

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COLORADO LAGOON ESTUARY RESTORATION PROJECT
CITY OF LONG BEACH
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA



Historic Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1928

October 2010

FINAL
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

COLORADO LAGOON ESTUARY RESTORATION PROJECT
CITY OF LONG BEACH
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Lead Federal Agency:

The United States Army Corps of Engineers

Cooperating Agency:

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

In Partnership With:

The City of Long Beach

Co-Prepared by:

LSA Associates, Inc.
20 Executive Park, Suite 200
Irvine, California 92614-4731
(949) 553-0666

LSA Project No. CLB0803

October 2010

**U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
SOUTH PACIFIC DIVISION
LOS ANGELES DISTRICT**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE
COLORADO LAGOON ESTUARY RESTORATION PROJECT
CITY OF LONG BEACH
LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA**

I have reviewed the attached Environmental Assessment that has been prepared for the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project, located in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, California. The proposed federal action is to transport and dispose approximately 32,500 cubic yards of treated dredged material. The dredging activities proposed for the Lagoon are part of a multi-component project by the City of Long Beach known as the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007111034, approved September 2008). The quantity above is associated with the dredging and treatment of the contaminated sediment found in the western and central arms of the Lagoon. Approximately 26,000 cubic yards will be dredged from the western arm and 6,500 cubic yards from the central lagoon. Disposal of the dredged material would occur at the Port of Long Beach (POLB) Middle Harbor Contained Disposal Facility (CDF). The excavated material will be stabilized prior to transport with a cement stabilization treatment process.

The POLB Middle Harbor Project was subject to, and has received, a Department of the Army permit (SPL-2004-1053-AJS) from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), as well as Waste Discharge Requirements (R4-2010-0020) issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. These permitting actions identify conditions related to the disposal of sediment into the Middle Harbor CDF that would apply to this project. In addition, the Corps would commit to any of the conditions from the Coastal Development Permit (CDP 5-09-071), that are applicable to the transport and disposal of sediments in the Middle Harbor CDF, including water quality monitoring. It is anticipated that the dredging will occur over a four month period beginning in March 2011.

The need for the proposed project is the result of the existing degraded water and sediment quality within the Lagoon due to elevated levels of lead, zinc, chlordane, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the sediment; and, chlordane, dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT), dieldrin, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) in fish and mussel tissue. In addition, testing confirmed the presence of PCBs, cadmium, copper, mercury, and silver as secondary contaminants of concern. The purpose of dredging the Lagoon is to remove the contaminated sediment, and treat the contaminated sediments to levels below the hazardous waste criteria so as to make the sediment acceptable for discharge at the Middle Harbor CDF.

The proposed project will improve sediment and water quality by removing contaminated sediment and will support the City's efforts to restore the Lagoon by implementing an important component of the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project.

In compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) has been consulted regarding potential impacts to

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). Although adverse impacts will occur associated with dredging operations, NMFS believes the project will result in a net benefit to EFH. Furthermore, no federally-listed species will be adversely affected by project implementation. Therefore, Section 7 consultation is not required pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1969, as amended.

Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (36 CFR Part 800) has been completed. A letter was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) requesting concurrence with the Corps' determination that the project, as planned, will not involve impacts to properties eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. SHPO, in a letter dated July 23, 2010, has concurred with the Corps' determination (COE100720A), thus completing Section 106 compliance.

The Corps finds this project to be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the articles and provisions of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 and the California Coastal Act. The California Coastal Commission, in a letter dated October 5, 2010, has concurred with the Corps' Negative Determination (ND-049-10) and agrees with the Corps that the proposed activities are the same as those analyzed in the above-referenced CDP 5-09-071.

Other resources analyzed in this EA, including air and water quality, hydrology, noise, land and recreation uses, aesthetics, and ground transportation are not expected to result in significant adverse impacts.

Hence, I have considered the information contained in this Environmental Assessment and determined that the impacts resulting from the implementation of the proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact upon the existing environment or the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

DATE

R. Mark Toy, P.E.
Colonel, US Army
Commander and District Engineer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
APPENDICES	v
FIGURES	vi
TABLES	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATED TERMS	vii
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 PROPOSED ACTION	1
1.2 PROJECT LOCATION	1
1.3 PROJECT HISTORY	2
1.4 PURPOSE OF PROJECT AND NEED FOR ACTION.....	5
1.5 PREVIOUS PROJECTS.....	6
1.6 AUTHORIZATIONS	6
2.0 PROJECT PLAN	7
2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	7
2.2 Plan Formulation.....	8
2.2.1 Planning Objectives	8
2.3 ALTERNATIVES.....	8
2.3.1 No Action Alternative.....	8
2.3.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	9
2.3.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	9
2.3.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	10
2.3.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	11
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	12
3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT.....	12
3.1.1 Project Setting	12
3.1.2 Structural Geology	12
3.1.3 Liquefaction	17
3.1.4 Landslides	17

3.1.5	Subsidence	18
3.1.6	Expansive Soils	18
3.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	18
3.2.1	Habitats	19
3.2.2	Fish and Essential Fish Habitat	23
3.3	TRAFFIC	27
3.4	AIR QUALITY	28
3.4.1	Meteorology	28
3.4.2	Air Quality	28
3.5	NOISE	32
3.6	LAND USE AND RECREATION	35
3.6.1	Land Use	35
3.6.2	Recreation	37
3.7	AESTHETICS	42
3.7.1	Existing Visual Character in the Vicinity of the Project Site	42
3.7.2	Existing Visual Character of the Project Site	43
3.8	CULTURAL RESOURCES	45
3.8.1	Project Area History	45
3.8.2	Historical, Paleontological, and Archaeological Resources	46
3.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	46
3.9.1	Off-site Releases	50
3.10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	51
3.10.1	Regional Watershed	51
3.10.2	Local Watershed	51
3.10.3	Surface Water	53
3.10.4	Tidal Culvert	55
3.10.5	Tides	55
3.10.6	Tidal Influence and Flushing	56
3.10.7	Sediment Quality	59
3.10.8	Surface Water Quality	62
3.10.9	Groundwater Hydrology	63
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	65
4.1	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	65
4.1.1	No Action Alternative	65
4.1.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	65
4.1.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	66
4.1.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	66

4.1.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	66
4.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	67
4.2.1	No Action Alternative.....	67
4.2.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	67
4.2.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	69
4.2.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	70
4.2.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	70
4.3	TRAFFIC	71
4.3.1	No Action Alternative.....	71
4.3.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	71
4.3.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	74
4.3.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	74
4.3.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	75
4.4	AIR QUALITY	76
4.4.1	No Action Alternative.....	77
4.4.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	78
4.4.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	80
4.4.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	83
4.4.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	85
4.5	NOISE.....	87
4.5.1	No Action Alternative.....	87
4.5.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	88
4.5.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	91
4.5.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	92
4.5.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	93
4.6	LAND USE AND RECREATION.....	95
4.6.1	No Action Alternative.....	95
4.6.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)	95
4.6.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	97
4.6.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	99
4.6.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	99

4.7	AESTHETICS.....	99
4.7.1	No Action Alternative.....	99
4.7.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative) ...	100
4.7.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	101
4.7.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	101
4.7.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	102
4.8	CULTURAL RESOURCES	102
4.8.1	No Action Alternative.....	102
4.8.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative) ...	102
4.8.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	104
4.8.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	104
4.8.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	104
4.9	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	105
4.9.1	No Action Alternative.....	105
4.9.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative) ...	105
4.9.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	109
4.9.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	109
4.9.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	110
4.10	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.....	110
4.10.1	No Action Alternative.....	110
4.10.2	Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative) ...	110
4.10.3	Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)	113
4.10.4	Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)	113
4.10.5	Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative).....	113
5.0	UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS	115
6.0	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES	116
7.0	GROWTH INDUCEMENT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	117
7.1	GROWTH INDUCEMENT.....	117
7.2	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	117
8.0	ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS	120

8.1	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	120
8.2	TRAFFIC	120
8.3	AIR QUALITY	121
8.4	NOISE	121
8.5	LAND USE AND RECREATION	122
8.6	AESTHETICS	122
8.7	CULTURAL RESOURCES	122
9.0	COORDINATION	124
10.0	COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS	125
10.1	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969	125
10.2	CLEAN WATER ACT, SECTION 401	125
10.3	CLEAN WATER ACT, SECTION 404	125
10.4	COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1976 (PL 92-583; 16 USC 1456 ET SEQ.)	126
10.5	FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1972, SECTION 7(C)	126
10.6	MAGNUSON-STEVENSON FISHERY MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION ACT, AS AMENDED	127
10.7	NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT	127
10.8	FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT	127
10.9	CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970, AS AMENDED	128
10.10	MIGRATORY BIRD ACT, AS AMENDED	129
11.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	130
12.0	DISTRIBUTION LIST	131
13.0	REFERENCES	138

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project Draft Technical Report
Appendix B: Results of the Cultural Resources Assessment for the Colorado Lagoon
Appendix C: Determination of Eligibility – Long Beach Marine Stadium
Appendix D: Treatment of Colorado Lagoon Sediments
Appendix E: Correspondence and Responses to Comments

FIGURES

Figure 1.2-1: Project Location	3
Figure 1.2-2: Existing Conditions.....	4
Figure 3.1-1: Regional Geologic Constraints	13
Figure 3.1-2: Local Geologic Constraints.....	14
Figure 3.2-1: Existing Habitat Communities	20
Figure 3.6-1: Land Uses in the Project Vicinity	36
Figure 3.6-2: Long Beach Park Locations	38
Figure 3.6-3: Long Beach School Locations	40
Figure 3.8-1: Historical Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1928.....	47
Figure 3.8-2: Historical Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1947.....	48
Figure 3.8-3: Historical Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1968.....	49
Figure 3.10-1: Existing Lagoon – Bay Tidal Connection.....	52
Figure 3.10-2: Colorado Lagoon Watershed and Subbasins	54
Figure 4.3-1: Construction Haul Routes	73
Figure 4.5-1: Potential Dredging Material Treatment Areas	94
Figure 4.6-1: Proposed Staging and Stockpile Areas	98
Figure 4.9-1: Composite Areas and Sampling Locations	108

TABLES

Table 3.2.1: Summary of Vegetation Communities and Habitat Types	19
Table 3.2.2: Managed Fish/Invertebrate Species Potentially Occurring in the Colorado Lagoon, Alamitos Bay, and Greater Near-shore San Pedro Bay Area	26
Table 3.4.1: Ambient Air Quality Standards	31
Table 3.5.1: Exterior Noise Limits, LN (dBA).....	34
Table 3.5.2: Maximum Interior Sound Levels, LN (dBA)	34
Table 3.6.1: Long Beach Unified School District Schools near the Project Area	39
Table 3.10.1: Recorded Water Levels at Los Angeles Outer Harbor (1983–2001 Tidal Epoch).....	56
Table 4.3.1: Alternative 1 Construction Trips by Component.....	72
Table 4.3.2: Alternative 2 Construction Trips by Component.....	74
Table 4.3.3: Alternative 3 Construction Trips by Component.....	75
Table 4.3.4: Alternative 4 Construction Trips by Component.....	75
Table 4.4.1: Proposed Dredging Equipment.....	77
Table 4.4.2: Alternative 1 Dredging Activity Emissions.....	78
Table 4.4.3: Area Air Pollutant Emission Budget (tons Per Day)	79
Table 4.4.4: Alternative 2 Dredging Activity Emissions.....	81
Table 4.4.5: Alternative 3 Dredging Activity Emissions.....	84
Table 4.4.6: Alternative 4 Dredging Activity Emissions.....	86
Table 4.5.1: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels	89
Table 4.5.2: Typical Noise Attenuation Levels	90

LIST OF ABBREVIATED TERMS

°F	degrees Fahrenheit
µg/kg-dry	microgram per kilogram-dry
AAQS	ambient air quality standards
ac	acre/acres
af	acre-feet
amsl	above mean sea level
AQMP	Air Quality Management Plan
AR	Army Regulations
BACT	Best Available Control Technology
Basin	South Coast Air Basin
bgs	below ground surface
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
Cal-EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
California Register	California Register of Historical Resources
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CCA	California Coastal Act
CCC	California Coastal Commission
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDMG	California Division of Mines and Geology
CDP	Coastal Development Permit
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFP	California Fully Protected
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cfs	cubic feet per second
CGS	California Geological Survey
CHL	California Historical Landmarks
City	City of Long Beach
CNDDDB	California Natural Diversity Data Base

CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
CO _{2e}	CO ₂ equivalent
COC	Contaminant of Concern
County	Los Angeles County
Corps	United States Army Corps of Engineers
CSC	California Species of Concern
CSU	California State University
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
CVC	California Vehicle Code
CWA	Clean Water Act
cy	cubic yard/cubic yards
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibels
dBA	A-weighted decibels
DDT	dichloro-diphenyl-trichlorethane
DPW	Department of Public Works
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
EDR	Environmental Data Resources, Inc.
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	(Federal) Environmental Protection Agency
ERL	Effects Range Low
ERM	Effects Range Median
FESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FMPs	Fishery Management Plans
FOCL	Friends of the Colorado Lagoon
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FR	Federal Register
ft	Feet/foot
FWCA	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
g	gravity
GCC	Global Climate Change

