiding construction-related impacts to ambient air quality, it was determined to be infeasible. The three action alternatives are incapable of avoiding construction-related impacts to air quality and were determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Air-1 through Air-7 will eliminate or substantially lessen the impact related to air quality to below the level of significance. Implementation of air quality mitigation measures Air-1 through Air-7 will ensure that maximum daily PM_{10} emissions will be reduced by approximately 22 percent and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions will be reduced by approximately 6 percent, a much less significant fugitive dust impact. Therefore, with the incorporation of these mitigation measures, fugitive dust emissions associated with the project will be maintained below the level of significance. Significant NO_X emissions expected in conjunction with construction will be reduced to below the level of significance through the incorporation of mitigation measures Air-8 through Air-10.

Measure Air-1

Water or a stabilizing agent that will not cause or contribute to water pollution shall be applied to exposed surfaces in sufficient quantity two times a day to prevent generation of dust plumes. Soil moistening shall be required to treat exposed soil during construction of each element of the project to avoid fugitive dust emissions, ensure compliance with

current air quality standards, and avoid contributions to cumulative increases in criteria pollutants. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications submitted for review include the requirement for the construction contractor to ensure that soil shall be moistened not more than 15 minutes prior to the daily commencement of soil-moving activities and three times a day, or four times a day under windy conditions, in order to maintain a soil moisture content of 12 percent. The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this measure through the submission of weekly monitoring reports to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services. At a minimum, active operations shall utilize one or more of the applicable best available control measures to minimize fugitive dust emissions from each fugitive dust source type that is part of the active operation.

Measure Air-2

Moistening or covering of excavated soil piles shall be required to treat grading areas during construction of the project to avoid fugitive dust emissions, ensure compliance with current air quality standards, and avoid contributions to cumulative increases in critical pollutants. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to ensure that excavated soil piles are watered hourly for the duration of construction or covered with temporary coverings.

Measure Air-3

Discontinuing construction activities that occur on unpaved surfaces during windy conditions shall be required to avoid fugitive dust emissions, ensure compliance with current air quality standards, and avoid contributions to cumulative increases in critical pollutants. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to cease construction activities that occur on unpaved surfaces during periods when winds exceed 25 miles per hour.

Measure Air-4

A wheel washing system shall be installed and used to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site. Washing of wheels leaving the construction site during construction of each phase of the project shall be required to avoid fugitive dust emissions, ensure compliance with current air quality standards, and avoid contributions to cumulative increases in criteria pollutants. Water used for wheel washing will be filtered to remove fine sediment before release to the storm drain system. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to clean adjacent streets of tracked dirt at the end of each workday or install on-site wheel-washing facilities.

Measure Air-5

Track out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation, and track out shall be removed at the conclusion of each workday. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to ensure that the track out shall not extend 25 feet or more from an active operation and that it would be removed at the conclusion of each workday.

Measure Air-6

All trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials on site or through neighboring streets shall be covered (e.g., with tarps or other enclosures that would reduce fugitive dust emissions). All transport of soils to and from the project site for each phase of the project shall be conducted in a manner that avoids fugitive dust emissions, ensures compliance with current air quality standards, and avoids contributions to cumulative increases in criteria pollutants. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to cover all loads of dirt leaving the site or to leave sufficient freeboard capacity in the truck to prevent fugitive dust emissions en route to the disposal site.

Measure Air-7

Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour. Prior to issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to ensure a traffic speed limited to 15 miles per hour.

Measure Air-8

Heavy-equipment operations shall be suspended during first- and second-stage smog alerts. Prior to issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications for each phase of the project include the requirement for the construction contractor to ensure heavy equipment operations be suspended during first and second stage smog alerts.

Measure Air-9

In order to mitigate the air quality impact caused by NO_x emissions from construction equipment, all construction equipment not expected to be used for a period in excess of 5 minutes shall be turned off as a means of reducing NO_x emissions to the maximum extent practicable. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications require the construction contractor to shut off engines when not in use. Specifications shall require the construction contractor to certify

monthly to the Department of Development Services that construction equipment is being maintained in peak operating condition.

Measure Air-10

In order to mitigate the air quality impact caused by NO_x emissions from construction equipment, all off-road diesel construction equipment shall use particulate filters. The applicant shall also ensure that cooled, exhaust gas recirculation devices are installed on all off-road diesel equipment where feasible. Prior to the issuance of permits for each phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications require the construction contractor to use particulate filters on all off-road diesel equipment and install cooled, exhaust gas recirculation devices on all off-road diesel equipment where feasible.

III.B GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in impacts related to surface fault rupture of a known earthquake fault and strong seismic ground shaking.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to geology and soils.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Geology-1 through Geology-3 described below will reduce impacts related to geology and soils to below the level of significance.

Measure Geology-1

Exposure of people or property to potentially adverse effects, including the risk of loss or injury, involving surface fault rupture from the operation of the project, shall be minimized through the applicant's compliance with the City of Long Beach General Plan, California Building Code, Long Beach Municipal Code, and Uniform Building Code.

Measure Geology-2

Exposure of people or property to potentially adverse effects, including the risk of loss or injury, involving seismic ground shaking from the operation of the project, shall be minimized through conformance with California Geological Survey's Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California and all applicable City of Long Beach codes and regulations related to seismic activity. The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the site-specific geotechnical investigations for the project are incorporated into the project plans and specifications. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall review and ensure that all recommendations of the site-specific geotechnical recommendations are incorporated into the final plans and specifications.

Measure Geology-3

The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that best management practices implemented for the project are consistent with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 to avoid soil erosion during construction of the project. Prior to approval of final plans and specifications, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the requirement to comply with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 is included in the specifications. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall monitor construction to ensure compliance with National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003.

III.C HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in hazards and hazardous materials impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and to safety hazards for people working or residing in the project area in the vicinity of an airport land use plan, a public airport, or a public-use airport.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to hazards and hazardous materials.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Hazards-1 through Hazards-4 will reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials to below the level of significance.

Measure Hazards-1

To reduce impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials hazardous materials during construction, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that all contractors transport, store, and handle construction-required hazardous materials in a manner consistent with relevant regulations and guidelines, including those recommended by the California Department of Transportation; the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region; the Los Angeles County Municipal Storm Water Permit (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS004003, Board Order No. 99-060; County of Los Angeles MS4 Permit); and the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. These agencies shall regulate through the permitting process the monitoring and enforcement of this mitigation measure as required by law. Standard personal protective equipment shall be worn during construction operations where warranted.

Measure Hazards-2

To reduce impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials during construction, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that all contractors immediately control the source of any unauthorized release of hazardous materials using appropriate release containment measures, and remediate any unauthorized release using the methodologies mandated by the City of Long Beach throughout the construction period. The City of Long Beach shall monitor and enforce regulations pertaining to the containment, disposal, and unauthorized release of hazardous materials. Engineering and administrative controls shall be utilized to reduce the potential of accidental releases from hazardous materials during the construction phase.

Measure Hazards-3

To reduce impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that all contractors are adhering to the appropriate regulations established by the South Coast Air Quality Management District, the Department of Toxic Substances Control, and other relevant guidelines regarding the release of hazardous emissions into the atmosphere and the off-site disposal of contaminated soils throughout the construction period. Engineering and administrative controls shall be utilized to reduce the potential of accidental releases from hazardous materials during the construction phase as well as during normal working hours.

Measure Hazards-4

The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that all contractors adhere to all federal, state, and local requirements in a manner consistent with relevant public safety regulations and guidelines. Engineering and administrative controls and reporting procedures shall be used to reduce the potential of accidental releases.

III.D HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in significant impacts in relation to surface water quality.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to hydrology and water quality.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Hydrology-1 through Hydrology-3 will reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality impacts related to surface water quality to below the level of significance.

Measure Hydrology-1

In order to mitigate impacts related to surface water quality caused by construction at the project site to below the level of significance, the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall require the construction contractor to implement best management practices consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 prior to completion of final plans and specifications. The construction contractor for each construction phase shall be required to submit a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan to the City of Long Beach for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the anticipated need for a grading permit. The applicant shall complete a water quality assessment prior to the issuance of permits. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall monitor construction to ensure compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003. Such compliance measures would, at a minimum, include preparation and implementation of a local Storm Water Quality Management Plan and a wet Season Erosion Control Plan (for work between October 15 and April 15). These plans shall incorporate all applicable best management practices described in the California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbook, Construction Activity into the construction phase of the project. Prior to construction, temporary measures must be implemented in order to prevent transport of pollutants of concern from the construction site to the storm drainage system. The best management practices should apply to both the actual work areas as well as contractor staging areas. Selection of construction-related best management practices would be in accordance with the requirements of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall ensure compliance throughout the duration of the project.

Measure Hydrology-2

In order to mitigate impacts related to surface water quality caused by construction at the project site, prior to the issuance of permits for all phases of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the plans and specifications require the construction contractor to prepare a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan for construction activities and implement best management practices for construction, construction material handling, and waste handling activities, which include the following:

- Schedule excavation, grading, and paving activities for dry weather periods.
- Control the amount of runoff crossing the construction site by means of berms and drainage ditches to divert water flow around the site.
- Identify potential pollution sources from materials and wastes that will be used, stored, or disposed of on the job site.
- Inform contractors and subcontractors about the clean storm water requirements and enforce their responsibilities in pollution prevention.

The construction contractor shall incorporate Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan requirements and best management practices to mitigate storm water runoff, which include the following:

- The incorporation of bio-retention facilities located within the project area.
- The incorporation of catch basin filtration systems.
- The use of porous pavements to reduce runoff volume.

Measure Hydrology-3

In order to mitigate impacts related to surface water quality caused by construction at the project site, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that the construction contractor is undertaking daily street sweeping and trash removal throughout the construction of the project to avoid degradation of water quality.

III.E NPDES

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in significant impacts related to NPDES, which will result in an impact from loss of pervious surfaces, to total increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways, and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site will be expected to contribute additional pollutants to storm water runoff.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to NPDES.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measure NPDES-1 will be expected to reduce potential impacts related to NPDES to below the level of significance.

Measure NPDES-1

The applicant shall be required to demonstrate that the construction contractor is implementing best management practices consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 to reduce transport of pollutants of concern from the construction site to the storm drainage and waterway system for each construction phase of the project as well as during the operation of the project. Prior to the issuance of permits for each construction phase of the project, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that final plans and specifications require compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 throughout the life of the project. The construction contractor for each construction phase shall be required to submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Management Plan to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the anticipated need for a grading permit.

The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall monitor construction to ensure compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall ensure National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System compliance throughout the duration of the project.

III.F TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to impact site access, related to increasing hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, and related to cumulative transportation and traffic related impacts.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to transportation and traffic.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Transportation-1 through Transportation-2 will reduce impacts related to transportation and traffic to below the level of significance.

Measure Transportation-1

In order to mitigate the impact related to substantially increasing hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, the project applicant shall install a traffic signal at the intersection of Rose Avenue and East Pacific Coast Highway. The installation of a traffic signal at this key intersection, and associated signing and striping modifications inclusive of crosswalks to facilitate pedestrian access to the site, is subject to the approval of the City of Long Beach and the California Department of Transportation.