GHG	Greenhouse gas
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HAPC	Habitat Area of Particular Concern
I-405	Interstate 405
I-605	Interstate 605
I-710	Interstate 710
km	kilometer
LACSD	Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts
LAFCO	Local Agency Formation Commission
Lagoon	Colorado Lagoon
LARWQCB	Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board
LBUSD	Long Beach Unified School District
L _{eq}	Equivalent Noise Level
LOS	Level of Service
LUST	leaking underground storage tank
MADEP	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
Magnuson Act	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mg/kg-dry	milligrams per kilogram dry
mg/L	milligrams per liter
MHHW	mean higher high water
mi	mile/miles
ml	milliliter
MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MLLW	mean lower low water
mph	mile per hour
MPN	most probable number
MSL	mean sea level
Mw	magnitude
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
ng/g-dry	nanograms per gram dry
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
nm	nautical mile
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO ₂	nitrogen dioxide

NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO _x	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O ₃	ozone
OEHHA	Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment
OVA	organic vapor analyzer
PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PBT	persistent bioaccumulative toxic
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyls
PCE	Passenger Car Equivalent
PCH	Pacific Coast Highway
PE	Pacific Electric
PEA	Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PHI	California Points of Historical Interests
PHMRF	Puente Hills Materials Recovery Facility
PM ₁₀	particulate matter of 10 micrometers or less
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter of 2.5 micrometers or less
POLB	Port of Long Beach
ppt	parts per thousand
RAG	Risk Assessment Guidance
ROC	Reactive Organic Compounds
ROW	right-of-way
ROWD	Report of Waste Discharge
RV	Recreational vehicle
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SA	Special Animal
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCCAT	Southern California Caulerpa Action Team
SCE	Southern California Edison
SEMP	Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy
SEERF	Southeast Resource Recovery Facility
sf	square feet
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SMMS	Synthetic Metals Mineralization System

SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SP	Special Plant
STLC	Soluble Threshold Limit Concentration
SUSMP	Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
T&E	Threatened and Endangered
TAD	Termino Avenue Drain
TADP	Termino Avenue Drain Project
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TMDL	total maximum daily loads
TTLC	total threshold limit concentrations
UBC	Uniform Building Code
USC	United States Code
USDoN	United States Department of the Navy
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
VOC	volatile organic compounds
WDID	Waste Discharge Identification
WDR	Waste Discharge Requirement
WET	waste extraction test
WMA	Water Management Area
WQC	Water Quality Certification

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PROPOSED ACTION

The Colorado Lagoon (Lagoon) is located in the City of Long Beach (City), Los Angeles County (County), California. The proposed federal action is to transport and dispose approximately 32,500 cubic yards of treated dredged material. The quantity above is associated with the City's dredging and treatment of the contaminated sediment found in the western and central arms of the Lagoon. The dredging activities proposed for the Lagoon are part of a multi-component project by the City of Long Beach known as the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2007111034, approved September 2008).

Disposal of the dredged material would occur at the Port of Long Beach (POLB) Middle Harbor Contained Disposal Facility (CDF). The dredged material previously determined to be contaminated with lead would be stabilized prior to transport with a cement stabilization treatment process. Four dredging alternatives are proposed. The alternatives vary with regard to the type of equipment used and the method of transport of the dredged material to the POLB disposal site. The POLB Middle Harbor Project was subject to, and has received, a Department of the Army permit (SPL-2004-1053-AJS) from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) for discharge of dredged and fill material at the Middle Harbor CDF pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The POLB would ensure that the discharge of dredged material from the Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project complies with applicable conditions of the Section 404 permit. It is anticipated that the dredging will occur over a four month period beginning in March 2011.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Restoration Center, National Marine Fisheries Service, is a cooperating agency in the Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project Environmental Assessment (EA), in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations, 40 CFR 1501.6. NOAA has special expertise in coastal and marine resources; federal jurisdiction by law under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Act and the Endangered Species Act, and will be providing financial assistance to this project. The Corps is the lead federal agency and NOAA is a cooperating agency.

1.2 PROJECT LOCATION

The Lagoon is an approximately 11.7-acre (ac) tidal water body located in the City. The Lagoon is owned and maintained as a City park by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine. Regional access to the Lagoon is provided by Interstate 405 (I-405), Interstate


605 (I-605), and Interstate 710 (I-710) to the north and west (refer to Figure 1.2-1). The Lagoon is primarily accessible from East Appian Way and East Colorado Street via Park Avenue from East 7th Street. However, many local streets provide access to the Lagoon and its surrounding areas. The Lagoon lies northwest of the mouth of the San Gabriel River and is north of Marine Stadium and Alamitos Bay. Connectivity of the Lagoon to Alamitos Bay and the Pacific Ocean is facilitated by a tidal culvert under Marina Vista Park that connects the Lagoon to Marine Stadium (refer to Figure 1.2-2).

1.3 PROJECT HISTORY

The Lagoon was once a part of the historic Los Cerritos Wetlands. In 1923, the low-lying tidelands of Alamitos Bay were dredged to form the Lagoon and Marine Stadium, which were used for recreational rowing. The City then purchased the Lagoon area and Recreation Park in the 1920s through general revenue bond funding. The 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Committee chose the Lagoon for diving trials and Marine Stadium for rowing events. High diving was performed from a three-story structure that was floating in the Lagoon. To prepare for the diving trials, the Lagoon was separated from Marine Stadium by a tide gate, which was installed to maintain adequate diving depth. In 1968, the City remodeled Marine Stadium for the Olympic rowing and canoeing team trials. Also, in the late 1960s, the area between what is now the north end of Marine Stadium and the south end of the Lagoon was filled and the existing underground box culvert was constructed, thereby further separating the Lagoon from Marine Stadium. This was undertaken as part of the construction for the then-proposed Pacific Coast Freeway. This “filled” area is now Marina Vista Park.

The deteriorated ecological health of the Lagoon is attributed to diminished tidal influence, and point source pollution, a process that has evolved over the past several decades. The Lagoon receives inflow from 11 storm water drains. Since the Lagoon is a natural low point in the watershed, it accumulates pollutants deposited over the entire watershed that enter the storm drains by storm flows and dry weather runoff. Additionally, accumulation of sediment and biomass has reduced the depth and capacity of the culvert, resulting in diminished tidal flushing at low tides and increased degradation of water quality.

The Lagoon’s watershed is 1,172 ac and composed of 773 ac of residential, 125 ac of commercial, 55 ac of institutional (schools), and 219 ac of open-space land uses. Urban runoff contains many pollutants such as heavy metals, pesticides, petroleum, hydrocarbons, nutrients, and bacteria. As a result, the Lagoon is listed in the 2002 and 2006 Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 303(d) lists as an impaired water body for lead, zinc, sediment toxicity, chlordane, dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane (DDT), dieldrin, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and bacteria. Beach advisory postings due to elevated bacteria levels are frequent.



LSA



0 1000 2000
FEET



Project Area

FIGURE 1.2-1

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project
Project Location

SOURCE: Thomas Guide, 2007

1:CLB0803/G/Location.cdr (3/22/2010)



LSA



- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Project Boundary | Existing Restrooms | Baseball Field |
| Culvert | Major System Outfall | Adult Soccer Field |
| Sand Nourishment Areas | Local Drain | Youth Soccer Field |
| Existing Storm Drain Pipelines | Indicates Drain Diverted by Termino Project | |

FIGURE 1.2-2

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project
Existing Conditions

SOURCE: Air Photo USA (2008), Moffat & Nichol (2007), Thomas Bros. (2007).
I:\CLB0803\GIS\ExistingConditions_Fig3.mxd (2/3/2009)

The County Department of Public Works (DPW) is replacing and rerouting the Termino Avenue Drain (TAD) that currently drains to the Lagoon. The TAD is a major outfall structure at the Lagoon that consists of two side-by-side storm water drainage lines. The DPW project would extend and reroute the drain to empty into Marine Stadium, thereby bypassing the Lagoon. The Termino Avenue Drain Project (TADP) would also intercept three additional drainpipes that currently discharge into the Lagoon. While this project would benefit water quality within the Lagoon, additional measures, as included in the City's Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project, would provide more complete and long-term benefits to water quality, habitat restoration, and recreational enhancements.

The City certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project in October 2008. Since that time, the City has obtained a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) from the California Coastal Commission (CCC) and a Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The Corps issued a Nationwide Permit Authorization for the restoration component of the overall project.

A Technical Report addressing Air Quality, Noise, and Traffic for the proposed action was prepared in June 2010 (LSA Associates, Inc.) (refer to Appendix A). The Technical Report has been incorporated into this EA.

1.4 PURPOSE OF PROJECT AND NEED FOR ACTION

The need for the proposed project is the result of the existing degraded water and sediment quality within the Lagoon due to elevated levels of lead, zinc, chlordane, and PAHs in the sediment; and chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, and PCBs in fish and mussel tissue. In addition, testing confirmed the presence of PCBs, cadmium, copper, mercury, and silver as secondary contaminants of concern. The purpose of the proposed dredging of the Lagoon is to remove the contaminated sediment, and treat the contaminated sediments to levels below the hazardous waste criteria so as to make the sediment acceptable for discharge at the Middle Harbor CDF.

The proposed project will improve sediment and water quality by removing contaminated sediment and will support the City's efforts to restore the Lagoon by implementing an important component of the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project.

The purpose of this EA is to evaluate potential environmental impacts that may result from each of the alternatives described in Chapter 2.0.

1.5 PREVIOUS PROJECTS

During the last five years, only minor projects have been completed. The following is a list of previous projects within the vicinity of the Colorado Lagoon:

- Model Boat Shop/Playgroup building rebuild. Completed August 2008 by the City.
- Rowing center building expansion. Completed August 2005 by the City.
- Walking pier upgrade. Currently under construction by PRM staff. Will be completed by November 2011.
- Viewing pier platform replacement of wood structures. Project currently on hold pending funding availability.

1.6 AUTHORIZATIONS

In February 2006, the Estuary Habitat Restoration Council approved funding for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project pursuant to the Estuary and Clean Water Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-457).

The Estuary Habitat Restoration Council consists of representatives of five federal agencies. These are the NOAA, Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Agriculture, and Corps. The duties of the Council include soliciting, reviewing, and evaluating project proposals, and submitting to the Secretary of the Army a prioritized list of projects recommended for construction.

Council Agenda topics include decisions on recommending additional proposals to the Secretary of the Army for funding, a brief update on projects previously recommended, a discussion of minor changes to be incorporated in the next solicitation for proposals, and a report on the habitat trends report produced by NOAA.

2.0 PROJECT PLAN

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed federal action under consideration by the Corps is to transport and dispose of approximately 32,500 cubic yards of treated dredged material. The dredging of the contaminated sediment in the western and central arms of the Lagoon will be carried out by the City. It is anticipated that the dredging will occur over a four-month period beginning in March 2011.

The dredging activities proposed for the Lagoon are part of a multi-component project known as the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project. Phase 1 of the City's Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project includes improvements at the Lagoon and the cleaning of the existing culvert that connects the Lagoon and Marine Stadium. Phase 2 involves improvements within Marina Vista Park, which includes developing an open channel or second underground culvert. In this first phase of the project, the dredging activities would dredge material out of the western arm and central Lagoon areas.

The Lagoon is listed as impaired on California's Section 303(d) list of water quality limited segments due to lead, zinc, chlordane, and PAHs in the sediment; and chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, and PCBs in tissues of marine organisms. Additionally, the RWQCB has approved total maximum daily loads (TMDLs) for the Lagoon that require removal of contaminated sediments.

Under the proposed project, it is estimated that the layer of contaminated sediment reaches 4–7 feet (ft) deep in portions of the western arm of the Lagoon and up to 3 ft deep in the central area. Sediment will be removed beyond these depths to provide a safeguard that only clean sediment remains. The depth of excavation at the deepest point would be down to 18 ft below the mean sea level point of 1929, or 15.4 ft below mean lower low water (MLLW). The width of the excavation footprint is intended to be as wide as possible to remove the maximum quantity of sediment while still providing for stable side slopes around the Lagoon perimeter. Slopes are to be dredged to create a smooth transition from the Lagoon bottom up the side slopes.

The proposed central Lagoon dredging activities would remove sediment and sand that has eroded and been deposited into the Lagoon waters over the years, creating a larger subtidal area. Contaminated sediments will also be removed from this area. Dredging activities would have an approximately 4-month duration and would result in the removal of approximately 26,000 cy of sediment from the western arm and 6,500 cy from the central Lagoon for a total of approximately 32,500 cy. Dredging and placement of dredge material operations are

expected to be performed by one or more of the following dredge types: hydraulic dredge; mechanical (i.e., clamshell or barge-based excavator) dredge; or a combination of the above listed dredges. The City is also investigating the feasibility of using electric excavators to dredge the Lagoon. All excavated material will be stabilized prior to transport to the POLB with a cement stabilization treatment process.

2.2 Plan Formulation

This section presents the process used to formulate and evaluate alternative dredging and disposal of sediment plans leading to selection of a Proposed Action for implementation. Planning objectives and constraints are identified, a decision making process is defined, and potential alternatives are discussed. Alternatives are evaluated, first, as to whether they meet project objectives and if they are practicable (i.e., could be accomplished within project budget and schedule limitations; least environmental damaging practicable alternative [LEDPA]). Alternatives that meet these criteria are carried forward for further analysis in the EA.

2.2.1 Planning Objectives

Planning objectives were identified to direct the formulation and evaluation of alternative plans. The order of the planning objectives listed below does not indicate their level of urgency or their priority.

1. Improve sediment and water quality by removing contaminated sediment.
2. Support the City's efforts to restore the Lagoon by implementing an important component of the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project.

2.3 ALTERNATIVES

The purpose of analyzing four alternatives is to increase the number of options available for the contractors carrying out the dredging, and the transport and disposal activities. The decision regarding which of the alternatives to be used would be left to the discretion of the contractor or by funding requirements.

2.3.1 No Action Alternative

The "No Action" Alternative, or that of not dredging the Lagoon, would result in the continuance of existing conditions. If dredging did not occur, the contaminated sediment would continue to be present and untreated, and would be expected to result in continued adverse impacts to the environment. The Lagoon would continue to be on the 303(d) Impaired Water Bodies List and would remain non-compliant with RWQCB TMDL's. The opportunity to dredge and dispose of sediments in the Middle Harbor CDF in the POLB

would be lost resulting in vastly increased costs to dredge and remove these sediments to a Class I landfill in a future project or in a future cleanup conducted under a Cleanup and Abatement Order issued by the RWQCB.

2.3.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The intention of this alternative is to dredge the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and transport the treated dredged material to the Port of Long Beach. The City is also investigating the feasibility of using electric excavators to dredge the Lagoon. The dredge area would be isolated by a silt curtain, and closed “environmental” buckets would be used to maintain water quality. Barge-based clamshell/bucket-type dredging equipment would be used or temporary shore-perpendicular berms or piers would be built into the Lagoon to allow a land-based dredger to access depths not within reach from the Lagoon’s shores. The dredged material would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the northern shore of the Lagoon until it is treated and loaded onto trucks. Plastic tarps and containment structures would be placed under and around the stockpile areas to minimize runoff back into the Lagoon and surrounding areas.

The dredged material would be treated on site (at the Lagoon). The treatment process would most likely occur with a pug mill that would mix the dredged material with cement lime and/or other chemical reagents to stabilize contaminants within sediments. Once the treatment is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and transported to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 24-mile [mi] roundtrip truck trip from the Lagoon). The trucked material would be put into the Middle Harbor CDF site at the POLB from dockside. The amount of dredged material is anticipated to be 32,500 cy (52,000 tons). Approximately 10,400 tons of cement would be required to maintain a 20 percent mixture ratio for the cement stabilization process. The cement that would be used for this process is anticipated to come from one of the several cement companies located at the POLB. The total amount of treated dredged material is anticipated to be 39,000 cy (62,400 tons).

It is anticipated that this alternative would require a total of 2,275 truck trips; this includes trucks coming from the POLB to the Lagoon for cement import activities and truck trips from the Lagoon to the POLB to transport treated dredged material.

2.3.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). The dredged area would be isolated by a silt curtain, and closed “environmental” buckets would be used to maintain water quality. The dredged material would be treated on site with cement, lime and other

chemical reagents. Similar to Alternative 1, the treatment process would most likely occur using a pug mill to mix the dredged material.

Alternative 2 differs from Alternative 1 in the mode of transport to the disposal site at the POLB. For Alternative 2, once the treatment process is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and transported to Marine Stadium (an approximately 2 mi roundtrip truck trip from the Lagoon). The treated dredged material would be transferred from the trucks onto a barge/scow located at Marine Stadium. From there, the barge would transport treated dredged material to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 20 mi roundtrip barge trip from Marine Stadium).

It is anticipated that this alternative would require 325 truck trips from the POLB to the Lagoon for cement/reagent import activities and 1,950 truck trips from the Lagoon to Marine Stadium for treated dredged material transport activities. In addition to these truck trips, approximately 35 barge trips from the Marine Stadium loading dock to the POLB would also occur (based on an average barge capacity of 1,200 cy and based on the assumption that the barge is propelled by tug boats).

2.3.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in dredging using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. It is anticipated that the piping of the dredged material would require the use of a diesel-fueled booster pump and that the pug mill operation would be powered with a diesel-fueled generator. Once the piped dredged material reaches the Marine Stadium barge or land-based treatment facility, the dredged material would be dewatered. This process may include a flocculation process, where a chemical reagent (e.g., coagulants or flocculants) is added to the dredged material and causes the separation of sediment and water to occur. Water resulting from the dewatering process would be treated prior to discharge into the Marine Stadium/Colorado Lagoon to meet appropriate water quality requirements. Sediment resulting from the dewatering process would be treated and loaded onto a barge located at the northwest end of Marine Stadium. From there, the barge would transport treated dredged material to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 20 mi roundtrip barge trip from Marine Stadium to POLB).

It is anticipated that this alternative would require 325 truck trips from the POLB to the Lagoon for cement/reagent import activities. In addition to these truck trips, approximately 35 barge trips from the Marine Stadium loading dock to the POLB would also occur (based on an average barge capacity of 1,200 cy and based on the specification that the barge is propelled by tug boats). It is anticipated that the barge location for this alternative would be adjacent to the treatment site, eliminating the need to truck material between the treatment at Marine Stadium and the Marine Stadium barge.

2.3.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would utilize the dry dredge method that would install a temporary coffer dam to isolate the west and central areas of the Lagoon. The dredge area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon. Plastic tarps and containment structures would be placed under and around the stockpile area to minimize runoff back into the Lagoon and surrounding areas.

Dredging activities would be carried out using a non-electric mechanical excavator. It is anticipated that the dewatering of the west arm and central Lagoon would require the use of diesel-fueled pumps to dewater groundwater. Similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, the dredged material would be treated on site. This alternative specifies the use of a diesel generator at the treatment site. Once the sediment treatment process is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and trucked to Marine Stadium, where it would be transferred from the trucks onto a barge/scow located at the northwest end of Marine Stadium and transported to the POLB disposal site.

It is anticipated that this alternative would require 325 truck trips from the POLB to the Lagoon for cement/reagent import activities and 1,950 truck trips from the Lagoon to Marine Stadium. In addition to these truck trips, approximately 35 barge trips from the Marine Stadium loading dock to the POLB would also occur (based on an average barge capacity of 1,200 cy and based on the specification that the barge is propelled by tug boats).

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1.1 Project Setting

The project location is within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) *Long Beach, California* 7.5-minute quadrangle. The site lies within the southwestern block of the Los Angeles Basin, which comprises a low alluvial floodplain. The floodplain is bound by a line of elongated low hills, folds, and faults, which delineate the northwest-trending Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone.

Prior to extensive dredging of the Colorado Lagoon and Marine Stadium area in the 1920s, the site was a tidal mudflat that received alternating alluvial deposits of marine sands, organic silts and clays, and fluvial deposits. In the 1960s, the previously dredged area between what is now the north end of Marine Stadium and the south end of the Lagoon was filled and the existing underground box culvert constructed. This was done as part of the construction for the then-proposed Pacific Coast Freeway. This “filled” area is now Marina Vista Park.

Consistent with the project area’s history, the soil underlying the project site is characterized by predominantly younger alluvial deposits and artificial fill. Younger alluvial deposits consist of Holocene alluvial soft clay, silt, silty sand, and sand.

3.1.2 Structural Geology

The proposed project area is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (California Geological Survey [CGS] 1986). However, based on the current understanding of the geologic framework of the area, ground shaking resulting from an earthquake occurring along regional faults is the seismic hazard with the highest probability of affecting the project site. A fault is described as the area where two tectonic or continental plates meet. An “active” fault is defined by the State of California as having had surface displacement within the Holocene time (i.e., within the last 11,000 years). A “potentially active” fault is defined as showing evidence of surface displacement during the Quaternary time (i.e., during the last 1.6 million years). These terms are, however, used by the State primarily for use in evaluating the potential for surface rupture along faults and are not intended to describe possible seismic activity associated with displacement along a fault. These definitions are not applicable to blind thrust faults that have only limited, if any, surface exposures. Figure 3.1-1 shows the faults within the region, and Figure 3.1-2 provides a closer look at the faults within the project area vicinity.





FIGURE 3.1-1

LSA



LEGEND

- Project Boundary
- Fault Lines
- Alquist-Priolo Faults
- Liquefaction Areas

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project
Regional Geologic Constraints

SOURCE: California Seismic Hazard Mapping Program (2002), USGS 250K QUAD (1980).

I:\CLB0702\GIS\fault_zones.mxd (6/21/2010)





FIGURE 3.1-2

LSA



LEGEND

- Project Boundary
- Fault Lines
- Liquefaction Areas

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project
Local Geologic Constraints

SOURCE: California Seismic Hazard Mapping Program (2002), USGS 7.5' QUAD - LONG BEACH ('80).

I:\clb0702\GIS\fault_zones_local.mxd (1/22/2008)

The project site is located within Seismic Zone 4 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). UBC Seismic Zones are based on the probability of expected intensity of ground shaking due to an earthquake. Seismic Zone 4 corresponds to regions where expected peak acceleration (as a fraction of gravity, g) is greater than $0.3g$. The probabilistic approach to forecasting future ground motion at the site determines the expected peak ground acceleration level that has a 10 percent probability of exceedance over 50 years.

The project site is located in the USGS *Long Beach, California* 7.5-minute quadrangle, and the Seismic Hazard Zone Evaluation report for this area is Open-File Report 98-19.¹ The peak horizontal ground acceleration (PGA) is a commonly used parameter to represent the level of observed and/or estimated ground shaking at a particular site. The California Division of Mines and Geology's (CDMG) probabilistic seismic hazard analysis² estimates that a PGA of $0.49g$ is applicable to the project site conditions for a 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (475-year return period). The "predominant earthquake" that contributes most to the ground-shaking hazard at 10 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years is a magnitude (M_w) 6.8 event on the nearby portion of the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, which is located 4 mi from the project site as shown in previously referenced Figure 3.1-2.

The Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone dominates the geologic structure of the *Long Beach, California* quadrangle. There are three primary traversing faults within the larger Newport-Inglewood Fault system: the Cherry Hill Fault, the Northeast Flank Fault, and the Reservoir Hill Fault. The northwest-trending and generally right lateral Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone is marked by a northwest-trending chain of elongated low hills and mesas that extend from Newport Bay to Beverly Hills. Within the project region, the Dominguez Hills and Signal Hill are uplifts along the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone. Continuous seismic activity occurs along this fault zone, which is believed to pose the greatest seismic hazard to the Los Angeles area, including the project site. A major event along this zone would produce strong or intense ground motion at the project site. Likewise, the most significant previous earthquake with regard to the project location was the M_w 6.3 Long Beach earthquake on March 11, 1933. This earthquake occurred along the Newport-Inglewood Structural/Fault Zone at a location about 18 mi to the southeast, offshore from Newport Beach.

Other known regional faults that could produce significant ground shaking at the site include the San Andreas Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault Zone, and the Los Alamitos Fault. A brief discussion of each of these fault systems is provided below. Previously referenced Figure 3.1-1 illustrates the approximate positions of the faults within the project region and Figure 3.1-2 shows the surface traces of the Newport-Inglewood Structural Zone with respect to the site.

¹ California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1998. "Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the *Long Beach* 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Los Angeles County, California," Open File Report 98-19. http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/download/evalrpt/longb_eval.pdf, accessed October 17, 2007.

² Ibid.

San Andreas Fault Zone. The San Andreas Fault Zone extends from Northern California to near the Mexican border. The fault zone has been divided into several segments. In Southern California, the San Andreas Fault consists of three segments: the Mojave, San Bernardino Mountains, and Coachella Valley segments. The project area is located approximately 56 mi southwest of the San Bernardino Mountains segment and approximately 72 mi east of the Mojave segment.

The last major rupture on the southern San Andreas occurred on January 9, 1857, along the Mojave segment. The magnitude is estimated to have been Mw 8.0. The interval between major ruptures averages about 140 years on the Mojave segment with a recurrence interval varying from under 20 years (in the City of Parkfield only, which is located directly over the most active region of the fault) to over 300 years. The San Andreas Fault Zone is a right-lateral, strike-slip fault that slips about 20 to 35 millimeters per year (mm/yr).

The Palos Verdes Fault Zone. The Palos Verdes Fault Zone is a 50 mi long, right-reverse fault lying near San Pedro, Redondo Beach, and Torrance. The most recent surface rupture of the offshore portion occurred in the Holocene, while the most recent surface rupture of the onshore portion occurred during the Late Quaternary. The slip rate along the fault is between 0.1 and 3.0 mm/yr, and the interval between ruptures is unknown. A probable magnitude of Mw 6.0 to 7.0 has been established for this fault, with the potential for larger earthquakes depending on fault geometry. The Palos Verdes Fault Zone includes two main faults, the Cabrillo Fault and the Redondo Canyon Fault, that are both capable of producing earthquakes of greater than 6.0 in magnitude. The proposed project is approximately 7 mi east of the Palos Verdes Fault Zone.

Whittier/Elsinore Fault System. The Whittier/Elsinore Fault System consists of several steep to near-vertical faults along a zone as much as 0.5 mi wide. The inferred sense of movement along these faults is predominantly reverse slip west of the Chino area and right lateral, strike slip to the east. Offset of Holocene sediments and historic seismicity indicates that the fault system is active. The proposed project is approximately 32 mi west of the Whittier/Elsinore Fault Zone.

The Los Alamitos Fault. The Los Alamitos fault is an inferred blind thrust fault located within the south-central portion of the Los Angeles Basin. The closest portion of the vertical surface projection of the buried thrust fault is located approximately 8 mi northeast of the proposed project. Like other blind thrust faults in the Los Angeles area, the Compton-Los Alamitos thrust is not exposed at the surface and does not present a potential surface rupture hazard; however, the fault is active and capable of generating earthquakes.