Measure Transportation-2

To ensure that impacts to the surrounding street system are minimized, it is recommended that the construction management plan for the project be developed in coordination with the City of Long Beach and, at a minimum, address the following:

- Address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation.
- Identify the routes that construction vehicles shall utilize for the delivery of construction materials (i.e., lumber, tiles, piping, windows, etc.) and to access the site, traffic controls and detours, and construction phasing plan for the project.
- Specify the hours during which transport activities can occur and methods to mitigate construction-related impacts to adjacent streets.
- Require the applicant to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including but not limited to gravel and dirt as a result of its operations. The

applicant shall clean adjacent streets, as directed by the City Engineer (or representative of the City Engineer), of any material which may have been spilled, tracked, or blown onto adjacent streets or areas.

- Limit hauling or transport of oversize loads to between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends, or federal holidays.
- Prohibit use of local streets.
- Ensure that haul trucks entering or exiting public streets shall at all times yield to public traffic.
- Ensure that, if hauling operations cause any damage to existing pavement, street, curb, and/or gutter along the haul route, the applicant shall be fully responsible for repairs. The repairs shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
- Keep all constructed-related parking and staging of vehicles on site and out of the adjacent public roadways.
- Ensure that the plan shall meet standards established in the current California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Device as well as City of Long Beach requirements.
- Limit hauling or transport of oversize loads to between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. only, Monday through Friday, unless approved otherwise by the City Engineer. No hauling or transport shall be allowed during nighttime hours, weekends, or federal holidays.

III.G UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to impact the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, related to insufficient water supplies, and related to solid waste.

Finding:

Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, that mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment related to utilities and service systems.

Facts:

Implementation of mitigation measures Utilities-1 through Utilities -3 will reduce impacts related to utilities and service systems to below the level of significance.

Measure Utilities-1

The City of Long Beach shall require the construction contractor to comply with the California Department of Transportation construction site best management practices, as identified in the Storm Water Quality Handbook Best Management Practices Manual, when installing or repairing wastewater treatment facilities. The City of Long Beach Department of Development Services shall require the construction contractor to implement best

management practices consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003 to reduce transport of pollutants of concern from the construction site to the storm drainage and waterway system for each construction phase of the project, as well as during operation of the project. The construction contractor for each phase of the project shall be required to submit a Standard Urban Storm Water Management Plan to the City of Long Beach for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the anticipated need for a grading permit. The Department of Development Services shall monitor construction to ensure compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. CAS 004003.

Measure Utilities-2

The City of Long Beach has incorporated Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design elements into the project that would reduce the potable water demand at the site and increase the efficiency of the water used for the project. This would include water conservation requirements for the proposed project, namely the installation of high-efficiency toilets (HET) in which the applicant may receive a $30 rebate per HET installed; the installation of ultra-low flush or zero-water urinals; and compliance with the State of California Model Landscape Ordinance, which only allows for the use of water-efficient irrigation equipment, has strict limits on the use of turf grass, and places strict limits on the expected quantity of water required per square foot of landscape. The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that consultation with the County of Los Angeles and Long Beach Water Department is conducted to incorporate other best management practices to address the increase in water demand, with the potential of implementing ordinances and regulations that would promote the efficient use of water at the project site. Degradation of water quality during construction of the project shall be reduced to below the level of significance through the requirement to conduct a detailed hydrology study based on the final site plans and to implement the recommendations, or comparable measures, into the plans and specifications for each project element prior to final approval by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services. A Senate Bill 610 water supply assessment or comparable study shall be prepared by a certified civil engineer, and a draft report, including recommendations, shall be submitted to the Department of Development Services for review. The Department of Development Services shall provide comments, if any, within 14 days of receiving the draft hydrology study. A Senate Bill 610 water supply assessment or comparable study shall be prepared by the retail water supplier. The Long Beach Water Department has determined that a water assessment is not required for this project.

Measure Utilities-3

The applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that at least 50 percent of the construction solid waste from the project is being diverted to comply with applicable federal, state, and local statutes related to solid waste and reduce direct and cumulative impacts from construction to below the level of significance. To ensure conformance with the Solid Waste Management Act of 1989, the City of Long Beach shall further require the construction contractor to manage the solid waste generated during construction of each element of the project by diverting at least 50 percent of it from disposal in landfills, particularly Class III landfills, through source reduction, reuse, and recycling of construction and demolition debris. The construction

contractor shall submit a construction Solid Waste Management Plan to the City of Long Beach prior to construction of the project. The construction contractor shall demonstrate compliance with the Solid Waste Management Plan through the submission of monthly reports during demolition activities that estimate the total solid waste generated and diversion of 50 percent of the solid waste.

SECTION IV
SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LEVEL OF INSIGNIFICANCE

The City of Long Beach (City) has determined that, although the mitigation measures will substantially reduce the level of impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation resulting from the project, these impacts will be significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts. Consequently, in accordance with Section 15093 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, a Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (see Section IX of this document) to substantiate the City's decision to accept these unavoidable adverse environmental effects on the grounds that they are outweighed by the benefits afforded by the project.

IV.A AESTHETICS

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project will be expected to result in significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts to aesthetics in relation to the substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings.

Findings:

A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (See Section IX of this document) to address the aesthetics impacts associated with the substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the site and its surroundings, resulting from the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, an historical resource that will occur during the construction of the project.

Mitigation of impacts to significant historical resources is normally achieved through rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historical resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.[1] However, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Low-flow Pump Station was determined to be infeasible as a result of the hydrology analysis.[2] Specifically, the hydrology analysis looked at five deficiencies that would need to be resolved without materially altering the Low-flow Pump Station:

- Its physical size is insufficient to accommodate the new flow/pumping requirements of the reconfigured Hamilton Bowl Detention Basin.
- The required invert of the newly constructed 48-inch below grade storm drainage is substantially below the current invert of the existing Low-flow Pump Station. Reconstruction of the wet well of the existing Low-flow Pump Station would be very prohibited versus the construction of the new low-flow pump station.
- The discharge from the existing Low-flow Pump Station, if it could be reused, would have to be piped to the Hamilton Bowl Pump Station. The increased

[1] Weeks, Kay D. and Anne E. Grimer. 1995. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

[2] Moffat & Nichol. October 2006. *Hamilton Bowl Pump Station / Detention Basin Hydrology Analysis*. Long Beach, CA.

head on the pumping system and its associated construction cost make this option not viable.

- The existing Low-flow Pump Station is located where the project is to be constructed.
- The size is incapable of supporting the three pumps in the existing station required to maintain the existing level of flood protection.

Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to aesthetics related to the demolition of an historical resource to the maximum extent feasible. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant adverse impact.

The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. Each of the alternatives was determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

The City is cognizant that a project of this magnitude may generate environmental impacts to aesthetics. The City has identified in Section 3.1, *Aesthetics*, of the EIR, one mitigation measure, Measure Cultural-2, that will address the impact to aesthetics related to demolition of an historical resource.

Measure Cultural-2

Impacts related to the loss of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, shall be reduced through archival documentation of as-found conditions. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that documentation of the Low-flow Pump Station is completed by the applicant in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation; a detailed historic narrative report including description, history, and statement of significance; measured architectural drawings (as built and/or current conditions); and a compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the National Park Service Heritage Documentation Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, for inclusion in the Library of Congress. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the Long Beach Public Library; the Historical Society of Long Beach; California State University, Long Beach; the Office of Historic Preservation; and the South Central Coastal Information Center where it would be available to local researchers.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services.

IV.B CULTURAL RESOURCES

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts to cultural resources related to an adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource, a historic period archaeological resource, historical resources, and to resources related to human remains.

Findings:

A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (See Section IX of this document) to address the cultural resources impacts associated with demolition of an historical resource that would occur during the construction of the project.

Mitigation of impacts to significant historical resources is normally achieved through rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historical resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.[3] However, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Low-flow Pump Station was determined to be infeasible as a result of the hydrology analysis.[4] Specifically, the hydrology analysis looked at five deficiencies that would need to be resolved without materially altering the Low-flow Pump Station:

- Its physical size is insufficient to accommodate the new flow/pumping requirements of the reconfigured Hamilton Bowl Detention Basin.
- The required invert of the newly constructed 48-inch below grade storm drainage is substantially below the current invert of the existing Low-flow Pump Station. Reconstruction of the wet well of the existing Low-flow Pump Station would be very prohibited versus the construction of the new low-flow pump station.
- The discharge from the existing Low-flow Pump Station, if it could be reused, would have to be piped to the Hamilton Bowl Pump Station. The increased head on the pumping system and its associated construction cost make this option not viable.
- The existing Low-flow Pump Station is located where the project is to be constructed.
- The size is incapable of supporting the three pumps in the existing station required to maintain the existing level of flood protection.

Implementation of mitigation measures Cultural-1 and Cultural-3 will reduce impacts to cultural resources related to an adverse change in the significance of paleontological resources and human remains to below the level of significance. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will reduce significant direct and cumulative impacts to historical resources scheduled for demolition to the maximum extent feasible. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant, unavoidable, adverse impact.

[3] Weeks, Kay D. and Anne E. Grimer. 1995. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

[4] Moffat & Nichol. October 2006. *Hamilton Bowl Pump Station / Detention Basin Hydrology Analysis*. Long Beach, CA.

The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. Each of the alternatives was determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

The City is cognizant that a project of this magnitude may generate environmental impacts to cultural resources during the construction and operation phases. The City has identified in Section 3.4, *Cultural Resources,* of the EIR, three mitigation measures, Cultural-1 through Cultural-3, that will reduce the potential cultural resources impacts from both the construction and operational phases of the project.

Implementation of mitigation measures Cultural-1 and Cultural-3 will reduce impacts to cultural resources related to an adverse change in the significance of paleontological resources and human remains to below the level of significance.

Measure Cultural-1

The impacts to cultural resources related directly or indirectly to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource from the project shall be reduced to below the level of significance through the salvage and disposition of paleontological resources that result from all earthmoving activities involving disturbances of the older Quaternary terrace deposits. Ground-disturbing activities include, but are not limited to, drilling, excavation, trenching, and grading. If paleontological resources are encountered during ground-disturbing activities, the applicant, under the direction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, shall be required to and be responsible for salvage and recovery of those resources consistent with standards for such recovery established by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology:[5]

Because the precise depth of strata considered highly sensitive for paleontological resources is unknown, the applicant, under the direction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, shall be responsible for and shall ensure implementation of construction monitoring by a qualified paleontological monitor during all earthmoving activities that involve disturbance of native soil (i.e., soil that has not been artificially introduced and has not accumulated through Hamilton Bowl's function as a flood control basin). The paleontological monitor shall coordinate a pre-construction briefing to provide information regarding the protection of paleontological resources. Construction personnel shall be trained in procedures to be followed in the event that a fossil site or fossil occurrence is encountered during construction. An information package shall be provided for construction personnel not present at the initial pre-construction briefing.

Should a potentially unique paleontological resource be encountered, a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted and retained by the City of Long Beach. The Society for Vertebrate Paleontology defines a qualified paleontologist as

"A practicing scientist who is recognized in the paleontologic community and is proficient in vertebrate paleontology, as demonstrated by:

[5] Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Accessed 11 December 2008. "Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines." Available at: http://www.vertpaleo.org/society/polstatconformimpactmigig.cfm

1. Institutional affiliations or appropriate credentials,
2. Ability to recognize and recover vertebrate fossils in the field,
3. Local geological and biostratigraphic expertise,
4. Proficiency in identifying vertebrate fossils, and
5. Publications in scientific journals."[6]

If fossil localities are discovered, the paleontologist shall proceed according to guidelines offered by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology.[7] This includes the controlled collection of fossil and geologic samples for processing, screen washing to recover small specimens (if applicable), and specimen preparation to a point of stabilization and identification.