3.1.3 Liquefaction

Soil liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs during strong ground shaking, most commonly in generally low- to medium-density, saturated, low cohesion soils, where the soils experience a temporary loss of strength and behave essentially as a fluid. Areas most susceptible to liquefaction-induced damage are underlain by loose, water-saturated, granular sediment within 40 ft of the ground surface. Saturated conditions reduce the effective normal stress, thereby increasing the likelihood of earthquake-induced liquefaction. One of the major types of liquefaction-induced ground failures is lateral spreading of mildly sloping ground. Lateral spreading involves movement of earth materials due to ground shaking and is evidenced by near-vertical cracks with horizontal movement of the soil. Liquefaction-induced ground failure has historically been a major cause of earthquake damage in Southern California.

According to the Seismic Hazard Zones Maps for the *Long Beach, California* quadrangle, the site is located within an area where liquefiable materials are mapped and/or where liquefaction has occurred in the past. In the *Long Beach, California* quadrangle, the liquefaction zone is widespread due to shallow groundwater and abundant young alluvium. The zone covers the lowland terrain adjacent to the hills along the Newport-Inglewood uplift, the beaches, and the areas of artificial fill. Artificial fills that overlie beach sands and estuarine deposits are specifically more likely to be susceptible to liquefaction. Therefore, extensive low-lying areas of artificial fill have been included in the liquefaction hazard zone within the *Long Beach, California* quadrangle.

Due to the presence of loose, unconsolidated silty sands underlain by young alluvial, estuarine deposits and shallow groundwater (groundwater levels are approximately 5 ft below ground surface [bgs] at Marine Stadium), potential liquefaction and lateral spreading risks at the project site are considered high. The artificial fill areas within the project site also overlie young alluvial or estuarine deposits. Because artificial fills are usually too thin to change the liquefaction hazard, and the underlying estuarine and alluvial deposits have high liquefaction susceptibility, the fill areas are also assumed to have a high susceptibility to liquefaction. Previously referenced Figure 3.1-2 shows the liquefaction hazard zone in the project vicinity.

3.1.4 Landslides

Landslides and other slope failures are common occurrences during or soon after earthquakes. Areas that are most susceptible to earthquake-induced landslides are steep slopes in poorly cemented or highly fractured rocks, areas underlain by loose, weak soils, and areas on or adjacent to existing landslide deposits. Within the *Long Beach, California* quadrangle, the lack of steep terrain, except for a few slopes on Signal Hill and Reservoir Hill, results in only about 0.1 percent of the land (62 ac) lying within the earthquake-induced landslide zone for the quadrangle. The proposed project is not included in or adjacent to the

earthquake-induced landslide zone. In addition, the project area is relatively level. Therefore, the possibility of a seismically induced landslide is remote.

3.1.5 Subsidence

Subsidence is the lowering of surface elevation due to changes occurring underground. In the arid southwest, subsidence can be associated with earth fissures (i.e., cracks in the ground surface that form from horizontal movement of sediment and can be more than 100 ft deep). Because of the loose, unconsolidated silty sands and shallow groundwater table, potential subsidence risks are considered to be moderate to high.

3.1.6 Expansive Soils

Expansive soils contain the types of clay minerals that occupy considerably more volume when they are wet or hydrated than when they are dry or dehydrated. Volume changes associated with changes in the moisture content of near-surface expansive soils can cause uplift or heave of the ground when they become wet or, less commonly, cause settlement when they dry out. Repeated cycles of wetting and drying in areas composed of expansive soils can produce incremental lateral and downslope movements known as “slope creep.” Potential variability in the soil moisture content typically decreases with increasing depth, and the weight of overlying soil also tends to reduce the amount of volume change that can occur. Therefore, the deeper portion of the foundation soil profile tends to be less problematic with regard to expansive soils. The soils testing on the project site indicate considerable variation with no consistent pattern of stratification among sites. The soil sample core logs indicate that clays and sandy clays are abundant in this area, which indicate a potential for volume changes. However, because groundwater levels are approximately 5 ft bgs at Marine Stadium, the soils are anticipated to remain relatively wet and are not anticipated to experience cycles of wetting and drying or volume changes, which would reduce the potential effects of the expansive soils on site.

3.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The Colorado Lagoon tidal water body consists of approximately 11.7 ac in the City of Long Beach. The Lagoon is located in a park setting and is owned and maintained as a City park by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine. The Lagoon lies northwest of the mouth of the San Gabriel River and is north of Marine Stadium and Alamitos Bay. The Lagoon is primarily accessible from East Appian Way and East Colorado Street via Park Avenue from East 7th Street. The site is located at approximately latitude 33.7710°N, longitude 118.1334°W, primarily in Section 4 of Township 5 South and Range 12 West on the USGS *Long Beach, California* 7.5-minute series topographical quadrangle. Land uses adjacent to the project area are predominantly residential and recreation.

The topography in the project vicinity is relatively flat with a gently sloping transition from the Lagoon waters to upland areas. The project area is dominated by the Lagoon, an 11.7 ac tidal water body¹ that is connected through an underground tidal culvert to Marine Stadium, which in turn is connected to Alamitos Bay and the Pacific Ocean. The proposed project area includes the Lagoon. The historic Los Cerritos Wetlands were dredged in the 1920s to deepen the Lagoon, which has subsequently been used for a variety of public and private recreational events.

3.2.1 Habitats

Vegetation Communities and Habitat Types. The Lagoon historically consisted of coastal salt marsh. The original vegetation communities have been eliminated or severely degraded due to the disturbances, steepness of the banks along the northern arm, the presence of invasive non-native vegetation, and degraded water quality and pollutants in the Lagoon. The lagoon habitat types include mudflats (approximately 0.83 ac), sandy beach (approximately 4.33 ac), and marine open water and subtidal (measured at high tide and including all subtidal and intertidal habitats) (approximately 13.12 ac) (County of Orange 1992). Figure 3.2-1 illustrates the distribution of habitats within the project site.

Table 3.2.1: Summary of Vegetation Communities and Habitat Types

Terrestrial Vegetation Community/Habitat Type	Colorado Lagoon (acres)
Mudflats	0.83
Sandy beach	4.33
Total marine open water and subtidal	13.12
Total	18.28

¹ Total may not equal sum due to rounding.

Source: Biological Resources Assessment for Colorado Lagoon, LSA Associates, Inc., February 2008.


Mudflats are not described in the references above but are considered here as a habitat type due to their high resource value as an exceptionally productive biodiversity center for invertebrates, an important feeding habitat for wintering and migrating shorebirds and waterfowl, and their ability to dissipate wave energy to help reduce the risk of eroding salt marshes. The following three habitat communities exist in or adjacent to the dredge areas:

- **Southern Coastal Salt Marsh (approximately 0.94 ac):** The salt marsh at the Lagoon has degraded from a natural three-tier coastal salt marsh plant community, to a remnant strip of a middle marsh plant community dominated by common pickleweed, saltwort, and jaumea (*Jaumea carnosa*). These middle marsh plants are ecologically important to the Lagoon since this community is made up of remnant populations that have survived the decades of degradation.

¹ LSA Associates, Inc. used a Geographic Information System (GIS) to estimate Colorado Lagoon water body acreage based on a 2006 aerial photo; however, the water body acreage will vary with the tides.



LSA



LEGEND

Project Boundary

Habitat Type (and Acreage) within Project Boundary

Sandy Beach - 4.33 ac

Developed - 2.54 ac

Mudflats - 0.83 ac

Marine Open Water and Subtidal- (High Tide) - 13.12 ac

Parks and Ornamental Landscaping - 7.53 ac

Southern Coastal Salt Marsh - 0.94 ac

Sensitive Species

Cooper's hawk nest

Estuary sea-blite

FIGURE 3.2-1

Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project
Existing Habitat Communities

SOURCE: Air Photo USA (2008), Moffat & Nichol (2007), Thomas Bros. (2007).

I:\CLB0803\GIS\Existing_Habitats.mxd (5/14/2009)

The lower edge of the marsh that is inundated most often and would normally be characterized by cordgrass is absent, apparently a result of decades of polluted water and muted tidal fluctuations. The upper marsh, which would normally be characterized by glasswort, alkali heath, and sea-blite (*Suaeda* spp.), has been colonized by non-native vegetation from the surrounding residential and park landscape and is not present in a functioning form. Some fragments of the upper marsh plant community still exist on site such as alkali heath (*Frankenia salina*), estuary sea-blite, salt grass, and shoregrass, but only within the elevation of the middle marsh plant community. In addition, even though the Lagoon receives fluctuating amounts of freshwater input, salinity measurements conducted by the Friends of the Colorado Lagoon (FOCL) report an average salinity of 35 to 40 parts per thousand (ppt), which does not allow the Lagoon to support characteristic brackish marsh species such as sedges, cat-tails, or rushes (*Carex* sp., *Scirpus* sp., *Typhus* sp., or *Juncus* sp.) even around the freshwater source.

The coastal salt marsh surrounds the Lagoon in a thin band that is interrupted by two zones of machine-groomed sandy beach (previously referenced Figure 3.2-1). Along the north arm of the Lagoon, the marsh plant community is the most diverse; however, the salt marsh is being outcompeted largely by Hottentot fig and other non-native species including common groundsel (*Senecio vulgaris*), rip-gut brome (*Bromus diandrus*), and cultivated grape (*Vitis vinifera*). The non-native species have outcompeted the salt marsh community on the north arm to the edge of the Lagoon. The north shore of the west arm consists mainly of turf grass and slopes steeply to the mud bottom. However, the west arm provides mats of shore grass and biologically diverse potholes of sufficient size to support multiple species, including sea lavender (*Limonium* sp.), sea-blight, alkaliweed (*Cressa* sp.), and saltgrass.

- **Mudflats (approximately 0.83 ac):** Mudflats, in general, support very little vegetation other than green algae. The mudflats of the Lagoon do not support any vegetation, but they do support invertebrate species such as mollusks, crustaceans, worms, California horn snail (*Cerithidea californica*), and tiger beetles (*Cicindelidae*). The mudflats form a contiguous strand around the Lagoon, with the most productive areas located around the north and west arms of the Lagoon, and with degraded mudflats in front of the sandy beaches. Mudflats can provide quality foraging habitat for some fish species. The Lagoon mudflats provide a consistent feeding area for many migrating and resident shorebirds and waterfowl such as marbled godwit (*Limosa fedoa*), American widgeon (*Anas americana*), and ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*).
- **Sandy Beach (approximately 4.34 ac):** Within the project area, there are two areas located along the north and south portions of the Lagoon that are sandy beaches. There is no vegetation growing on these beaches since they are frequently machine groomed. The sandy beaches are used by the public for various recreational activities and as a roosting site for gulls and resting waterfowl. The area has a high recreation value, but due to constant use and grooming, there is little habitat value in these areas for native flora or fauna.

Marine Communities. Aquatic vegetation in the Lagoon has been described in Chambers (2004). This past documentation by Chambers shows that the majority of the Lagoon substrate is soft mud with a heavy cover of algae. Temperature and salinity levels stay relatively constant throughout the year, but oxygen and nutrient levels vary. The species composition is dominated by introduced species tolerant of disturbance and freshwater. Dominant species in the northern arm of the Lagoon included gut weed (*Enteromorpha intestinalis*) and sea lettuce (*Ulva lobata*), while red algae (*Gracilaria* sp.) dominate benthic areas of the western arm of the Lagoon. A few scattered eelgrass plants were observed during the 2004 surveys at a depth of about 9 ft below MSL (which is slightly deeper than ideal eelgrass habitat of 4-7 ft below MSL). A subsequent eelgrass survey was conducted in August 2009 by Dr. Christine Whitcraft of California State University (CSU) Long Beach; Erika Fox of CSU Long Beach; and Eric Zahn of Tidal Influence. No signs of eelgrass leaves, shoots roots, or rhizomes were observed underwater or on shore. The two marine habitat types at the Lagoon are described below.

Marine Open Water and Subtidal Habitat (approximately 13.12 ac at high tide): This habitat type represents the open water in the Lagoon and comprises the most acreage within the project limits. Due to the reduced capacity and perching of the culvert to Marine Stadium, the tidal flushing is greatly reduced, and water levels do not fluctuate substantially. The deeper water is used by a variety of species, including vertebrates, invertebrates, and plants. Phytoplankton and zooplankton populations are an important component of the deep subtidal range because they are the primary food source for many organisms within this habitat. Plankton movements and distribution are totally dependent on currents and tides (USDON 1999). Many invertebrates, birds, and fish utilize the plankton as a primary food source. This habitat in the Lagoon is currently functionally limited by the muted tidal exchange through the culvert. This effect has contributed to the degradation of the Lagoon and the reduction of the Lagoon's original habitat. However, the Lagoon still provides habitat for adult fish and their young as a shelter and nursery as well as providing foraging opportunities for migratory birds, including the federally listed endangered California least tern (*Sternula antillarum brownii*). Dominant invertebrates included the gelatinous colonial bryzoan (*Zoobytron verticillatum*) and the solitary tunicate (*Styela plicata*). Clam species collected during the July 2004 survey included smooth chione (*Chione fluctifraga*), common littleneck (*Protothaca staminea*), California jackknife clam (*Tagelus californianus*), and Philippine cockle (*Venerupis philipinarum*). The benthic community is relatively diverse in the northern arm and central portion of the Lagoon. However, the biodiversity of benthic organisms in the western arm of the Lagoon is diminished, which may be due to several factors including but not limited to poor water quality, low dissolved oxygen, sediment contamination, or a combination of these factors. The available data are not sufficient to determine if the low diversity is caused by contaminated sediment.

Dominant fish species included topsmelt, arrow goby (*Clevelandia ios*), and California killifish (*Fundulus parvipinnis*). Conditions at the Lagoon and surrounding areas have not changed since this baseline was determined.

Marine mammals and sea turtles have not been reported from the Lagoon and are highly unlikely to be found in the Lagoon.

Threatened and Endangered Species. The FESA of 1973, as amended, is federal legislation that protects endangered and threatened species and their critical habitats. Endangered species are plant or wildlife species that are in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. Threatened species are those that are likely to become endangered in the foreseeable future. Once a species is listed, all protective measures authorized by the FESA apply to the species and its habitat. Proposed species are those that are proposed in the Federal Register (FR) to be listed under the FESA. Proposed species do not receive statutory protection under the FESA; however, conservation measures are encouraged by the USFWS. The only threatened and endangered species which may occur at the Colorado Lagoon during dredging activities is the California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*).

“Take” of a T&E species or its habitat is prohibited by federal law without a special permit. The term “take,” under FESA, means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in such conduct. Harm is defined by the USFWS to encompass “an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Such act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering” (50 CFR § 17.3).

The California least tern is listed as State and federally endangered species. This species has been documented at the Lagoon in previous consulting firm reports and by FOCL members. In the summer of 2004, Keane conducted a total of 20 surveys at the Lagoon and Marine Stadium for California least terns. Based on the results of the Keane study, the Lagoon was considered to rarely support foraging least terns (Keane 2004).

3.2.2 Fish and Essential Fish Habitat

Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) is managed under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Magnuson Act). This act protects waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity (Magnuson-Stevens Act, 16 USC 1801 et seq.). Substrates include sediment, hard bottom, structures underlying waters, and associated biological communities (National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS] 2002). This EFH assessment for the City of Long Beach Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project is being

provided in conformance with the Magnuson Act. NMFS (2002) defines specific EFH terms as follows (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] §§ 600.05–600.930):

- “Waters” include all aquatic areas and their associated biological, chemical, and physical properties that are used by fish and may include aquatic areas historically used by fish where appropriate.
- “Substrate” includes sediment, hard bottom, structures underlying the waters, and associated biological communities.
- “Necessary” means the habitat required to support a sustainable fishery and the managed species’ contribution to a healthy ecosystem; and “Spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity” covers a species’ full life cycle.

Fishery Management Plans. Under the Magnuson Act, the federal government has jurisdiction to manage fisheries in the U. S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), which extends from the outer boundary of State waters (3 nautical miles [nm] or 5.6 kilometers [km] from shore) to a distance of 200 nm (370 km) from shore. Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) are extensive documents that are constantly revised and updated. The goals of the management plans include, but are not limited to, the promotion of an efficient and profitable fishery, achievement of optimal yield, provision of adequate forage for dependent species, prevention of overfishing, and development of long-term research plans (PFMC 1998, 2008a). There are two FMPs that encompass the proposed project site: the Coastal Pelagics FMP (6 species), and the Pacific Groundfish FMP (89 species).

- **Coastal Pelagics.** EFH for Coastal Pelagics is defined as all marine and estuarine waters from the shoreline of the coasts of California, Oregon, and Washington offshore to the limits of the EEZ and above the thermocline. (The thermocline is the portion of the water column where water temperature changes rapidly, usually warmer surface waters transitioning to cooler subsurface waters.) The habitat for the Coastal Pelagics is primarily above the thermocline.
- **Pacific Groundfish.** There are 89 fish species covered under the Pacific Groundfish FMP, including ratfish (*Hydrolagus colliei*), finescale codling (*Antimora microlepis*), Pacific rattail (*Coryphaenoides acrolepis*); three species of sharks, three skates; six species of roundfish; 62 species of rockfishes, scorpionfishes and thornyheads; and 12 species of flatfishes. The Pacific Groundfish, EFH includes all waters off southern California between Mean Higher High Water (MHHW) and depths less than or equal to 3,500 m. It also considers EFH to include areas of the upriver extent of saltwater intrusion. Lastly, specific Habitat Areas of Particular Concern (HAPCs) have been identified as: estuaries, canopy kelp, seagrass, rocky reefs, and other specific areas (such as seamounts).

Relevant Species. Although there are nearly 100 fish/invertebrate species covered under the Coastal Pelagics and Pacific Groundfish FMPs, not all occur near the proposed project site. Table 3.2.2 lists species that have been collected or observed during studies near the project site, including Alamitos Bay, San Pedro Bay, and the Colorado Lagoon. While only a small subset of Federally managed fish species would be expected to directly utilize the Lagoon, the primary and secondary productivity of the Lagoon that is anticipated as a result of the improvement would indirectly benefit Federally managed fish species in the nearshore environment away from the Lagoon.

- **Coastal Pelagics.** Two coastal pelagics—northern anchovy and Pacific sardine—are likely to occur in the vicinity of the proposed project. Northern anchovy is among the most common and abundant fish species in the area. In 2006, larvae were present in the throughout the San Pedro Bay-Alamitos Bay area during two seasonal periods, a greater peak in March–July and a lesser peak in October–December (MBC and Tenera 2007). Juvenile and adult northern anchovies have consistently been collected during fish sampling near the proposed project site (MBC 1994, 2009; MEC 2002). Northern anchovy are found from the surface to depths of 310 m (1,017 ft), though juveniles are generally more common inshore and in estuaries (Davies and Bradley 1972).

Pacific sardine were not abundant during 2006 ichthyoplankton sampling throughout the area (MBC and Tenera 2007), but was taken in the San Pedro Bay area by Watson et al. (2007). This species is also less common/abundant than northern anchovy near the project site (MBC 1994, 2009; MEC 2002). Pacific sardine is epipelagic, occurring in loosely aggregated schools (Wolf et al. 2001) with larvae taken from the near-shore waters out to at least 100 km offshore (Moser et al. 2001).

Jack mackerel, Pacific mackerel, and market squid have all been collected near the proposed project site, but in much lower frequency and numbers than northern anchovy and Pacific sardine. All coastal pelagics are associated with the water column (as opposed to the seafloor like many of the groundfish); however, female squid also lay egg masses on sandy bottoms during spawning (at depths of about 5–55 m, with most occurring between 20–35 m) (PFMC 1998).

Pacific Groundfish. As Table 3.2.2 shows, none of the species covered under the Pacific Groundfish FMP are considered common or abundant in the proposed project area. The leopard shark (*Triakis semifasciata*) uses estuaries, bays, and nearshore habitat for foraging and breeding. They prey on benthic invertebrates and to a lesser degree small fishes and rays. Leopard sharks are found in the eastern Pacific, between Oregon and Cabo San Lucas, Mexico as well as within the Gulf of California, Mexico. The tidal culvert between Marine Stadium and the Lagoon may serve as a barrier that prevents the occurrence of leopard sharks within the Lagoon, which would otherwise provide foraging and breeding habitat for the leopard shark, which have not been observed in the Lagoon.

Table 3.2.2: Managed Fish/Invertebrate Species Potentially Occurring in the Colorado Lagoon, Alamitos Bay, and Greater Near-shore San Pedro Bay Area

Common Name	Potential Habitat Use	Occurrence	
		Larval ^{1,2,3}	Juvenile/ Adult ^{2,4,5,6}
Coastal Pelagics			
northern anchovy	Open water.	Common	Abundant
Pacific sardine	Open water.	Common	Common
Pacific (chub) mackerel	Open water, juveniles off sandy beaches and around kelp beds.	—	Uncommon
jack mackerel	Open water, young fish over shallow banks and juveniles around kelp beds.	Rare	Uncommon
market squid	Open water. Rare near bays, estuaries, and river mouths.	Uncommon	Rare
Pacific Groundfish			
English sole	Soft bottom habitats.	Uncommon	Common
Pacific sanddab	Soft bottom habitats.	Rare	Uncommon
Curlfin sole	Soft bottom habitats.	Rare	Rare
black rockfish	Along breakwater, near deep piers and pilings. Associated with kelp, eelgrass, and high-relief reefs.	—	Rare
calico rockfish	Multiple habitat associations but prefer hard substrata and rocky interfaces.	—	Rare
kelp rockfish	Common on hard substrate, kelp; reported along breakwater.	—	Rare
black and yellow rockfish	Common on hard substrate; reported along breakwater	—	Rare
California scorpionfish	Benthic, on soft and hard bottoms, as well as around structures.	—	Uncommon
treefish	Common on hard substrate, kelp; reported along breakwater.	—	Rare
grass rockfish	Common on hard substrate, kelp, and eelgrass habitats.	—	Rare
vermilion rockfish	Juveniles over soft-bottom and kelp, adults associated with hard substrate.	—	Uncommon
lingcod	Multiple habitat associations but prefer hard substrata and rocky interfaces.	—	Rare
cabezon	Multiple habitat associations but prefer hard substrata and rocky interfaces.	Rare	Rare
Pacific hake	Common offshore, juveniles in open water.	Rare	—
leopard shark	Multiple habitat associations, including soft bottoms, and near structure, kelp, and eelgrass.	n/a	Rare in Lagoon, uncommon to common in Alamitos Bay, and common in near-shore San Pedro Bay area
spiny dogfish	Pelagic and on muddy bottoms.	n/a	Rare
big skate	Soft bottom habitat.	n/a	Uncommon
California skate	Soft bottom habitat.	n/a	Uncommon

Occurrence: Abundant>Common>Uncommon>Rare. n/a = Not applicable, internal fertilization. (Note: Most rockfish larvae not identifiable to species.) “—” indicates none recorded.

Sources: 1. MBC and Tenera (2007); 2. MEC (2002); 3. Watson et al. (2007); 4. Allen (1976); 5. MBC (1994); 6. Froeschke et al. (2005).

3.3 TRAFFIC

The proposed project area is located in the southeastern portion of the City. The Lagoon and Marina Vista Park lie northwest of the mouth of the San Gabriel River and are north of Marine Stadium and Alamitos Bay. The closest major roadway to the project site is East 7th Street, which is a six-lane, east-west regional corridor located north of the project area. The proposed project area is bounded by several local streets, including East 6th Street, Park Avenue, East Appian Way, East Colorado Street, East Eliot Street, Monrovia Avenue, Haines Avenue, and Orlena Avenue.

The City Traffic and Transportation Bureau of the Department of Public Works has estimated the following existing traffic volumes on the streets near the project site:

- East 7th Street currently carries approximately 45,000 vehicles a day between Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) and Park Avenue.
- The intersection of East 7th Street and PCH has an existing level of service (LOS) F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, which is below the City's established threshold of LOS D as the minimum operating level for roadway segments and intersections.¹
- The portion of East Colorado Street adjacent to the Lagoon carries approximately 11,000 vehicles a day.
- Park Avenue carries approximately 15,000 vehicles a day north of East 4th Street and East Appian Way.
- Park Avenue carries approximately 10,500 vehicles a day south of East 4th Street and East Appian Way.
- East Appian Way carries approximately 9,000 vehicles a day.

The City does not have existing LOS information for the local streets serving the project area. However, the City Traffic Engineer has stated that existing traffic volumes on the local roads adjacent to the Lagoon area are higher than many residential/park areas due to the existing roadway network and other physical constraints such as the waters of Marine Stadium and Alamitos Bay and the bridges that cross Alamitos Bay. These physical constraints result in a somewhat discontinuous street network in the southeastern portion of Long Beach, and much of the traffic destined to or from Belmont Park, Belmont Shore, and portions of Belmont Heights utilize Park Avenue to access East 7th Street. East Appian Way also provides a secondary route to and from Belmont Park and Naples via a bridge over Alamitos Bay that connects to PCH.

¹ Long Beach Home Depot Traffic Impact Analysis, April 2005.

3.4 AIR QUALITY

3.4.1 Meteorology

Climate in the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) is determined by its terrain and geographical location. The Basin is a coastal plain with connecting broad valleys and low hills. The Pacific Ocean forms the southwestern border, and high mountains surround the rest of the Basin. The Basin lies in the semi-permanent high-pressure zone of the eastern Pacific; the resulting climate is mild and tempered by cool ocean breezes. This climatological pattern is rarely interrupted; however, periods of extremely hot weather, winter storms, or Santa Ana wind conditions do occur.

The annual average temperature varies little throughout the Basin, ranging from the low to middle 60s, measured in degrees Fahrenheit (°F). With a more pronounced oceanic influence, coastal areas show less variability in annual minimum and maximum temperatures than inland areas. The climatological station closest to the site is the Long Beach Station.¹ The monthly average maximum temperature recorded at this station from April 1958 to August 2009 ranged from 66.9°F in January to 83.9°F in August, with an annual average maximum of 74.2°F. The monthly average minimum temperature recorded at this station ranged from 45.3°F in December to 64.9°F in August, with an annual average minimum of 54.8°F. January is typically the coldest month and August is typically the warmest month in this area of the Basin.