All significant specimens collected shall be appropriately prepared, identified, and catalogued prior to their placement in a permanent accredited repository, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. The qualified paleontologist shall be required to secure a written agreement with a recognized repository, regarding the final disposition, permanent storage, and maintenance of any significant fossil remains and associated specimen data and corresponding geologic and geographic site data that might be recovered as a result of the specified monitoring program. The written agreement shall specify the level of treatment (e.g., preparation, identification, curation, and cataloguing) required before the fossil collection would be accepted for storage. In addition, a technical report shall be completed. If the fossil collection is unable to be placed in an accredited repository, the collection may be donated by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services to local schools for educational purposes.

Daily logs shall be kept by the qualified paleontological monitor during all monitoring activities. The daily monitoring log shall be keyed to a location map to indicate the area monitored, the date, and the assigned personnel. In addition, this log shall include information of the type of rock encountered, fossil specimens recovered, and associated specimen data. Within 90 days of the completion of any salvage operation or monitoring activities, a mitigation report shall be submitted to the Historic Preservation Office / Officer for the City of Long Beach with an appended, itemized inventory of the specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, will signify the completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services.

Measure Cultural-2

Impacts related to the loss of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, shall be reduced through archival documentation of as-found conditions. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that documentation of the Low-flow Pump Station is completed by the applicant in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall

[6] Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Accessed 11 December 2008. "Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines." Available at: http://www.vertpaleo.org/society/polstatconformimpactmigig.cfm

[7] Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. Accessed 11 December 2008. "Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Nonrenewable Paleontologic Resources: Standard Guidelines." Available at: http://www.vertpaleo.org/society/polstatconformimpactmigig.cfm

comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation; a detailed historic narrative report including description, history, and statement of significance; measured architectural drawings (as built and/or current conditions); and a compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the National Park Service Heritage Documentation Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, for inclusion in the Library of Congress. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the Long Beach Public Library; the Historical Society of Long Beach; California State University, Long Beach; the Office of Historic Preservation; and the South Central Coastal Information Center where it would be available to local researchers.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services.

Measure Cultural-3

Although the discovery of human remains is not anticipated during ground-disturbing activities for the project, a process has been delineated by the State of California for addressing the unanticipated discovery of human remains:

Unanticipated Discovery of Human Remains (Public Resources Code 5097): The Los Angeles County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery of human remains. Upon discovery of human remains, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any of that area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until the following conditions are met:

- The Los Angeles County Coroner has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and

- If the remains are of Native American origin, the descendants from the deceased Native Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

IV.C LAND USE AND PLANNING

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts to land use and planning related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a potential historic resource.

Findings:

A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (See Section IX of this document) to address the to land use and planning impacts associated with the substantial adverse change in the significance of a potential historic resource, resulting from the demolition of the Low-

flow Pump Station, an historical resource that would occur during the construction of the project.

Mitigation of impacts to significant historical resources is normally achieved through rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historical resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.[8] However, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Low-flow Pump Station was determined to be infeasible as a result of the hydrology analysis.[9] Specifically, the hydrology analysis looked at five deficiencies that would need to be resolved without materially altering the Low-flow Pump Station:

- Its physical size is insufficient to accommodate the new flow/pumping requirements of the reconfigured Hamilton Bowl Detention Basin.
- The required invert of the newly constructed 48-inch below grade storm drainage is substantially below the current invert of the existing Low-flow Pump Station. Reconstruction of the wet well of the existing Low-flow Pump Station would be very prohibited versus the construction of the new low-flow pump station.
- The discharge from the existing Low-flow Pump Station, if it could be reused, would have to be piped to the Hamilton Bowl Pump Station. The increased head on the pumping system and its associated construction cost make this option not viable.
- The existing Low-flow Pump Station is located where the project is to be constructed.
- The size is incapable of supporting the three pumps in the existing station required to maintain the existing level of flood protection.

Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce anticipated significant impacts to land use and planning resulting related to demolition of an historical resource to the maximum extent feasible; however, demolition of the historical resource remains a significant impact to land use and planning due to its conflict with the City General Plan. The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. Each of the alternatives was determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

The City is cognizant that a project of this magnitude may generate environmental impacts to land use and planning. The City has identified in Section 3.9, *Land Use and Planning*, of the EIR, one mitigation measure, Measure Cultural-2, that will address the impact to land use and planning related to demolition of an historical resource.

[8] Weeks, Kay D. and Anne E. Grimer. 1995. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

[9] Moffat & Nichol. October 2006. *Hamilton Bowl Pump Station / Detention Basin Hydrology Analysis*. Long Beach, CA.

Measure Cultural-2

Impacts related to the loss of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, shall be reduced through archival documentation of as-found conditions. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that documentation of the Low-flow Pump Station is completed by the applicant in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation; a detailed historic narrative report including description, history, and statement of significance; measured architectural drawings (as built and/or current conditions); and a compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the National Park Service Heritage Documentation Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, for inclusion in the Library of Congress. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the Long Beach Public Library; the Historical Society of Long Beach; California State University, Long Beach; the Office of Historic Preservation; and the South Central Coastal Information Center where it would be available to local researchers.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services.

IV.D NOISE

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project will be anticipated to result in a significant impact in terms of exposure of persons to or generation of construction-related noise levels in excess of applicable standards.

Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts in terms of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above those existing without the project.

Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts in terms of a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above those existing without the project.

Implementation of the project will be anticipated to result in a significant impact in terms of exposure of persons to or generation of outdoor activity related noise levels in excess of applicable standards.

The project will be anticipated to result in a significant impact in terms of exposure of persons to or generation of parking related noise levels in excess of applicable standards.

Findings:

A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (See Section IX of this document) to address the to noise impacts associated with the construction and operation of the project. Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-1 will reduce noise levels by approximately 3 dBA. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-3 through Noise-6 will reduce noise levels by at least 10 dBA. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-2 and Noise-7 will further assist in attenuating construction noise levels. While implementation of mitigation measures Noise-1 through Noise-7 will reduce construction-generated noise levels, noise levels will still exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold at multiple receptors. Therefore, construction-generated noise will still remain a significant, unavoidable, adverse impact.

Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-8 will reduce outdoor activity noise levels at the single- and multi-family residential uses to the east of the site by approximately 5 dBA. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, these residential uses will experience a 4.7 dBA increase from outdoor activity over the existing ambient noise level. This level will not exceed the 5-dBA threshold for operational noise. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measure Noise-8 will reduce significant impacts related to outdoor activity generated noise to below the level of significance.

Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-9 will reduce outdoor activity noise levels at the single- and multi-family residential uses to the east of the site by approximately 5 dBA. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, these residential uses will experience a 4.1-dBA increase from parking activity over the existing ambient noise level. This level will not exceed the 5-dBA threshold for operational noise. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure Noise-9 will reduce significant impacts related to parking activity generated noise to below the level of significance.

The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. While the No Project Alternative was capable of avoiding construction-related impacts to ambient noise levels, it was determined to be infeasible. The two action alternatives are incapable of avoiding construction-related, unavoidable, adverse impacts to ambient noise levels and were determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

The City is cognizant that a project of this magnitude may generate environmental impacts to noise. The City has identified in Section 3.10, *Noise,* of the EIR, nine mitigation measures, measures Noise-1 through Noise-9, that will address the potential noise impacts of the project.

Measure Noise-1

All construction equipment shall be equipped with mufflers and other suitable noise attenuation devices.

Measure Noise-2

The applicant shall require that grading and construction contractors use equipment with rubber tires rather than tracks to the extent possible, to minimize the impacts of excavation and grading noise upon the adjacent neighborhood.

Measure Noise-3

A 10-foot sound attenuation blanket shall be installed along the eastern portion of the property line such that the line of sight is blocked from construction activity to the residential land uses, which would include the area for the proposed 6–8 Middle School scheduled to open in 2011 northeast of the project. The blankets shall remain in place as long as construction activity utilizing heavy duty equipment is located within 200 feet of the property line.

Measure Noise-4

A 10-foot sound attenuation blanket shall be installed along the northwestern portion of the property line such that the line of sight is blocked from construction activity to the single-family residence. The blankets shall remain in place as long as construction activity utilizing heavy duty equipment is located within 130 feet of the property line.

Measure Noise-5

A 10-foot sound attenuation blanket shall be installed along the southern portion of the property line such that the line of sight is blocked from construction activity to the multi-family residence. The blankets shall remain in place as long as construction activity utilizing heavy duty equipment is located within 100 feet of the property line.

Measure Noise-6

A 10-foot sound attenuation blanket shall be installed along the northern portion of the property line such that the line of sight is blocked from construction activity to the Alvarado (Juan Bautista) Elementary School and the new 6–8 Middle School if it is in operation during construction activities. The blankets shall remain in place as long as construction activity utilizing heavy duty equipment is located within 50 feet of the property line.

Measure Noise-7

A noise disturbance coordinator shall be established. The disturbance coordinator shall be responsible for responding to any local complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator shall determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., starting too early, bad muffler, etc.) and shall be required to implement reasonable.

Measure Noise-8

A 6-foot-high solid wall shall be constructed along the eastern portion of the outdoor aquatics area such that the line of sight is blocked from the swimming pools to residential land uses.

Measure Noise-9

A 6-foot-high solid wall shall be constructed along the eastern property line of the project site such that the line of sight is blocked from the parking lot to residential land uses.

IV.E RECREATION

Significant Impact:

Implementation of the project has the potential to result in indirect significant impacts to recreation constituting a significant adverse effect on the environment.

Findings:

A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been prepared (See Section IX of this document) to address the recreation impact associated with the indirect significant impacts to recreation constituting a significant adverse effect on the environment, resulting from the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, a historical resource that will occur during the construction of the project.

Mitigation of impacts to significant historical resources is normally achieved through rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the historical resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*.[10] However, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Low-flow Pump Station was determined to be infeasible as a result of the hydrology analysis.[11] Specifically, the hydrology analysis looked at five deficiencies that would need to be resolved without materially altering the Low-flow Pump Station:

- Its physical size is insufficient to accommodate the new flow/pumping requirements of the reconfigured Hamilton Bowl Detention Basin.
- The required invert of the newly constructed 48-inch below grade storm drainage is substantially below the current invert of the existing Low-flow Pump Station. Reconstruction of the wet well of the existing Low-flow Pump Station would be very prohibited versus the construction of the new low-flow pump station.
- The discharge from the existing Low-flow Pump Station, if it could be reused, would have to be piped to the Hamilton Bowl Pump Station. The increased head on the pumping system and its associated construction cost make this option not viable.
- The existing Low-flow Pump Station is located where the project is to be constructed.
- The size is incapable of supporting the three pumps in the existing station required to maintain the existing level of flood protection.

[10] Weeks, Kay D. and Anne E. Grimer. 1995. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties *Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

[11] Moffat & Nichol. October 2006. *Hamilton Bowl Pump Station / Detention Basin Hydrology Analysis*. Long Beach, CA.

Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to recreation related to demolition of an historical resource to the maximum extent feasible. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant, unavoidable, adverse impact.

The EIR considered the No Project Alternative and three action alternatives, the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative. Each of the alternatives was determined to be infeasible.

Facts:

The City is cognizant that a project of this magnitude may generate environmental impacts to recreation. The City has identified in Section 3.11, *Recreation*, of the EIR, one mitigation measure, Measure Cultural-2, that will address the impact to recreation related to demolition of an historical resource.

Measure Cultural-2

Impacts related to the loss of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, shall be reduced through archival documentation of as-found conditions. Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services that documentation of the Low-flow Pump Station is completed by the applicant in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include large-format photographic recordation; a detailed historic narrative report including description, history, and statement of significance; measured architectural drawings (as built and/or current conditions); and a compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History. The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the National Park Service Heritage Documentation Program, Historic American Buildings Survey, for inclusion in the Library of Congress. Archival copies of the documentation also would be submitted to the Long Beach Public Library; the Historical Society of Long Beach; California State University, Long Beach; the Office of Historic Preservation; and the South Central Coastal Information Center where it would be available to local researchers.

Completion of this mitigation measure shall be monitored and enforced by the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services.

SECTION V
FINDINGS REGARDING ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives were analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Kroc Community Center (project) consistent with the recommendations of Section 15126.6 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, which require evaluation of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant project effects. The analysis of alternatives is limited to those that the City of Long Beach (City) determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. Section 15126.6(f) of the State CEQA Guidelines describes feasibility as being dependent on site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, consistency with other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and the ability of the project proponent to gain access to or acquire an alternative site. As a result of the analysis contained in the Kroc Community Center EIR regarding the economic, engineering, environmental, and social characteristics of the project and alternatives, the City recommends approval of the project. Support for the project is directly responsive to the ability to attain all of the objectives of the project and reduce impacts. Therefore, the project will meet all objectives of the project and reduce impacts.

Four alternatives were considered and evaluated in detail in the EIR, including the No Project Alternative and three alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project, particularly impacts related to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation. An alternative to extend the project frontage south onto East Pacific Coast Highway was determined to be infeasible for the project. As a result of the project formulation process, the City explored the alternatives to assess their ability to fulfill most of the basic objectives of the project. With the exception of the No Project Alternative, each of the alternatives would generally result in similar impacts, and each would be likely to result in several unavoidable significant adverse impacts (i.e., noise-related impacts). Alternatives addressed in the EIR were derived from work undertaken by the City, from comments that were received in response to the Notice of Preparation of the EIR, and from comments provided by interested parties that attended the public scoping meeting. The resulting range of alternatives considered in this EIR consists of the following four alternatives:

- No Project Alternative
- Reduced Site Alternative
- Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site)
- Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative

As required by CEQA, the No Project Alternative considers the effects of continuing to operate the project area as it currently exists. The additional alternatives evaluate the effects of a reduced project site, a site located in another portion of the City, or enhancing the existing recreational facilities surrounding the project area.

The ability of the project, the No Project Alternative, and the three alternatives listed above to meet the objectives of the project is summarized in Table V-1, *Summary of Project and Alternatives' Ability to Attain Project Objectives*.

Only the project was determined to meet the project objectives while the No Project Alternative met four project objectives, the Reduced Site Alternative met 8 of the 12 project alternatives, the Alternate

Site Alternative (former Sports Park site) met 10, and Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative met 7 of the 12 project alternatives (Table V-1, *Summary of Project and Alternatives' Ability to Attain Project Objectives*).

TABLE V-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES' ABILITY TO ATTAIN PROJECT OBJECTIVE

Objective	Project	No Project	Reduced Site Alternative	Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site)	Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative
1. Provide a safe recreational facility that meets the needs and interests of the residents in an underserved community.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Provide services to underserved individuals in the central area of the City of Long Beach and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill. The primary service area would be U.S. Census Tract Numbers 5733.00, 5752.02, 5751.01, 5751.02, and 5752.01 in the City of Long Beach, and 5734.02 in the City of Signal Hill.	Yes	Yes (but very limited)	Yes	No	Yes
3. Contain the passive and active recreation for a minimum of 32,000 square feet of gymnasium, 25,000 square feet for aquatic recreation, and 4 acres of playing fields.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
4. Have the ability to provide educational programming for a minimum of 300 adults and 100 children at one time and the capacity to serve a minimum of 100 families within the same facility.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
5. Offer social programs (such as job training, family resources, and health seminars) to accommodate up to 450 people at one time.	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
6. Be accessible to public transit.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
7. Encourage positive social and recreational opportunities to an ethnically diverse community.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
8. Stimulate stability and growth in an economically challenged neighborhood.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
9. Create a sustainable facility that reflects the requirements of the City of Long Beach interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development.	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
10. Be consistent with Kroc Foundation Grant requirements.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
11. Be consistent with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit requirements.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
12. Maintain water detention capability of approximately 160 acre feet.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Based on the analysis provided in the EIR, only the No Project Alternative is capable of reducing the significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation to below the level of significance. Significant impacts would remain as a result of the other alternatives: the Reduced Site Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site), and the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative that were analyzed in this EIR. Table V-2, *Comparative Analysis of Impacts for Project and Alternatives,* provides a comparative analysis for the project, the No Project Alternative, and the three alternatives discussed in this document.

Evaluation of a no project alternative is required, as well as an environmentally superior alternative if the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. For this project, the Environmentally Superior Action Alternative is the No Project Alternative. This alternative is capable of reducing the impact on the significant impacts discussed above; however, it would not provide the benefits that will result from development of the project and only meets four of the 12 project objectives. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would be the environmental superior alternative for the project. While this alternative would avoid the significant impacts related to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, and recreation; as with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to noise. Furthermore and as previously discussed, this alternative would fail to meet all of the project objectives.

TABLE V-2
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS FOR PROJECT AND FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

RESOURCE	Project	No Project	Reduced Site Alternative	Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site)	Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative
Aesthetics	Demolition of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station will result in a significant impact related to the substantial degradation of this existing visual character of the site and its surroundings. *Impact:* Significant and unavoidable	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to aesthetics. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to aesthetics. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to aesthetics. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to aesthetics. *Comparative Impact:* Positive
Air Quality	Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts to air quality related to maximum daily PM_{10} emissions, $PM_{2.5}$ emissions, NO_x emissions, and fugitive dust impact (ambient air quality). *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to ambient air quality. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to ambient air quality. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to ambient air quality. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to ambient air quality. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Biological Resources	No significant impacts related to biological resources will arise from implementation of the project. *Impact:* None	As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological resources. *Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological resources. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological resources. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological resources. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Cultural Resources	Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts to cultural resources related to an adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource, a historic period archaeological resource, historical resources, and to resources related to human remains. *Impact:* Significant and unavoidable (as it is related to the demolition of an historical resource)	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources. *Comparative Impact:* Positive
Geology and Soils	Implementation of the project will be expected to result in potentially significant impacts related to surface fault rupture of a known earthquake fault, grading activities, and strong seismic ground shaking. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Implementation of the project will be expected to result in hazards and hazardous materials impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and to safety hazards for people working or residing in the project area in the vicinity of an airport land use plan, a public airport, or a public-use airport. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Hydrology and Water Quality	Implementation of the project will be expected to result in significant impacts in relation to surface water quality. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	Unlike the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. *Comparative Impact:* Negative

TABLE V-2
COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF IMPACTS FOR PROJECT AND FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES, Continued

RESOURCE	Project	No Project	Reduced Site Alternative	Alternate Site Alternative (former Sports Park site)	Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative
National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)	Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts related to NPDES,, which would result in an impact from loss of pervious surfaces, to total increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways, and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site will be expected to contribute additional pollutants to storm water runoff. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to NPDES. *Comparative Impact* :Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to NPDES. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to NPDES. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to NPDES. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Land Use and Planning	Implementation of the project will result in significant impacts to land use and planning related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a potential historic resource. *Impact:* Significant and unavoidable	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to land use and planning. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to land use and planning. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not be expected to result in significant impacts to land use and planning. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not be expected to result in significant impacts to land use and planning. *Comparative Impact:* Positive
Noise	Implementation of the project will be anticipated to result in the following significant impacts: exposure of persons to or generation of construction-related noise levels in excess of applicable standards, substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above those existing without the project, a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above those existing without the project, exposure of persons to or generation of outdoor activity–related noise levels in excess of applicable standards, and exposure of persons to or generation of parking-related noise levels in excess of applicable standards. *Impact:* Significant and unavoidable (as it relates to noise during construction)	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to noise. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to noise. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to noise. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts related to noise. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Recreation	Implementation of the project will have the potential to result in indirect significant impacts to recreation constituting a significant adverse effect on the environment. *Impact:* Significant and unavoidable	As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation. *Comparative Impact:* Positive
Traffic and Transportation	Implementation of the project will result in significant traffic and transportation impacts related to site access, increasing hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses, and cumulative transportation and traffic impacts. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in impacts to traffic and transportation. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to traffic and transportation. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to traffic and transportation. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to traffic and transportation. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral
Utilities and Service Systems	Implementation of the project has the potential to impact the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, related to insufficient water supplies solid waste. *Impact:* Mitigated below the level of significance	Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts related to utilities and service systems. *Comparative Impact:* Positive	As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to utilities and service systems. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would demonstrate the same impact on utilities and service systems as that caused by the project. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral	As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would demonstrate the same impact on utilities and service systems as that caused by the project. *Comparative Impact:* Neutral

V.A NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: Under the No Project Alternative, the existing conditions described in this document would remain unchanged. The recreational activities conducted at the site would remain unchanged. Similarly, the site and structures would remain without any alterations or improvements.

Effectiveness in Meeting Project Objectives: Under the No Project Alternative, the objectives of the project would not be met. This alternative meets only 3 of the 12 objectives discussed in the EIR. The summary of this alternative's ability to meet the objectives is described in Table V-1.

Comparison of Effects of the Alternative to Effects of the Project: The regulatory framework and existing conditions would be the same as that described for the project. A summary comparison of this alternative to impacts of the project is presented in Table V-2. The analysis presented in the table shows that this alternative would not result in the significant impacts that would be anticipated as a result of the project.

- Aesthetics - The No Project Alternative would retain the site's existing 19 acres of undeveloped land without additional construction, operation, or maintenance associated with new construction, therefore avoiding any visible obstruction of scenic vistas or resources present in the surrounding area from sensitive viewpoints. As with the project, this alternative would avoid substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway. Similarly, the No Project Alternative would avoid any potential adverse effects of lighting and glare as well as inconsistency of the building with surrounding visual character due to the absence of interior and exterior lighting, potentially reflective building materials, and divergent design plans. In addition, the No Project Alternative would avoid demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, an historical resource pursuant to CEQA, therefore preventing any significant impact to the existing visual character of the site.

- Air Quality - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline condition. The No Project Alternative would not require grading or the use of construction equipment or mobile or stationary facilities, thus avoiding any potentially significant impacts to air quality from fugitive dust emissions, NO_x emissions, or the possible release of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or greenhouse gases. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan, violate any existing air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential short-term, construction-related significant impacts to air quality that would result from emissions from short-term construction equipment and long-term vehicular emissions from the anticipated increase in vehicle miles traveled to the project by employees, clients, and visitors.

- Biological Resources - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. As documented during site assessments performed in October 2007, several lepidopteran species were observed at the project site and while the site area was noted as being disturbed and composed of ruderal non-native species, the site was determined to be suitable to

support common butterfly species.[1] As such, the No Project Alternative would avoid affecting 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 (CDFG) or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and any riparian habitat or other sensitive species or natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

- Cultural Resources - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. As such, there would be no excavations or disturbance of the existing site and the No Project Alternative would not be expected to result in significant impacts to cultural resources related directly or indirectly to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. The No Project Alternative would not result in the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not require demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station. Finally, the No Project Alternative would not involve any ground-disturbing activities that could result in the potential disruption of an unanticipated encounter of human remains.