Most rainfall in the Basin occurs between November and April. Summer rainfall is minimal and is generally limited to scattered thundershowers in coastal regions and slightly heavier showers in the eastern portion of the Basin and along the coastal side of the mountains. The Long Beach Station monitored precipitation from April 1958 to August 2009. Average monthly rainfall during that period varied from 2.94 inches in February to 0.39 inch or less between May and October, with an annual total of 11.89 inches. Patterns in monthly and yearly rainfall totals are unpredictable due to fluctuations in the weather.

Although the Basin has a semiarid climate, air near the surface is generally moist because of the presence of a shallow marine layer. With very low average wind speeds, there is a limited capacity to disperse air contaminants horizontally. The dominant daily wind pattern is an onshore 8–12-mile per hour (mph) daytime breeze and an offshore 3–5 mph nighttime breeze. The typical wind flow pattern fluctuates only with occasional winter storms or strong northeasterly (Santa Ana) winds from the mountains and deserts northeast of the Basin. Summer wind flow patterns represent worst-case conditions because this is the period of higher temperatures and more sunlight, which results in ozone formation.

3.4.2 Air Quality

Many factors have a potential impact on air quality, including local climate, topography, and land use. The proposed project is located within the City, which is within the non-desert

¹ Western Regional Climate Center, <http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca5085>, website accessed March 18, 2010.

portion of the County. Los Angeles County is part of the Basin and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). Air quality is determined primarily by meteorological conditions, the type and amount of pollutants emitted, and their subsequent dispersion into the atmosphere. The combination of topography, low mixing height, abundant sunshine, and emissions from the second largest urban area in the United States gives the Basin the worst air pollution problem in the nation.

During spring and early summer, pollution produced during any one day is typically blown out of the Basin through mountain passes or lifted by warm, vertical currents adjacent to mountain slopes. Air contaminants can be transported 60 mi or more from the Basin by ocean air during the afternoons. From early fall to winter, the transport is less pronounced because of slower average wind speed and the appearance of drainage winds earlier in the day. During stagnant wind conditions, offshore drainage winds may begin by late afternoon. Pollutants remaining in the Basin are trapped and begin to accumulate during the night and the following morning. A low morning wind speed in pollutant source areas is an important indicator of air stagnation and the potential for buildup of primary air contaminants.

Inversions are generally lower in the nighttime when the ground is cool than during daylight hours when the sun warms the ground and, in turn, the surface air layer. As this heating process continues, the temperature of the surface air layer approaches the temperature of the inversion base, causing heating along its lower edge. If enough warming takes place, the inversion layer becomes weak and opens up to allow the surface air layers to mix upward. This can be seen in the middle to late afternoon on a hot summer day when the smog appears to clear up suddenly. Winter inversions typically break earlier in the day, preventing excessive contaminant buildup.

The combination of stagnant wind conditions and low inversions produces the greatest pollutant concentrations. On days of no inversion or high wind speeds, ambient air pollutant concentrations are lowest. During periods of low inversions and low wind speeds, air pollutants generated in urbanized areas are transported predominantly onshore into Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. In the winter, the greatest pollution problem is accumulation of carbon monoxide (CO) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) due to extremely low inversions and air stagnation during the night and early morning hours. In the summer, the longer daylight hours and the brighter sunshine combine to cause a reaction between hydrocarbons and NO_x to form photochemical smog.

Pollutants of potential concerns include ozone (O₃), CO, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate matter (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. These chemicals, called criteria pollutants, are harmful to individual health, materials, and agriculture. The quality of surface air (air quality) is evaluated by measuring ambient concentrations of pollutants that are known to have harmful effects on public health. The degree of air quality degradation is then compared to ambient air quality standards (AAQS) such as the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS and NAAQS, respectively). The Federal Clean Air

Act (CAA) (42 United States Code [USC] Sections 7401–7671q) requires the adoption of NAAQS to protect the public health and welfare from the effects of air pollution. The NAAQS have been updated on many occasions to adjust the criteria pollutants. Current standards are set for SO₂, CO, NO₂, O₃, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, and lead. The California Air Resources Board (ARB) has established additional standards that are generally more restrictive than the NAAQS.

The 1990 Federal CAA amendments, Section 176, requires the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to put into effect rules to ensure that federal actions conform to the appropriate State Implementation Plan (SIP). These rules, known together as the General Conformity Rule (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Sections 51.850–.860 and 40 CFR Sections 93.150–.160), require any federal agency responsible for an action in a non-attainment area, to determine that the action is either exempt from the General Conformity Rule’s requirements or to positively determine that the action conforms to the applicable SIP. In addition to the roughly 30 presumptive exemptions established and available in the General Conformity Rule, an agency may establish that emission rates would be less than specified emission rate thresholds, known as *De Minimis* limits. An action is exempt from a conformity determination if an applicability analysis shows that the total direct and indirect emissions from the project will be below the applicable *De Minimis* thresholds and will not be regionally significant, which is defined as representing 10 percent or more of an area’s emissions inventory or budget. Air quality in the United States is governed by the Federal CAA and is administered by the EPA. In addition to being subject to the requirements of the CAA, air quality in California is also governed by more stringent regulations under the California CAA. Table 3.4.1 summarizes the CAAQS and NAAQS for pollutants.

The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for attaining state and federal clean air standards in the Basin that includes the Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project area. The SCAQMD is the regional agency charged with being primarily responsible for managing local air quality by regulating emissions from stationary sources of air pollution. Standards for motor vehicle emissions are set by the ARB and apply uniformly statewide. The SCAQMD Rules and Regulations are adopted by the SCAQMD and apply to the area and activities within the Basin. The SCAQMD also is involved with the overall development and implementation of the SIP, as well as adopting and enforcing emissions from motor vehicles, fuels, and consumer products at the state level. The SCAQMD is also charged with updating the air quality management plan (AQMP) for the Basin. The AQMP outlines the District’s strategies to reduce ozone precursor emissions from a wide variety of stationary and mobile sources.

Air quality in the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project area is generally good. As noted above, however, standards for ozone are exceeded, most often in summer months. Although standards are exceeded only a few times annually in the coastal zone, they are exceeded more frequently inland due to pollutants carried by prevailing winds. The major source of air pollution in the project area is automobiles, followed by recreational facilities.

Table 3.4.1: Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards ¹		Federal Standards ²		
		Concentration ³	Method ⁴	Primary ^{3,5}	Secondary ^{3,6}	Method ⁷
Ozone (O ₃)	1-Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Photometry	—	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8-Hour	0.07 ppm (137 µg/m ³)		0.075 ppm (147 µg/m ³)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	24-Hour	50 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³		—		
Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})	24-Hour	No Separate State Standard		35 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	15.0 µg/m ³		
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8-Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)	9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)	None	Non-Dispersive Infrared Photometry (NDIR)
	1-Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)		35 ppm(40 mg/m ³)		
	8-Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m ³)		—	—	—
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO ₂)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m ³)	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Same as Primary Standard	Gas Phase Chemiluminescence
	1-Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m ³)		0.100 ppm (see footnote 8)	None	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO ₂)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	—	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	0.030 ppm (80 µg/m ³)	—	Spectrophotometry (Pararosaniline Method)
	24-Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³)		0.14 ppm (365 µg/m ³)	—	
	3-Hour	—		—	0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³)	
	1-Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)		—	—	
Lead ¹⁰	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³	Atomic Absorption	—	—	High-Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Calendar Quarter	—		1.5 µg/m ³	Same as Primary Standard	
	Rolling 3-Month Average ⁹	—		0.15 µg/m ³		
Visibility-Reducing Particles	8-Hour	Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer - visibility of ten miles or more (0.07-30 miles or more for Lake Tahoe) due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70 percent. Method: Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape.		No Federal Standards		
Sulfates	24-Hour	25 µg/m ³	Ion Chromatography			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1-Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride ⁹	24-Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)	Gas Chromatography			

Notes for Table 3.4.1

Source: California Air Resources Board, February 16, 2010.

- ¹ California standards for ozone; carbon monoxide (except Lake Tahoe); sulfur dioxide (1- and 24-hour); nitrogen dioxide; suspended particulate matter - PM₁₀, PM_{2.5} and visibility reducing particles, are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.
- ² National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual averages or annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth-highest eight-hour concentration in a year, averaged over three years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM₁₀, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m³ is equal to or less than one. For PM_{2.5}, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over three years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact the EPA for further clarification and current federal policies.
- ³ Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
- ⁴ Any equivalent procedure which can be shown to the satisfaction of ARB to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.
- ⁵ National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.
- ⁶ National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.
- ⁷ Reference method as described by the EPA. An "equivalent method" of measurement may be used but must have a "consistent relationship to the reference method" and must be approved by the EPA.
- ⁸ To attain this standard, the 3-year average of the 98th percentile of the daily maximum 1-hour average at each monitor within an area must not exceed 0.100 ppm (effective January 22, 2010).
- ⁹ The ARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as "toxic air contaminants" with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.
- ¹⁰ National lead standard, rolling 3-month average: final rule signed October 15, 2008.

°C = degrees Celsius

µg/m³ = micrograms per cubic meter

ppm = parts per million

EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency

mg/m³ = milligrams per cubic meter

3.5 NOISE

Noise is generally defined as unwanted or objectionable sound. Noise levels are measured on a logarithmic scale because of physical characteristics of sound transmission and reception. Noise energy is typically reported in units of decibels (dB) in which a change of 10 units on the decibel scale reflects an increase of 10 times the noise energy and roughly translates to a doubling of perceived loudness. The human ear does not respond uniformly to sounds at all frequencies, being less sensitive to low and high frequencies than to medium frequencies, which correspond with human speech. In response to this, the A-weighted noise level (or scale) was developed. The A-weighted scale corresponds better with people's subjective judgment of sound levels than does the traditional decibel scale. The A-weighted sound level is called the "noise level" referenced in dBA. Noise is measured on a logarithmic scale; a doubling of sound energy results in a 3 dBA increase in noise levels. However, changes in noise levels of less than 3 dBA are not typically noticeable by the human ear. Changes from 3–5 dBA may be noticed by some individuals who are extremely sensitive to changes in noise. A 5.0 dBA increase is readily noticeable, while the human ear perceives a 10 dBA increase in sound level to be a doubling of sound.

Noise levels diminish (or attenuate) as distance from the source increases according to the inverse square rule, but the rate constant varies with type of sound source. Sound attenuation from point sources, such as industrial facilities, is approximately 6 dB per doubling of distance. Heavily traveled roads with few gaps in traffic behave as continuous line sources and attenuate at 3 dB per doubling of distance. Noise from more lightly traveled roads is attenuated at 4.5 dB per doubling of distance.

Community decibel levels are reported in different ways. The two most common reporting mechanisms used in environmental analysis of community noise levels are the Community Noise Equivalent Level (dBA, CNEL) and the Equivalent Noise Level (dBA, L_{eq}). The CNEL is a 24-hour weighted noise average, which assigns a 5 dB penalty to the noise levels (adds 5 dB to the measured noise level before computing the noise average) between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. and a 10 dB penalty from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. These penalties are intended to account for a greater sensitivity to noise, which occurs during quiet evening hours and overnight hours when people sleep.

The CNEL is therefore most appropriate for analysis of projects that are anticipated to generate substantial noise during nighttime and overnight hours, such as supermarkets, which experience predawn deliveries of goods (such as associated heavy truck noise and loading/unloading noise), other 24-hour retail uses, and certain industrial uses. Similar to the CNEL, the L_{eq} is also a type of noise average, but the L_{eq} does not assign a penalty or weighting to record noise levels as the CNEL does. Rather, the L_{eq} represents the average of the fluctuating noise levels recorded in any given time period, usually 1 hour, or $L_{eq(h)}$. The L_{dn} index, the average A-weighted noise level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of 10 dB to levels measured in the night between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., penalizes nighttime noise the same as the CNEL index, but does not penalize evening noise.

People are subject to a multitude of sounds in the environment. Excessive noise cannot only be undesirable but may also cause physical and/or psychological damage. The amount of annoyance or damage caused by noise is dependent primarily upon three factors: the amount and nature of the noise, the amount of ambient noise present before the intruding noise, and the activity of the person working or living in the noise source area. The difficulty in relating noise exposure to public health and welfare is one of the major obstacles in determining appropriate maximum noise levels. Although there is some dispute in the scientific community regarding the detrimental effects of noise, a number of general conclusions have been reached:

- Noise of sufficient intensity can cause irreversible hearing damage;
- Noise can produce physiological changes in humans and animals;
- Noise can interfere with speech and other communication; and
- Noise can be a major source of annoyance by disturbing sleep, rest, and relaxation.

The Noise Element of the City of Long Beach General Plan contains noise standards for mobile noise sources. These standards address the impacts of noise from adjacent roadways and airports. The City specifies outdoor and indoor noise limits for residential uses, places of worship, educational facilities, hospitals, hotels/motels, and commercial and other land uses. The noise standard for exterior living areas is 65 dBA CNEL. The indoor noise standard is 45 dBA CNEL, which is consistent with the standard in the California Noise Insulation Standard.

In addition to the Noise Element of the General Plan, the City has adopted a quantitative Noise Control Ordinance, No. C-5371, Long Beach 1977 (Municipal Code, Chapter 8.80). The ordinance establishes maximum permissible hourly noise levels (L_{50}) for different districts throughout the City. Tables 3.5.1 and 3.5.2 list exterior noise and interior noise limits for various land uses. For the purposes of the proposed project, the exterior noise standard of 70 dBA L_{\max} has been applied to all of the sensitive land uses, the residences, the preschool, and the open space located within the vicinity of the project dredging areas.