- Geology and Soils - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The No Project Alternative would not require grading, thus avoiding any potentially significant impacts to geology and soils with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil from fugitive dust. The No Project Alternative would not have the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects, result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil, be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, be located on expansive soil, or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential significant impacts to geology and soils that would result from a location near a known earthquake fault, or erosion due to grading activities.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The No Project Alternative would not release hazardous materials into the environment; cause hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school; be located on a hazardous materials site; be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip; interfere with an emergency plan; or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or be located near a public airport.

- Hydrology and Water Quality - The No Project Alternative would retain the site's existing 19 acres of undeveloped land without additional construction, operation,

[1] Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 22 October 2008. Memorandum for the Record, 1222-004, No. 3. Pasadena, CA.

demolition, clearing, stockpiling of soils and materials, concrete pouring, landscaping, maintenance, and other activities associated with the project that would create short-term impacts on surface water quality. Similarly, the No Project Alternative would avoid any potential adverse effects on drainage and groundwater supplies due to the absence of a need for drainage from the project site and need to alleviate any erosion or siltation due to the implementation of the project. The No Project Alternative also avoids any significant impact on hydrology related to the 100-year flood zone, seiche, tsunamis, and mudflows.

- NPDES - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in the loss of pervious surfaces. The project would include upgrades to the drainage infrastructure to accommodate the project and to improve drainage from the project site. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not include upgrades to the drainage infrastructure to accommodate the project and to improve drainage from the project site and would maintain the site as it currently exists. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would avoid impacts to storm drain and waterway in the form of additional pollutants to storm water runoff generated by an increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways, and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site.

- Land Use and Planning - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not physically divide an established community. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, an historical resource. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with a policy in the City General Plan concerning preservation of historic homes and buildings. The No Project Alternative area would not be located in an area or adopted as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan.[2] The No Project Alternative area is not located in an area or adopted as part of a natural community conservation plan.[3] Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or natural community conservation plan.

- Noise - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. Therefore, unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in potentially significant impacts to noise related to temporary increases in ambient noise due to construction. The No Project Alternative would also avoid long-term increases in ambient noise levels related to outdoor activity and parking that exceed applicable standards. As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not be located within an airport plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. The No Project Alternative would also not be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

[2] City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building. 1973. *City of Long Beach General Plan, Conservation Element.* Long Beach, CA.

[3] California Department of Fish and Game. Accessed 28 June 2007. Web site. "Natural Community Conservation Planning." Sacramento, CA. Available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/

- Recreation - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts in relation to the accelerated physical deterioration of existing neighborhood recreational facilities. As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would avoid demolition of a historical resource (the Low-flow Pump Station), which has been identified on the project site, thus avoiding the significant indirect impact associated with the project.

- Transportation and Traffic - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would avoid potential temporary significant impacts to traffic that would result from the construction of the project. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not generate any additional traffic. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not adversely impact the level of service (LOS) at any of the 12 key study intersections and would avoid significant impacts in relation to the acceptable LOS at key study intersections. As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in impacts to transportation and traffic related to a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not include a design feature or incompatible uses that would substantially increase hazards. In addition, the No Project Alternative would not generate any additional trips and would not result in impacts to emergency vehicle access/egress or alter any existing emergency access routes. Furthermore, the No Project Alternative would not increase the capacity for visitors and would not result in impacts in terms of inadequate parking capacity. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not incorporate measures designed to encourage alternative transportation. However, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

- Utilities and Services Systems - The No Project Alternative would not involve any construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not be is expected to generate additional wastewater that would flow into the existing system, and as such, the No Project Alternative would not be expected to result in significant impacts to utilities related to the exceeding of wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As with the project, the No Project Alternative would not generate more wastewater that would overburden the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant's (JWPCP) current capacity and require the additional wastewater treatment facilities. Further, like the project, the No Project Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to the storm drain system or water supply. Unlike the project, the No Project Alternative would not result in impacts related to the wastewater treatment capacity or solid waste.

Feasibility: This Alternative is not feasible.

Facts: The above feasibility finding is based on the following:

- This No Project Alternative would only meet 4 of the 12 objectives of the project (Table V-1).

- The No Project Alternative would not provide the social, educational, and recreational opportunities that were identified for the project. The existing project site allows for limited recreational opportunities and experiences for the diverse needs and interests of the community and neighboring areas.

- The No Project Alternative would present no improvements to the baseline existing conditions.

V.B REDUCED SITE ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: The Reduced Site Alternative would consist of development of a recreational facility at a reduced scale. Under this alternative, the facility would be reduced in size by 15 percent. The Reduced Site Alternative would develop up to 5.95 acres of the project site for the development of a roughly 144,956-square-foot building, which would sit atop approximately 259,182 square feet of raised building pads.

Effectiveness in Meeting Project Objectives: This alternative meets 8 of the 12 project objectives discussed in discussed in the EIR. The summary of this alternative's ability to meet the objectives is described in Table V-1.

Comparison of Effects of the Alternative to Effects of the Project: The regulatory framework and existing conditions would be the same as that described for the project. A summary comparison of the effects of this alternative to the effects of the project is presented in Table V-2. The table shows that this alternative is similar to the project in it potential impacts.

- Aesthetics – As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative avoids substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway and would not result in significant impacts related to scenic resources. The Reduced Site Alternative would involve the construction of a recreational facility and construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions, including demolition of the historically designated Low-flow Pump Station, thus resulting in potentially long-term significant impacts to the visual character of the site. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not involve potential adverse effects of lighting and glare because the construction of the parking lot and usage of security and walkway lighting would not significantly contribute to increased nighttime lighting levels. As such, the Reduced Site Alternative would not create a substantial increase in the amount of glare to the already lit, urbanized setting of the project area.

- Air Quality - The Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Reduced Site Alternative would require grading and the use of construction equipment, mobile equipment, and stationary facilities, thus resulting in potentially significant impacts to air quality from fugitive dust emissions, NO_x emissions, or the possible release of VOCs or greenhouse gases. The Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan, violate any existing air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and create objectionable odors. As with the

project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential for significant impacts to air quality as a result of short-term construction equipment emissions and long-term vehicular emissions from the anticipated increase in vehicle miles traveled to the recreational facility by employees and visitors.

- Biological Resources - As with the project, there would be no impacts to biological resources with the Reduced Site Alternative. Although the site is disturbed and comprised of ruderal non-native species, several lepidopteran species were observed at the project site.[4] This Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction that disturbs the existing environmental setting but at a reduced scale of 15 percent. Furthermore, this alternative would entail the same elements as the project. Specifically, landscaping at the reduced project site would be consistent with the plant species and vegetation for the area. Planting of vegetation would consist of plant species that would continue to support the presence of the identified lepidopteran (specifically butterfly) species at the project site, as well as the additional wildlife that would be supported by these plants.[5] As such, the Reduced Site Alternative would avoid affecting species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS, and any riparian habitat or other sensitive species or natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. The Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan.

- Cultural Resources - As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would entail the same project elements as those described in the project. Although the construction-related activity would be conducted at a reduced scale, the Reduced Site Alternative would entail construction-related activities including excavation and ground disturbance, and would require the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station and Public Restrooms. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would include excavations and disturbance of the existing site that would have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources related directly or indirectly to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. Also like the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would entail physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. As previously mentioned, the Reduced Site Alternative would require demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station. Also like the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would involve ground-disturbing activities that could result in the potential disruption of an unanticipated encounter of human remains.

- Geology and Soils - The Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Reduced Site Alternative would require grading, thus resulting in potentially significant impacts to geology and soils with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil from fugitive dust. The Reduced Site Alternative would not be expected to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, be located on

[4] Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 22 October 2008. Memorandum for the Record, 1222-004, No. 3. Pasadena, CA.

[5] Sapphos Environmental, Inc. 22 October 2008. Memorandum for the Record, 1222-004, No. 3. Pasadena, CA.

expansive soil, or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to location near a known earthquake fault and would have the potential to result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil due to grading activities.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials - The Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Reduced Site Alternative would require less construction than the project, but could still result in potentially significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials with respect to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials due to any fuels, lubricants, or other construction-related hazardous materials that may be used. The Reduced Site Alternative would not be expected to release hazardous materials into the environment; cause hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school; be located on a hazardous materials site; be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip; interfere with an emergency plan; or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and location near a public airport.

- Hydrology and Water Quality - The Reduced Site Alternative would involve activities associated with the project's construction such as demolition, clearing, stockpiling of soils and materials, concrete pouring, and landscaping, thus creating short-term impacts on surface water quality. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would have the potential to violate drainage standards because the 10th Street storm drain intended to support the project would not have enough capacity to pass a 50-year design storm; however, like the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would entail design features that would avoid this significant impact. Like the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to ground water supplies or recharge due to the distance of these areas from the project site. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to resulting impacts related to a 100-year flood or seiche, tsunamis, or mudflows.

- NPDES - As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction, operation, or maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would include upgrades to the drainage infrastructure to accommodate the project and to improve drainage from the project site. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would include construction of facilities that would result in significant impacts from the loss of pervious surfaces. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to storm drain and waterway in the form of additional pollutants to storm water runoff generated by an increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site.

- Land Use and Planning - As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would be developed in a manner that is consistent with the surrounding community. Therefore, the Reduced Site Alternative would not physically divide a community. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would result in the demolition of the Low-flow

Pump Station, a historical resource, and as a result would conflict with a policy in the City General Plan concerning preservation of historic homes and buildings. The Reduced Site Alternative would not be located in an area or adopted as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan[6] or in an area or adopted as part of a natural community conservation plan.[7] Therefore, the Reduced Site Alternative would not conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or natural community conservation plan. Since there would be potential impacts to land use and planning in terms of demolition of a historic resource that would conflict with a policy in the City General Plan, the Reduced Site Alternative would have result in a potentially significant impact to land use and planning. As with the project, implementation of mitigation measures would be expected to reduce anticipated significant impacts to land use and planning resulting from construction of the Reduced Site Alternative to the maximum extent feasible; however, as with the project, demolition of the historical resource would remain a significant impact to land use and planning due to its conflict with the City General Plan.

- Noise - Construction of the Reduced Site Alternative would be similar to the project, but would occur on a smaller scale. While the duration of the construction of the Reduced Site Alternative would be slightly less than that of the project due to its smaller scale, the peak noise levels of construction would remain the same as those anticipated for the project. As with the project, the construction of the Reduced Site Alternative would result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the alternative's site area on an intermittent basis. Operational noise levels would also be comparable to the project but slightly reduced as a result of less traffic noise and less noise due to a reduced occupancy level. As with the project, ambient noise increases due to outdoor activity and parking activity associated with the Reduced Site Alternative would also result in significant impacts in terms of a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

- Recreation - As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Reduced Site alternative lead to minimal physical deterioration of the nearby parks due to loss of public access to existing facilities, as well as reduce the amount of recreational field space available for sports and recreational activities during the construction phase. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative includes the construction of recreational facilities that would result in the demolition of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station that has been identified on the project site. Therefore, the Reduced Site Alternative would result in the same significant indirect impact associated with the project.