Table 3.5.1: Exterior Noise Limits, LN (dBA)

Receiving Land Use	Time Period	L_{50}	L_{25}	L_8	L_2	L_{\max}
Residential (District One)	Night: 10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.	45	50	55	60	65
	Day: 7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.	50	55	60	65	70
Commercial (District Two)	Night: 10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.	55	60	65	70	75
	Day: 7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.	60	65	70	75	80
Industrial (District Three)	Anytime ¹	65	70	75	80	85
Industrial (District Four)	Anytime ¹	70	75	80	85	90

¹ For use at boundaries rather than for noise control within industrial districts.

dBA = A-weighted decibels

L_2 = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 2% of a stated time period.

L_8 = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 8% of a stated time period.

L_{25} = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 25% of a stated time period.

L_{50} = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 50% of a stated time period.

L_{\max} = maximum sound level

L_N = percentile noise exceedance level

Table 3.5.2: Maximum Interior Sound Levels, LN (dBA)

Receiving Land Use	Time Interval	L_8	L_2	L_{\max}
Residential	10:00 p.m.–7:00 a.m.	35	40	45
	7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m.	45	50	55
School	7:00 a.m.–10:00 p.m. (while school is in session)	45	50	55
Hospital and other noise-sensitive zones	Anytime	40	45	50

dBA = A-weighted decibels

L_2 = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 2% of a stated time period.

L_8 = A-weighted noise levels that are equaled or exceeded by a fluctuating sound level 8% of a stated time period.

L_{\max} = maximum sound level

L_N = percentile noise exceedance level

The City's Noise Control Ordinance (Section 8.80.202) governs the time of day that construction work can be performed. The Noise Ordinance prohibits construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. on weekdays or federal holidays (considered a weekday) if the noise would create a disturbance across a residential or commercial property line or violate the quantitative provisions of the ordinance, except for emergency work authorized by the building official.

The Noise Ordinance prohibits construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on Friday and 9:00 a.m. on Saturday and after 6:00 p.m. on Saturday, except for emergency work authorized by the building official. No construction, drilling, repair, remodeling, alteration, or demolition work shall occur at anytime on Sundays, except for emergency work authorized by the building official.

The Colorado Lagoon is located in an area characterized primarily by residences, parks, and schools. Although noise measurements have not been taken, ambient noise levels are generally quiet. The primary existing noise sources in the project area are transportation facilities. Traffic on streets adjacent to the project site is the dominant source contributing to ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Noise from motor vehicles is generated by engine vibrations, the interaction between the tires and the road, and the exhaust system. In addition, recreational facilities and activities contribute to the human-made ambient noise environment in the Lagoon. Noise levels tend to increase during summer months from heavy recreational activities.

3.6 LAND USE AND RECREATION


3.6.1 Land Use

The area surrounding the proposed project is composed primarily of park and recreational land, residential development, and small areas of commercial and industrial land uses, as detailed below. Figure 3.6-1 shows the project site and adjacent land uses.

- **North:** Recreation Park, which is a City park, is adjacent to the Lagoon on the north and includes 9-hole and 18-hole golf courses, a baseball stadium, a softball stadium, a casting pond, picnic areas, a dog park, tennis courts, a community center, lawn bowling, a band shell, and a playground.
- **South:** Developed neighborhoods, which are largely composed of residential land uses, are located to the south. Small areas of commercial and institutional development are located to the south of the Lagoon and to the west of Marina Vista Park. In addition, Marine Stadium, which is a recreational water body, is located to the south of the project site.
- **East:** Developed residential land uses are located to the east of the project site.
- **West:** Developed residential land uses are located to the west of the project site.



FIGURE 3.6-1



SOURCE: City of Long Beach Dept. of Planning & Building and Dept. of Technology Services

I:\CLB0803\G\LandUse.cdr (7/2/10)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Land Uses in the Project Vicinity

3.6.2 Recreation

On-Site Recreation Opportunities. There are several existing on-site recreation facilities and opportunities at the Colorado Lagoon, including swimming areas, a sandy shoreline, grassy open space, play equipment, picnic areas, a pedestrian bridge over the Lagoon, the Colorado Lagoon Marine Science Center, restrooms, and parking. Additionally, the Colorado Lagoon Playgroup Preschool, which is a private program for 3–5-year-old children that is permitted through the City to use the building, and a model boat shop are located on the south side of the Lagoon. The City utilizes the Lagoon area for several City programs, which in 2010 include:

- **Summer Fun Days:** Lectures and guided explorations of Lagoon wildlife began June 21, 2010.
- **Estuary Explorers:** FOCL volunteers lead explorations at the Lagoon on the second Saturday of every month.
- **Super Science at Colorado Lagoon:** Six-week free program for children that runs from June through August.
- **Model Boat Program:** Model boat building program for children held during the summer.

Off-Site Recreation Opportunities. The City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine operates and maintains all municipal parks and recreation facilities in Long Beach. The parks and recreation system includes 94¹ parks encompassing 1,672 acres (ac) (Strategic Plan, Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine, 2003). In addition to parks, Long Beach has a number of specialty facilities that provide recreation and leisure opportunities other than those within the project area, including: a riverfront recreation vehicle (RV) compound; two historic ranchos; the Long Beach Museum of Art; two marine biological reserves; two special events parks (Queen Mary and Rainbow Lagoon); Shoreline, Santa Cruz and Victory Parks; and the El Dorado Nature Center Park and trail. Long Beach is also home to public and private golf courses and a number of water recreation areas other than those within the project area, including boat launches and Alamitos Bay. Public golf courses include Heartwell, El Dorado, Recreation, Recreation South (adjacent to the north of the project site), and Skylinks. Three of these are 18-hole courses, one is an 18-hole executive par 3 golf course, and one is a 9-hole executive par 3 course. Each is maintained and operated by a private contractor. As provided in the City's Open Space and Recreation Element and Strategic Plan, Figure 3.6-2 shows the location of the Long Beach parks. The City has added the following six parks that total 11.7 ac since adoption of its Open Space and Recreation Element and Strategic Plan:

¹ Total is by park type classification wherein portions of El Dorado, Heartwell, and DeForest Parks fall into multiple park type classes. When parks are simply counted by name, there are 89 parks in the City of Long Beach.




FIGURE 3.6-2



SOURCE: Open Space and Recreation Element

F:\CLB0803\G\ParkLocation.cdr (6/21/10)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Long Beach Park Locations

- Burton W. Chace Mini-Park: 0.29 ac, located at Market Street and Dairy Avenue. Amenities include open space.
- Ed “Pops” Davenport Park: 5.84 ac, located at 2910 E. 55th Way. Amenities include open space.
- Grace Park: 1.2 ac, located at Elm Avenue and Plymouth Street. Amenities include open space.
- 21st Street and Hill Street Park: 0.9 ac, located adjacent to the Los Angeles River. Amenities include a trail, open space, park benches, and a drinking fountain.
- Trolley: 0.1 ac. Amenities include open space.
- Jack Nichol Park: 3.5 ac, located at 6200 Costa Del Sol. Amenities include a basketball court, baseball field, playground, soccer field, softball field, restrooms, picnic area, and a youth recreation program.

Public schools within Long Beach also provide parklands and recreational amenities. As shown in Figure 3.6-3, there are 70 public school facilities located in Long Beach, most of which have areas of green open space and other recreation amenities, such as sports fields and courts. The Open Space and Recreation Element of the City’s General Plan states that school site recreation programs managed by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine are held currently at 16 elementary and 5 middle school locations. Table 3.6.1 lists schools in the project vicinity.

Table 3.6.1: Long Beach Unified School District Schools near the Project Area

School Name and Location	Distance from Project*	Grades	Number of Classes (2006–2007)	Average Class Size (2008–2009)	Total Number of Students (2006–2007)
Bryant Elementary 4101 East Fountain Street	1.41 miles	K–5	16	21.9	352
Fremont Elementary 4000 East 4 th Street	0.46 mile	K–5	19	23.2	420
Lowell Elementary 5201 East Broadway	0.32 mile	K–5	33	21.2	663
Mann Elementary 257 Coronado Avenue	1.49 miles	K–5	16	21.8	352
Jefferson Middle School 750 Euclid Avenue	0.97 mile	6–8	195	25.0	892
Rogers Middle School 365 Monrovia Avenue	0.15 mile	6–8	148	30.7	883
Wilson High School 4400 East 10 th Street	0.66 mile	9–12	952	29.1	4,343

*Distances were measured using a Geographic Information System (GIS). Measurements were taken from the project boundary closest to each school’s location.

Source: www.ed-data.k12.ca.us. Downloaded 6/10.




FIGURE 3.6-3



SOURCE: Open Space and Recreation Element

F:\CLB0803\G\SchoolLocation.cdr (6/21/10)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Long Beach School Locations

The City of Long Beach has few open recreation areas within its boundaries that are owned and maintained by other governmental jurisdictions. The most significant of these are the Los Angeles County (County) bicycle, pedestrian, and equestrian trails along the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers and Coyote Creek. The County also leases a 4.82 ac park in the Carmelitos Housing Development, and the City of Los Alamitos has a 0.5 ac park within the boundaries of Long Beach (Strategic Plan, Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine, 2003).

It should be noted that several of the off-site park and recreation facilities are in close proximity to the project site. These existing facilities are listed below.

- Recreation Park is 229 ac and is adjacent to the Lagoon on the north. The park includes 9-hole and 18-hole golf courses, a baseball stadium, a casting pond, picnic areas, a dog park, tennis courts, a community center, lawn bowling, green open space, and a playground.
- Marine Stadium is a water body and park area adjacent to Marina Vista Park on the south. The park amenities include an activity center, boating facilities, coastal viewing, a rowing center, green open space, benches, and picnic tables. Additionally, Marine Stadium is the site of municipal band concerts in the summer.
- Will Rogers Mini-Park is 1.9 ac and is located adjacent to the project area at the intersection of East Appian Way and Nieto Avenue. The park provides open space.
- Pacific Electric Railway Greenbelt is a narrow strip of land that runs diagonally from East 4th Street and Park Avenue (adjacent to the project area) to East 11th Street and Loma Avenue. The area includes walking and riding trails, and native plants.
- Jack Nichol Park is located approximately 1 mi from the project site at 6200 Costa Del Sol. The park facilities provide a basketball court, baseball field, playground, soccer field, softball field, restrooms, picnic area, and a youth recreation program.
- Mother's Beach (Marine Park) is a beach area that is adjacent to the waters of Marine Stadium. The recreation amenities include boating facilities, coastal viewing, a playground, swimming, volleyball, green open space, benches, and picnic tables.
- Chittick Field is located approximately 3.25 mi from the project site at 1900 Walnut Avenue. The park facilities provide open green space, picnic tables, a soccer field, and a softball field.
- Martin Luther King, Jr. Park is located approximately 3.66 mi from the project site at 1950 Lemon Avenue. The park facilities provide a community center, open green space, playground, a handball/racquetball court, picnic areas, two baseball/softball fields, a soccer field that overlays a baseball field, swimming pool, softball fields, and restrooms.
- Stearns Champions Park is located approximately 2.30 mi from the project site at 4520 East 23rd Street. The park facilities provide basketball and volleyball courts, two baseball diamonds, roller hockey, a soccer field, a community center, and open green space.

- Bryant Elementary School is located at 4101 East Fountain Street, which is approximately 1.41 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 1.82 ac of green open space, basketball courts, volleyball courts, and playgrounds.
- Fremont Elementary School is located at 4000 East 4th Street, which is approximately 0.46 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 1.82 ac of green open space, basketball courts, volleyball courts, and playgrounds.
- Lowell Elementary School is located at 5201 East Broadway, which is approximately 0.32 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 1.98 ac of green open space, basketball courts, volleyball courts, and playgrounds.
- Mann Elementary School is located at 257 Coronado Avenue, which is approximately 1.49 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 1.98 ac of green open space, basketball courts, volleyball courts, and playgrounds.
- Kettering Elementary School is located at 550 Silvera Avenue, which is approximately 1.57 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 5.67 ac of green open space, a playground, basketball and volleyball courts, and a soccer field.
- Tincher Elementary School is located at 1701 Petaluma Avenue, which is approximately 2.90 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 6.45 ac of green open space, a playground, basketball courts, and a soccer field.
- Jefferson Middle School is located at 750 Euclid Avenue, which is approximately 0.97 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 3.45 ac of green open space, a baseball field, a gymnasium, basketball courts, and volleyball courts.
- Rogers Middle School is located at 365 Monrovia Avenue, which is approximately 0.15 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 2.47 ac of green open space, a baseball field, a gymnasium, basketball courts, and volleyball courts.
- Wilson High School is located at 4400 East 10th Street, which is approximately 0.66 mi from the project site. The school facilities provide 11.50 ac of green open space, baseball field, a gymnasium, basketball courts, a football field, volleyball courts, a swimming pool, and tennis courts.

3.7 AESTHETICS

3.7.1 Existing Visual Character in the Vicinity of the Project Site

The area surrounding the proposed project is composed primarily of park and recreational land, residential development, and small areas of commercial and institutional land uses.