- Transportation and Traffic - As with the project, the construction-related traffic would potentially result in temporary significant impacts to traffic. The Reduced Site

[6] City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building. 1973. *City of Long Beach General Plan, Conservation Element*. Long Beach, CA.

[7] California Department of Fish and Game. Accessed 28 June 2007. Web site. "Natural Community Conservation Planning." Sacramento, CA. Available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/

Alternative would generate fewer long-term vehicle trips than the project due to its smaller capacity; however, as with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would still be expected to result in impacts in relation to the LOS at the intersection of Rose Avenue at East Pacific Coast Highway. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would be located outside of the limits of the Long Beach Airport Land Use Plan and would not result in impacts to transportation and traffic related to a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would include a secondary access point on Rose Avenue off of East Pacific Coast Highway, which would result in a significant impact in relation to an increased hazard due to the lack of a pedestrian crosswalk. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would include the construction of new emergency access routes to provide adequate emergency vehicle access/egress. The Reduced Site Alternative would incorporate adequate parking facilities to accommodate the anticipated visitors. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would incorporate measures designed to encourage alternative transportation and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

- Utilities and Service Systems - The Reduced Site Alternative would involve construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would be expected to generate additional wastewater that would flow into the existing system, and as such, the Reduced Site Alternative would be expected to result in significant impacts to utilities related to the exceeding of wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not generate more wastewater that would overburden JWPCP's current capacity and require the additional wastewater treatment facilities. Further, like the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts related to the storm drain system or water supply. As with the project, the Reduced Site Alternative would result in impacts related to the wastewater treatment capacity or solid waste.

Feasibility: This Alternative is infeasible.

Facts: The above feasibility finding is based on the following:

- The Reduced Site Alternative would only meet 8 of the 12 objectives of the project (Table V-1).

- The Reduced Site Alternative would be comparable to the project in terms of resulting in significant impacts; however, this alternative would only provide services to a fraction of the population that would be serviced by the project.

- The Reduced Site Alternative would not be capable of reducing the significant impacts that would result from the project to below the level of significance.

V.C ALTERNATE SITE ALTERNATIVE (FORMER SPORTS PARK SITE)

Description of Alternative: The Alternate Site Alternative would involve the development of the project recreational facility on a portion of the roughly 55-acre Sports Park site located in the City. The layout of the recreation uses and parking areas would be developed around the physical constraints of

the site, which include the Cherry Hill earthquake fault, topographic and geologic variations across the site, grading and water detention requirements, and continued operation of 19 oil wells (17 on site and 2 adjacent to the site). This site also includes a wetlands mitigation program, and an off-site location for wetlands mitigation has been identified along the San Gabriel River.

Effectiveness in Meeting Project Objectives: This alternative meets nine of the project objectives discussed in discussed in the EIR. The summary of this alternative's ability to meet the objectives is described in Table V-1.

Comparison of Effects of the Alternative to Effects of the Project: The regulatory framework and existing conditions would be the same as that described for the project. A summary comparison of this alternative to effects of the project is presented in Table V-2. The table shows that this alternative would be anticipated to result in positive impacts to: aesthetics, land use and planning, and recreation when compared to the project.

- Aesthetics - As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative avoids substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway and would not result in significant impacts related to scenic resources. The Alternate Site Alternative would involve the construction of a recreational facility and construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions at the location of the Alternate Site. However, this alternative would not include the demolition of the historically designated Low-flow Pump Station, as it would not be located on the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site, thereby avoiding this potentially significant impact to the visual character of the site. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not involve potential adverse effects of lighting and glare because the construction of the parking lot and usage of security and walkway lighting would not significantly contribute to increased nighttime lighting levels. As such, the Alternate Site Alternative would not create a substantial increase in the amount of glare to the already lit, urbanized setting of the project area.

- Air Quality - Although the Alternate Site Alternative would not require the demolition of the same structures as those identified at the project site, this alternative would involve construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Alternate Site Alternative would require grading and the use of construction equipment, mobile equipment, and stationary facilities, thus resulting in potentially significant impacts to air quality from fugitive dust emissions, NO_x emissions, or the possible release of VOCs or greenhouse gases. The Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan, violate any existing air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and create objectionable odors. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential for significant impacts to air quality as a result of short-term construction equipment emissions and long-term vehicular emissions from the anticipated increase in vehicle miles traveled to the recreational facility by employees and visitors.

- Biological Resources - It would be anticipated that this alternative would be required to adhere to comparable sustainable design and site elements as the project. As such, the Alternate Site Alternative would avoid affecting species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or

by CDFG or USFWS, and any riparian habitat or other sensitive species or natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. The Alternate Site Alternative would not have the potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan. As with the project, there would be no impacts to biological resources with the Alternate Site Alternative.

- Cultural Resources - As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would entail the same project elements as those described in the project. Although the construction-related activity would not occur at the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site, the Alternate Site Alternative would entail construction-related activities including excavation and ground disturbance, and would potentially require the demolition of the historic resources at the Alternate Site. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would include excavations and disturbance of the existing site that would have the potential to result in significant impacts to cultural resources related directly or indirectly to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. The Alternate Site Alternative would avoid demolition of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station and would thus avoid significant impacts to historic cultural resources. However, the Sports Park has not been subject to directed surveys and evaluation to assess the historical significance of oil wells and appurtenant facilities. Like the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would involve ground-disturbing activities that could result in the potential disruption of an unanticipated encounter of human remains.

- Geology and Soils - The Alternate Site Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Alternate Site Alternative would require grading, thus creating potentially significant impacts to geology and soils with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil from fugitive dust. The Alternate Site Alternative would not be expected to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, be located on expansive soil, or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to the location near a known earthquake fault, and would have the potential to result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil due to grading activities. Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would also have the potential to expose people and structures to substantial adverse effects due to close proximity to the Cherry Hill earthquake fault.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials - The Alternate Site Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in potentially significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials with respect to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials due to any fuels, lubricants, or other construction-related hazardous materials that may be used. The Alternate Site Alternative would not be expected to release hazardous materials into the environment; cause hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school; be located on a hazardous materials site; be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip; interfere with an emergency plan; or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland

fires. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and location near a public airport. Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would also have the potential to expose people and structures to potential substantial adverse effects due to the continued operation of 19 oil wells (17 on site and 2 adjacent to the site). The presence of these wells would create a significant safety hazard for the people that come to the center. In addition, the oil wells could create a hazard to the public or environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or potential fire hazards, or especially in the case that any accident conditions involve the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

- Hydrology and Water Quality - The Alternate Site Alternative would involve activities associated with the project's construction such as demolition, clearing, stockpiling of soils and materials, concrete pouring, and landscaping, thus creating short-term impacts on surface water quality. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would have the potential to violate drainage standards because existing drains intended to support the project may not have enough capacity to pass a 50-year design storm.

- NPDES - Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not include upgrades to the drainage infrastructure of the site, which would enhance the NPDES-compliance capabilities at the site. The physical makeup of the Alternate Site Alternative location would significantly limit the types of NPDES improvements that could be incorporated with the alternative; therefore, the Alternate Site Alternative would have greater impacts to drainage when compared with the project. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would result in significant impacts from the loss of pervious surfaces. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to storm drain and waterway in the form of additional pollutants to storm water runoff generated by an increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site.

- Land Use and Planning - As with the project, the construction of the recreational facility at this location would be consistent with the existing land uses at the Alternate Site, and this alternative would be located in a manner that is compatible with the existing community. Therefore, the Alternate Site Alternative would not cause a physical division within an established community. The Alternate Site Alternative would avoid demolition of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, and would thus avoid conflict with a policy in the City General Plan concerning preservation of historic homes and buildings. Therefore, unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not result in impacts to land use and planning related to a conflict with a policy in the City General Plan. The Alternate Site Alternative would not be located in an area or adopted as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan[8] or in an area or adopted as part of a natural community conservation plan.[9]

[8] City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building. 1973. *City of Long Beach General Plan, Conservation Element*. Long Beach, CA.

[9] California Department of Fish and Game. Accessed 28 June 2007. Web site. "Natural Community Conservation Planning." Sacramento, CA. Available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/

- Noise - The construction activities of the Alternate Site Alternative would be similar to the project, but at a different location. The peak noise levels of construction with the Alternate Site Alternative would remain the same as those anticipated for the project. As with the project, the construction of the Alternate Site Alternative would result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the alternative's site area on an intermittent basis. Operational impacts would also be comparable to the project. Ambient noise increases due to outdoor activity and parking activity associated with the Alternate Site Alternative would result in significant impacts in terms of a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

- Recreation - The Alternate Site alternative in the short term would lead to minimal physical deterioration of the nearby parks due to loss of public access to existing facilities. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. In addition, this alternative would not include the demolition of the historically designated Low-flow Pump Station, as it would not be located on the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site.

- Transportation and Traffic - As with the project, the construction-related traffic would potentially result in temporary significant impacts to traffic. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would generate additional long-term vehicle trips to the alternative's site and may result in impacts in relation to inadequate LOS at the intersections nearby the alternative's site. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not result in impacts to transportation and traffic related to a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Unlike the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would not include a design feature or incompatible use that would substantially increase hazards; however, like the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would include the construction of new emergency access routes to provide adequate emergency vehicle access/egress. The Alternate Site Alternative would incorporate adequate parking facilities to accommodate the visitors to the alternative. As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would incorporate measures designed to encourage alternative transportation and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

- Utilities and Service Systems - As with the project, the Alternate Site Alternative involves the construction of a recreational center that is expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements due to increased discharge of non-potable water from the facility. Similar to the project, the Alternate Site Alternative would reduce the capacity of water supply to be produced from its groundwater wells. An additional significant impact would be that the amount of water demanded over the course of the Alternate Site Alternative's development, and its operation may amount to an equal if not greater than amount of water needed to serve a 500-dwelling unit project. The Alternate Site Alternative would not avoid increases in amount of solid waste to be generated during and after development.

Feasibility: This Alternative is infeasible.

Facts: The above feasibility finding is based on the following:

- Although the Alternate Site Alternative would be capable of avoiding impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, and recreation related to removal of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, it was determined to be infeasible due to the inability to meet most of the basic objectives of the project, the potential to expose people and structures to seismic hazards from the Cherry Hill earthquake fault, and the unknown potential for impacts to cultural resources related to 17 oil wells and appurtenant facilities.

- The Alternate Site Alternative would only meet 10 of the 12 objectives of the project (Table V-1). Specifically, the Sports Park has insufficient area to accommodate primary project elements, including a minimum 32,000-square-foot gymnasium, 25,000 square feet of aquatic recreation, and 4 acres of playing fields. Lack of space for key project elements would not allow the provision of programming for a minimum of 300 adults and 100 children at one time.

- The Alternate Site Alternative would result in impacts that are comparable to the project.

- The proximity of the Cherry Hill earthquake fault would likely render the site infeasible due to the potential exposure of people and structures to hazards related to seismic activity.

- The Alternate Site Alternative would not be located in the project area, and as a result, would not provide the opportunities for the target service population identified for the project. The Alternate Site Alternative is located 0.9 mile south of the target area that it is intended to serve, and therefore would impair the delivery of social, educational, and recreational services and opportunities to a roughly 74,000-person underserved community residents of the City and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill.

V.D ENHANCE EXISTING FACILITIES ALTERNATIVE

Description of Alternative: The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative proposes the renovation of several facilities: Rotary Centennial; Martin Luther King, Jr. Park; Signal Hill Park; MacArthur Park; California Recreation Center; Orizaba Park maintained by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine; and a private gym, all located within a 1-mile radius of the roughly 74,000-person underserved community residents of the City and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill. Enhancing these facilities could entail a combination of internal and external improvements to these existing facilities.

Effectiveness in Meeting Project Objectives: This alternative meets six of the project objectives discussed in discussed in the EIR. The summary of this alternative's ability to meet the objectives is described in Table V-1.

Comparison of Effects of the Alternative to Effects of the Project: The regulatory framework and existing conditions would be the same as that described for the project. A summary comparison of this Alternative to effects of the project is presented in Table V-2. The table shows that this alternative would be anticipated to result in positive impacts when compared to the project with regards to the following issue areas: aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, and recreation. This

alternative would have an anticipated negative impact on hydrology and water quality when compared to the project.

- Aesthetics - As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative avoids substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway and would not result in significant impacts related to scenic resources. The Enhance Existing Facilities would retain the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site's existing 19 acres of undeveloped land and structures and would instead improve several existing recreational facilities in the project area. As such, this alternative would avoid the obstruction of scenic vistas or resources present in the surrounding area from sensitive viewpoints and would avoid demolition of the historically designated Low-flow Pump Station. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not involve potential adverse effects of lighting and glare because of any addition to the existing facilities, and usage of additional security and walkway lighting would not significantly contribute to increased nighttime lighting levels. As such, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not create a substantial increase in the amount of glare to the already lit, urbanized setting of the existing facilities.

- Air Quality - The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would involve construction, operation, and maintenance activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would require grading and the use of construction equipment, mobile equipment, and stationary facilities, thus resulting in potentially significant impacts to air quality from fugitive dust emissions, NO_x emissions, or the possible release of VOCs or greenhouse gases. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to conflict with the Air Quality Management Plan, violate any existing air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and create objectionable odors. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential for significant impacts to air quality as a result of short-term construction equipment emissions and long-term vehicular emissions from the anticipated increase in vehicle miles traveled to the recreational facility by employees and visitors.

- Biological Resources - Although the construction scenarios and elements at each existing facility would vary, it could be assumed that the existing facilities are located on disturbed land containing a majority of non-native species. It could further be assumed that because the existing facilities would be located on developed sites, these sites would lack suitable habitat to support many listed species. As such, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would avoid affecting any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFG or USFWS, and any riparian habitat or other sensitive species or natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFG or USWFS. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state Habitat Conservation Plan. As with the project, there would be no impacts to biological resources with the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative.

- Cultural Resources - The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would entail renovations and improvements to existing facilities. Unlike the project, the construction-related activity with the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would occur at various sites and would be limited to previously disturbed sites and existing structures, which would be enhanced to accommodate recreational activities that are comparable to those being at the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site. As such, there would be no excavations or disturbance of the existing site beyond the previously disturbed areas, and the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not be expected to result in significant impacts to cultural resources related directly or indirectly to the destruction of a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not entail the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of a resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of a historical resource would be materially impaired. Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not require demolition of any historical resources. Finally, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not involve any ground-disturbing activities that could result in the potential disruption of an unanticipated encounter of human remains.

- Geology and Soils - The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would require less grading than the project, but would still have the potential to result in significant impacts to geology and soils with respect to erosion or loss of topsoil from fugitive dust. The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would not be expected to be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, be located on expansive soil, or have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available. As with the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to location near a known earthquake fault and would have the potential to result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil due to grading activities.

- Hazards and Hazardous Materials - The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would involve construction activities beyond the baseline conditions. The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would require less construction than the project, but would have the potential to result in significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials with respect to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials due to any fuels, lubricants, or other construction-related hazardous materials that may be used. The Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would not be expected to release hazardous materials into the environment; cause hazardous emissions within 0.25 mile of a school; be located on a hazardous materials site; be located within 2 miles of a private airstrip; interfere with an emergency plan; or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. As with the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative would have the potential to result in significant impacts to the public or the environment related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials and location near a public airport. Unlike the project, the Enhanced Existing Facilities Alternative may result in additional impacts to hazards and hazardous materials due to disposal of asbestos or lead paint in the existing structures.

- Hydrology and Water Quality - The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would require the same construction activities, including demolition, clearing, stockpiling of soils and materials, concrete pouring, and landscaping, thus creating short-term impacts on surface water quality. Because the named parks (Rotary Centennial; Martin Luther King, Jr. Park; Signal Hill Park; MacArthur Park; California Recreation Center; and Orizaba Park) maintained by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine are not detention basins and not known to be groundwater discharge areas, the existing storm water and drainage systems at these parks may not be adequate to support the anticipated needs of increased recreational use, and therefore causing a significant potential impact to drainage and groundwater.

- NPDES - Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not include upgrades to the drainage infrastructure of the sites, which would enhance the NPDES-compliance capabilities at the sites. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would result in significant impacts from the loss of pervious surfaces. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would result in less than significant impacts to storm drain and waterway in the form of additional pollutants to storm water runoff generated by an increase in vehicular trips on roadways and driveways and the associated increase in parking surrounding the project site.

- Land Use and Planning - As with the project, the construction of the recreational facility at these locations would be consistent with the existing land uses on the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative site, and this alternative would be located in a manner that is compatible with the existing community. Therefore, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not cause a physical division within an established community. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would avoid demolition of an historical resource and would thus avoid conflict with a policy in the City General Plan concerning preservation of historic homes and buildings. Therefore, unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not result in impacts to land use and planning related to a conflict with a policy in the City General Plan. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not be located in an area or adopted as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan[10] or in an area or adopted as part of a natural community conservation plan.[11]

- Noise - Under the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative, the peak noise levels of construction would be similar to those anticipated for the project because similar construction-related activities would occur during the renovation of existing facilities. As with the project, the construction of the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would result in a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the alternative's site on an intermittent basis. Operational impacts would also be comparable to the project but might be slightly reduced as a result of less traffic noise and less noise due to a reduced occupancy level at each facility.

[10] City of Long Beach, Department of Planning and Building. 1973. *City of Long Beach General Plan, Conservation Element*. Long Beach, CA.

[11] California Department of Fish and Game. Accessed 28 June 2007. Web site. "Natural Community Conservation Planning." Sacramento, CA. Available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/nccp/

- Recreation - The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would lead to minimal physical deterioration of the nearby parks due to the provision of enhancement of the existing facilities. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not have the potential to result in significant impacts to recreation related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that may have an adverse physical effect on the environment. In addition, this alternative would not include the demolition of the historically designated Low-flow Pump Station, as it would not be located on the Hamilton Bowl / Chittick Field site.

- Transportation and Traffic - As with the project, the construction-related traffic would potentially result in temporary significant impacts to traffic. Enhancing several facilities throughout the community would cause an increase in traffic and number of vehicle trips to each facility. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would generate additional long-term vehicle trips to the alternative's site and may result in impacts in relation to inadequate LOS at the intersections nearby the alternative's site. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not result in impacts to transportation and traffic related to a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. Unlike the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not include a design feature or incompatible use that would substantially increase hazards. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would provide adequate emergency vehicle access/egress to the alternative's site. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would incorporate adequate parking facilities to accommodate the visitors to the alternative. As with the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would incorporate measures designed to encourage alternative transportation and would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

- Utilities and Service Systems - The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative involves the renovation of various recreational facilities that may exceed wastewater treatment requirements due to increased discharge of non-potable water from the facility. Similar to the project, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would reduce the capacity of water supply to be produced from its groundwater wells, if present. An additional significant impact would be that the amount of water demanded over the course of the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative's development, and its operation may amount to an equal if not greater than amount of water needed to serve the existing facilities. The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would not avoid increases in amount of solid waste to be generated during and after development.

Feasibility: This Alternative is infeasible.

Facts: The above feasibility finding is based on the following:

- Although the Existing Facilities Alternative would be capable of avoiding impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, and recreation related to removal of an historical resource, the Low-flow Pump Station, it was determined to be infeasible due to the inability to meet most of the basic objectives of the project and economic infeasibility due to lack of consistency with the requirements of the Kroc Foundation Grant, the specified funding source for the project.

- The Existing Facilities Alternative would not avoid the significant, unavoidable, adverse construction impacts to ambient air quality and noise levels. Such impacts would potentially be dispersed to seven locations throughout the City.

- A fatal flaw of this alternative is the inconsistency with the requirements of the Kroc Foundation Grant rendering it infeasible due to lack of a funding source.

- The Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative would only meet 7 of the 12 objectives of the project (Table V-1). Specifically, the Enhance Existing Facilities Alternative has insufficient area to accommodate primary project elements, including a minimum 32,000-square-foot gymnasium, 25,000 square feet of aquatic recreation, and 4 acres of playing fields. Lack of space for key project elements would not allow the provision of programming for a minimum of 300 adults and 100 children at one time, or the ability to accommodate up to 450 people for social programs at one time.

- This alternative would be costly as improvements to each of the seven recreational facilities identified in this alternative would vary with the type and cost of the improvements required.

- The construction time and coordination associated with the renovation and improvements to up to seven recreational facilities mentioned would take more time and distribute construction-related impacts to air quality, noise and traffic to seven dispersed locations throughout the City.

- The use of seven dispersed locations to provide social, educational, and recreational programming would place the specified services at distances within a 1-mile radius from the target population; therefore, a dispersed location strategy would be infeasible for providing services to a roughly 74,000-person underserved community residents of the City and the City of Signal Hill.

SECTION VI
FINDINGS REGARDING MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

VI.A REQUIREMENTS OF MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

According to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the California Environmental Quality Act, requires that when a public agency is making the findings required by Sections 21081, the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

The City of Long Beach (City) hereby finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Program meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing a monitoring program designed to ensure compliance during project implementation with mitigation measures adopted by the City.

SECTION VII
FINDINGS REGARDING LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF DOCUMENTS

VII.A LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF DOCUMENTS

Section 15091(e) of the California Code of Regulations, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines requires the public agency to specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the decision is based. Section 10.0 of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) contains a list of all references used in the preparation of the environmental analysis. Unless otherwise noted, reference materials are located at the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services, which shall also serve as the custodian of the documents constituting the record of proceedings upon which the City of Long Beach has based its decision related to the project. The designated location and custodian of documents is as follows:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services
Attention: Ms. Jill Griffiths
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 4th Floor
Long Beach, California 90802
E-mail: jill_griffiths@longbeach.gov

References not available from the City of Long Beach Department of Development Services are located at Sapphos Environmental, Inc. by contacting:

Sapphos Environmental, Inc.
Ms. Eimon Raoof
430 North Halstead Street
Pasadena, California 91107
Phone: (626) 683-3547
E-mail: eraoof@sapphosenvironmental.com

SECTION VIII
CERTIFICATION REGARDING INDEPENDENT JUDGEMENT

Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c) of the Public Resources Code, the City of Long Beach (City) certifies that the Department of Development Services and the City Council have independently reviewed and analyzed the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on behalf of the City. The Department of Development Services, other City staff, the City of Long Beach Planning Commission, and the City Council reviewed the Draft EIR and supporting technical appendices and required changes to those documents prior to circulation for public review. The Draft EIR circulated for public review reflected the independent judgment of the City. The Final EIR similarly has been subject to review and revision by the Department of Development Services staff and reflects the independent judgment of the City.

SECTION IX
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with Section 15093 of State CEQA Guidelines, the City of Long Beach Planning Commission, and the City of Long Beach City Council (City Council) has determined that the educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental risks. The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identified and discussed significant impacts to: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), land use and planning, noise, recreation, traffic and transportation and utilities and services systems, that are expected as a result of implementing the Kroc Community Center. The Final EIR determined that the project will not result in impacts related to: agriculture resources, mineral resources, population and housing, and public services. With the implementation of the mitigation measures specified in the Final EIR, impacts to air quality, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, NPDES, and utilities and service systems will be mitigated to below the level of significance.

IX.I ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS

The EIR determined that the project is expected to result in significant unavoidable impacts to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation.

Aesthetics

Section 3.01, *Aesthetics*, of the Final EIR identified and evaluated significant impacts related to aesthetics. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to aesthetics to the maximum extent feasible, in terms of an historical resource (Low-flow Pump Station) scheduled for demolition. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant adverse impact.

Cultural Resources

Section 3.04, *Cultural Resources*, of the Final EIR identified and evaluated significant impacts related to cultural resources. Implementation of mitigation measures Cultural-1 and Cultural-3 will reduce impacts to cultural resources related to an adverse change in the significance of a paleontological resource or human remains to below the level of significance.

Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will reduce significant direct and cumulative impacts to historical resources scheduled for demolition to the maximum extent feasible. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant adverse impact.

Land Use and Planning

Section 3.09, *Land Use and Planning*, of the Final EIR identified and evaluated significant impacts related to land use and planning. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce anticipated significant impacts to land use and planning resulting from construction of the site to the maximum extent feasible; however, demolition of the historical resource remains a significant impact to land use and planning due to its conflict with the City General Plan.

Noise

Section 3.10, *Noise*, of the Final EIR identified and evaluated significant impacts related to noise. Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-1 will reduce noise levels by approximately 3 dBA. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-3 through Noise-6 will reduce noise levels by at least 10 dBA. Implementation of mitigation measures Noise-2 and Noise-7 will further assist in attenuating construction noise levels. While implementation of mitigation measures Noise-1 through Noise-7 will reduce construction-generated noise levels, noise levels will still exceed the 5-dBA significance threshold at multiple receptors. Therefore, construction-generated noise will still remain a significant adverse and unavoidable impact.

Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-8 will reduce outdoor activity noise levels at the single- and multi-family residential uses to the east of the site by approximately 5 dBA. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, these residential uses will experience a 4.7 dBA increase from outdoor activity over the existing ambient noise level. This level will not exceed the 5-dBA threshold for operational noise. Therefore, implementation of the mitigation measure Noise-8 will reduce significant impacts related to outdoor activity generated noise to below the level of significance.

Implementation of mitigation measure Noise-9 will reduce outdoor activity noise levels at the single- and multi-family residential uses to the east of the site by approximately 5 dBA. With the implementation of this mitigation measure, these residential uses will experience a 4.1-dBA increase from parking activity over the existing ambient noise level. This level will not exceed the 5-dBA threshold for operational noise. Therefore, implementation of mitigation measure Noise-9 will reduce significant impacts related to parking activity–generated noise to below the level of significance.

Recreation

Section 3.11, *Recreation*, of the Final EIR identified and evaluated significant impacts related to recreation. Implementation of mitigation measure Cultural-2 will be expected to reduce significant direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts to recreation to the maximum extent feasible, in terms of an historical resource scheduled for demolition. However, the demolition of this historical resource will still remain a significant adverse impact.

IX.2 OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The City of Long Beach Planning commission and the City of Long Beach City Council determined that the educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits of implementing the project, when balanced against all adverse effects, outweigh and override the unavoidable adverse effects of the project and cause those effects remaining after mitigation to be acceptable due to several considerations. The project offers significant opportunities and benefits that are not currently accessible or available in the surrounding community.

Educational

The project will present educational opportunities that are expected to support the community surrounding the project site. As discussed in the Final EIR, approximately 46 percent of the population is not employed and more than half of the population above the age of 25 years has less than a high school diploma. The project will have the ability to provide educational programming (i.e., library

space, computer labs, and classrooms) for a minimum of 300 adults and 100 children at one time and the capacity to serve a minimum of 100 families within the same facility.

It is anticipated that the educational programming available at the center will be developed to the needs and specification of the individuals accessing the center. The educational prospects and professional growth of these individuals will be enhanced by these opportunities.

Economic

The project will stimulate stability and growth in an economically challenged neighborhood. As discussed in the Final EIR, the community surrounding the project site consists primarily of families (an average of 3.67 persons per household), with approximately 18 percent of the households within a 1-mile radius of the site headed by a single parent and nearly 30 percent are below poverty level as opposed to roughly 9.2 percent nationally. As further discussed in the EIR and in the City General Plan Housing element, the proposed project is located in both a Community Development Block Grant area and in a Neighborhood Improvement Strategy Area. Both these designations represent underserved urban areas that require improvements based upon economic, social, and public indicators.

Programming at the center will be developed to target the economic needs of the community by hosting job training and other professional development classes, workshops, and events. The project itself will create new jobs in the community during construction and throughout the operation and maintenance of the center. Further the development of a modern structure will offer frontage and highlight this area as a burgeoning center for additional business, similar development, and may encourage future enhancements to the existing structures on neighboring lots and in the area surround the project site.

Environmental

The project will consist of a sustainable facility that reflects the requirements of the City's interim Green Building Requirements for Private Development. As discussed in the EIR, the project site is accessible to public transit and will be consistent with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards and NPDES permit requirements.

The project will implement environmentally sustainable practices during construction and throughout the life of the project. The environmental values embodied in this project reflect the City's commitment to sustainable development throughout the City and will serve to shape the environmental education process for the City by exposing residents to the project and to its benefits.

Recreation

The project will provide a safe recreational facility that meets the needs and interests of the residents in an underserved community. The site will contain the passive and active recreation for a minimum of 32,000 square feet of gymnasium, 25,000 square feet for aquatic recreation, and 4 acres of playing fields.

The size and nature of the recreational activities that will be available at this project site far surpass what is currently available at any one site within the project area. The number of individuals able to access the site at once will allow the recreational spaces to be utilized by many individuals and activities that other sites can not accommodate. Further the manicured green space at the site will be strategically situated to support the site functionally and beautify the site aesthetically.

Social

The project provides services to individuals in the central area of the City and the southwestern portion of the City of Signal Hill. As discussed in the EIR, the community is ethnically diverse with approximately 34 percent Hispanic, 23 percent Caucasian, 21 percent Asian, and 14 percent African American residents in the population within a 1-mile radius. The site will encourage the wealth of different, ethnicities, traditions, celebrations and practices located in this community to gather at a central location to share, learn, and grow from one another in a positive environment.

As previously discussed, the project will offer social programs (such as job training, family resources, and health seminars) to accommodate up to 450 people at one time. The programming at the site will encourage positive social and recreational opportunities to this ethnically diverse community. The programming will further encourage positive interactions and healthy, productive lifestyles for all individuals accessing the center.

IX.2.1 Overriding Considerations for Adverse Environmental Risks

The project is consistent with the City's commitment to the health, safety, and development of its residents and neighbors by providing quality service to its diverse community in ways that are helpful, caring and responsive.[1] The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits of the project, as discussed above, outweigh and override the unavoidable impacts related to aesthetics, cultural resources, land use and planning, noise, and recreation.

Aesthetics

The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits achieved through development of the project associated with the opportunities and services for residents of the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill override the visual character impact associated with aesthetics. The visual character of the existing site that will be lost through demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station will be documented in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include photographic recordation of the existing site, a detailed historic narrative report, measured architectural drawings, and compilation of historic research. The project further specifies measures to reduce this impact to the maximum extent possible. The aesthetics significant impact is overridden by the project's ability to provide facilities, programs, and services that encourage positive life-changing experiences for children and adults, strengthen families, and enrich the lives of individuals in the central area of Long Beach, California, and the neighboring City of Signal Hill.

Cultural Resources

The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits achieved through development of the project associated with the opportunities and services for residents of the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill override the demolition of this historical resource impact associated with cultural resources. The cultural resource that will be lost through demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station will be documented in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include photographic recordation of the existing site, a detailed historic narrative

[1] City of Long Beach City Values: What We Believe. 2009. Available at: http://www.ci.long-beach.ca.us/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=11628

report, measured architectural drawings, and compilation of historic research. The project further specifies measures to reduce this impact to the maximum extent practicable. The cultural resources significant impact is overridden by the project's ability to provide facilities, programs, and services that encourage positive life-changing experiences for children and adults, strengthen families, and enrich the lives of individuals in the central area of Long Beach, California, and the neighboring City of Signal Hill.

Land Use and Planning

The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits achieved through development of the project associated with the opportunities and services for residents of the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill override the land use and planning impact related to the project's conflict with the City General Plan. The project' s conflict with the City's General Plan, which is associated with the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, will be documented in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include photographic recordation of the existing site, a detailed historic narrative report, measured architectural drawings, and compilation of historic research. The project further specifies measures to reduce this impact to the maximum extent practicable. The land use and planning significant impact is overridden by the project's ability to provide facilities, programs, and services that encourage positive life-changing experiences for children and adults, strengthen families, and enrich the lives of individuals in the central area of Long Beach, California, and the neighboring City of Signal Hill.

Noise

The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits achieved through development of the project associated with the opportunities and services for residents of the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill override the short-term, construction-related impact associated with noise. The project provides elements and mitigation measures that are anticipated to significantly reduce noise levels in the neighboring areas. Implementation of noise mitigation measures will further reduce the short-term, construction-generated noise levels. The temporary noise significant impact is overridden by the project's ability to provide facilities, programs, and services that encourage positive life-changing experiences for children and adults, strengthen families, and enrich the lives of individuals in the central area of Long Beach, California, and the neighboring City of Signal Hill.

Recreation

The educational, economic, environmental, recreation, and social benefits achieved through development of the project associated with the opportunities and services for residents of the Cities of Long Beach and Signal Hill override the recreation impact associated with the demolition of a historical resource. The conflict associated with the demolition of the Low-flow Pump Station, will be documented in the form of a Historic American Buildings Survey that shall comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation*. The documentation shall include photographic recordation of the existing site, a detailed historic narrative report, measured architectural drawings, and compilation of historic research. The project further specifies measures to reduce this impact to the maximum extent practicable. The recreation significant impact is overridden by the project's ability to provide facilities, programs, and services that encourage positive life-changing experiences for children and adults, strengthen families, and enrich the lives of individuals in the central area of Long Beach, California, and the neighboring City of Signal Hill.

SECTION X
SECTION 15091 FINDINGS

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the record, the City of Long Beach (City) Department of Development Services, the City of Long Beach Planning Commission, and the City of Long Beach City Council has made the following findings with respect to the significant impacts on the environment resulting from the Kroc Community Center pursuant to Section 15091 of the State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identified in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

- The changes and alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of City. The City Board of Supervisors may designate The Salvation Army to implement certain measures as part of pre-construction, construction, and postconstruction activities. Pursuant to Section 15091(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Mitigation Monitoring Program identifies responsible agencies for the mitigation measures.

- The mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are feasible and will be required as conditions of approval.

Based on the foregoing findings and the substantial evidence contained in the record, and as conditioned by the foregoing findings:

- All significant effects on the environment due to the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.

- Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the overriding concerns set forth in the foregoing Statement of Overriding Considerations.