Recreation Park, which is a City park, is adjacent to the Lagoon on the north and includes 9-hole and 18-hole golf courses, a baseball stadium, a softball stadium, a casting pond, picnic areas, a dog park, tennis courts, a community center, lawn bowling, and a playground. A chain link fence separates the Lagoon project site from the Recreation Park 9-hole golf course along

the west side of the north arm of the Lagoon and along the existing north parking lot to the existing restroom. The chain link fence does not separate the Recreation Park golf course and the project site around the west arm of the Lagoon, which is west of the restroom.

Developed neighborhoods, which are largely composed of residential land uses, are located to the south, east, and west. Small areas of commercial and institutional development are located to the south of the Lagoon and to the west of Marina Vista Park. In addition, Marine Stadium, which is a recreational water body, is located adjacent to the south of Marina Vista Park.

3.7.2 Existing Visual Character of the Project Site

Colorado Lagoon. The Lagoon was once a part of the historic Los Cerritos Wetlands and historically consisted of coastal salt marsh. In 1923, the low-lying tidelands of Alamitos Bay were dredged to form the Lagoon and Marine Stadium, which were used for recreational rowing. The original vegetation communities have been eliminated or severely degraded due to disturbances related to human activity, steepness of the banks along the northern arm of the Lagoon, the presence of invasive non-native vegetation, and degraded water quality and pollutants in the Lagoon. A few isolated stands of coastal salt marsh occur within highly degraded habitat areas and other non-native species. The project area supports two plant communities and four habitat types. The plant communities within the project area include parks and ornamental plantings (approximately 7.53 ac) and southern coastal salt marsh (approximately 0.94 ac). The four habitat types within the project area include mudflats (approximately 0.83 ac), sandy beach (approximately 4.33 ac), developed land (approximately 2.54 ac), and marine open water and subtidal (approximately 13.12 ac). Previously referenced Figure 3.2-1 illustrates the distribution of these areas within the project site.

The Lagoon is largely characterized as a water body and park comprising ornamental landscaping. The dominant herbaceous plant is turf grass, which is a mixture of multiple non-native grasses such as Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) and annual bluegrass (*Poa annua*). Scattered throughout the project area are mature trees typically used in Southern California park landscaping. The dominant ornamental plant species are gum tree (*Eucalyptus* sp.), Canary Island pine (*Pinus canariensis*), carrotwood (*Cupaniopsis anacardioides*), myoporum (*Myoporum laetum*), southern magnolia (*Magnolia grandifolia*), Peruvian pepper (*Schinus molle*), and European olive (*Olea europaea*).

Within the project area, there are two sandy beach areas located along the north and south portions of the Lagoon. There is no vegetation growing on these beaches since they are frequently machine groomed. The sandy beaches are used by the public for various recreational activities and as a roosting site for gulls and resting waterfowl. The area has a high recreation value.

The northern portion of the Lagoon area is developed with a parking lot on the north shore and a driveway entrance from East 6th Street to the parking lot. As stated above, a chain link

fence separates the Lagoon project site from Recreation Park along the north arm and north beach/north parking lot boundary. The driveway entrance from East 6th Street to the parking lot is lined with approximately 32 Mexican fan palms (*Washingtonia robusta*) along the shore and approximately 16 palms along the chain link fence. Also along the chain link fence are various species of non-native shrubs and trees. Vegetation within the developed area consists of some individuals of non-native turf grass, mainly Bermuda grass, growing along the sides of the access road and in the cracks of the asphalt. The access road and parking lot area currently do not support any native vegetation and have little to no habitat value.

The Lagoon water body comprises 11.7 ac within the Lagoon project area. The Lagoon water quality is currently degraded due to urban runoff impairments and the culvert restrictions that limit tidal flushing. Due to the limited capacity and perching of the culvert that connects the Lagoon to Marine Stadium, tidal flushing is restricted, and water levels do not fluctuate at the same level as the tides. This effect has contributed to the degradation of the water quality at the Lagoon. As a result, the Lagoon waters have limited aesthetic appeal due to high turbidity (less clarity) and the potential for periodic blooms of algae. In addition, the major storm drains and several of the minor storm drains visibly outlet into the Lagoon.

There are several physical structures at the Lagoon. The existing restroom structures on the north and south shores are old but maintained in good condition. The existing pedestrian bridge at the Lagoon is in need of minor repairs to deteriorated portions of the wood structure. The preschool and model boat structures have recently been renovated and are therefore in excellent condition. The Marine Science Center building was painted with a mural several years ago. The Marine Science Center and lifeguard structures to the south side of the Lagoon are maintained in good condition. The picnic tables, playground, and other recreation features are maintained in operational condition by the City. Generally, the physical structures at the Lagoon are in a moderate to excellent state of repair. These structures are small in scale compared to the overall site and do not dominate the visual features at the Lagoon.

In summary, the existing aesthetic quality of the Lagoon area is characterized by passive and active recreation open space represented primarily by grassy areas with ornamental trees, beach, and a water body. The visual quality of the water is somewhat degraded by turbidity and visible outlet structures. Physical improvements are maintained in moderate to excellent condition. Overall, the Lagoon is a visual asset to the community by providing open space in an urban environment.

Light and Glare. Currently, low-level security lighting is provided on the streets surrounding the project area, at Marine Stadium, and at the adjacent golf course to provide illumination for roadway traffic, adjacent residential areas, and the golf course users. The Lagoon currently has two restroom structures with two mercury vapor lights on the outside of the buildings. One restroom building is located on the north side of the Lagoon, and the second restroom building is located on the south side of the Lagoon. Marina Vista Park

currently has one restroom structure located to the north of East Eliot Street, which is illuminated by two light poles. A fourth restroom structure is located south of East Eliot Street at Marine Stadium and is illuminated with two lights on the outside of the building.

3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The project site is generally flat and surrounded by a developed urban area of the City. The project site includes the Lagoon and adjacent parkland areas, including Marina Vista Park. The Lagoon is an approximately 11.7 ac tidal water body that is connected to Alamitos Bay and the Pacific Ocean through an underground tidal culvert to Marine Stadium.

3.8.1 Project Area History

The Colorado Lagoon was once a part of the historic Los Cerritos Wetlands. In 1923, the low-lying tidelands of Alamitos Bay were dredged of more than 7 million cy of sand, silt, and mud to create the Lagoon and Marine Stadium. Since their development, the Lagoon and Marine Stadium have been utilized for recreational and competitive diving and rowing, including various Olympic events. Marine Stadium is unique in its design, accommodating four competing rowing teams in one heat.

The City purchased the Lagoon area and Recreation Park in the 1920s through general revenue bond funding. The 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Committee chose the Lagoon for diving trials. High diving was performed from a three-story structure floating in the Lagoon. To prepare for the diving trials, the Lagoon was separated from Marine Stadium by a tide gate, which was installed to maintain adequate diving depth in the Lagoon.

The 1932 Olympics also utilized Marine Stadium for rowing events. During these games, the United States rowing team won the gold medal in Marine Stadium. In 1968, the City remodeled Marine Stadium and constructed the current boathouse for the Olympic rowing and canoeing team trials. The boathouse that was used during the 1932 Olympics still remains (located on the southeast corner of E. Colorado Street and Neito Avenue). This building is noteworthy due to the Olympic history; however, it has been extensively remodeled and is not listed as a historical landmark.

In the late 1960s, the area between what is now the north end of Marine Stadium and the south end of the Lagoon (which was also the end of the original Olympic course) was filled and the existing underground box culvert constructed, thereby further separating the Lagoon from Marine Stadium. This was done as part of the construction for the then-proposed Pacific Coast Freeway. The freeway was never built and the “filled” area is now Marina Vista Park.

Despite the fill, which relocated the Olympic course’s finish line, Marine Stadium still provides 2,000 m straight of water, which is the standard sprint distance for national and international rowing. Marine Stadium is the only rowing venue specifically built for the sport

in the United States and it continues to be a center for training United States Olympic Rowing Teams. In 1984, the Women's Olympic Sculling trials were held in the Marine Stadium. Marine Stadium is also the location from which aviators Clyde Schlieper and Wes Carroll set off when they set a world record for longest sustained flight (30 days) in 1939. In addition, Marine Stadium is notable because it and the Los Angeles Coliseum are the only two surviving 1932 Olympic structures. For these reasons, Marine Stadium was designated a California Registered Historical Landmark (#1014) on April 29, 1995.

In January 1990 the Corps evaluated the Marine Stadium and determined that the Marine Stadium was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places due to lack of sufficient integrity. In February 1990, the State Office of Historic Preservation provided concurrence that the Marine Stadium does not meet eligibility requirements of the National Register of Historic Places. Both letters are appended to this EA (Appendix D).

3.8.2 Historical, Paleontological, and Archaeological Resources

Records searches and an archaeological survey have been conducted. No cultural resources that could be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were identified in the area of potential effects (APE) by the archaeological survey. The survey found that soil in the project area is loamy sand and that marine shell was observed over the majority of the project area and is consistent with previous dredging and fill of tidal areas, as shown in the historic aerials (Figures 3.8-1 through 3.8-3).

The records search found that seven resources have been previously identified within 0.25 mi of the project area, including six archaeological sites and one historic resource. None of the archaeological sites is located within the APE; however, the historic resource, as identified previously, is located in the immediate vicinity of the project area. This resource is the Long Beach Marine Stadium (CA-LAN-056) and is determined to be a Point of Historical Interest. The stadium is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources (California Register), the California Historical Landmarks (CHL; No. 1014), and the California Points of Historical Interests (PHI; No. 19-186115). The Marine Stadium, however, is not eligible for the NRHP.

3.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The ecological health of the Lagoon is degraded. The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) listed the Lagoon on California's Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies due to elevated levels of lead, zinc, chlordane, and PAHs in the sediment, and chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, and PCBs in fish and mussel tissue. In addition, testing confirmed the presence of PCBs, cadmium, copper, mercury, and silver as secondary contaminants of concern. Bacterial contamination of the Lagoon water is also a major concern and indicator bacteria was added in 2006 to California's Section 303(d) list.



FIGURE 3.8-1

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Historic Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1928



FIGURE 3.8-2

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Historic Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1947



FIGURE 3.8-3

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Historic Aerial of the Colorado Lagoon, 1968

The LARWQCB has approved TMDLs for the Lagoon that require removal of contaminated sediments. It is estimated that the layer of contaminated sediments reaches 4–7 ft in portions of the western arm of the Lagoon and up to 3 ft deep in the central area. Sediment will be removed beyond these depths to provide a safeguard that only clean sediment remains. Additional dredging may be required in other parts of the Lagoon, but this is not part of the proposed action.

The TMDL study conducted by the LARWQCB is considered a separate yet complementary project in relationship to the proposed project and is expected to characterize the condition of the Lagoon and provide limitations on the discharge quantities for pollutants of concern into the Lagoon for future development projects.

Concentrations of existing pollutants have been evaluated in the three areas of the Lagoon, which are identified as the western arm (CL-1), central Lagoon (CL-2), and northern arm (CL-3), by collecting three vibracore samples in each area. Results indicated that with the exception of elevated concentrations of lead in soil present in the Lagoon, no organochlorine pesticide, PCBs, or PAHs were detected above the State levels for hazardous waste.

3.9.1 Off-site Releases

According to the Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (EDR) Radius Map with GeoCheck[®] prepared by EDR on December 21, 2007, two leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites were identified within 0.3 mi of the project limits. The first LUST, identified as Mobil #18-M1A, is located approximately 0.2 mi north-northwest of the western arm of the Lagoon. Based on records from a file review obtained at the LARWQCB, the Mobil #18-M1A site was issued underground storage tank (UST) case closure on September 4, 1996,¹ and requires no further action related to the UST release. In addition, based on information provided in the First Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report² and Well Abandonment Report Request Letter,³ concentrations of benzene have been limited to the Mobil #18-M1A site and its immediate surrounding area. Therefore, it is unlikely that this site will pose a concern to groundwater within the project limits. The second LUST is identified as Southland Corp #25800 and is located approximately 0.28 mi northwest of the western arm of the Lagoon. A gasoline release that was reported on April 21, 1986, reportedly affected both soil and groundwater at the Southland Corp #25800 site. The LARWQCB issued a site closure letter on August 2, 1996. Therefore, it is unlikely that this site will pose a concern to groundwater within the project limits.

¹ Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, *Underground Storage Tank Case Closure – Mobil SS# 18-M1A*, September 4, 1996.

² Kleinfelder, Inc., *First Semi-Annual Groundwater Monitoring Report Mobil Station 18-M1A*, August 1995.

³ Kleinfelder, Inc., *UST Case Closure Mobil Service Station #18-M1A Well Abandonment Report – Delivery Date Extension*, September 30, 1996.

3.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

3.10.1 Regional Watershed

The project site is located in the San Gabriel River watershed. The watershed drains 689 square miles from Los Angeles, Orange, and San Bernardino Counties and is bounded by the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, a large portion of San Bernardino and Orange Counties to the east, the Los Angeles River watershed to the west, and the Pacific Ocean to the south. The San Gabriel River's headwaters originate in the San Gabriel Mountains, while the lower part of the river flows through a concrete-lined channel before becoming a soft-bottom channel near its termination at the Pacific Ocean. The project site is located within the Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay Water Management Area (WMA) of the San Gabriel River watershed. The WMA is located between the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and drains to the same general area as the San Gabriel River. The Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay comprise the main water bodies of the WMA.¹

Alamitos Bay, located in the southeastern portion of the City near the Los Angeles County/Orange County border, consists of Marine Stadium, a recreation facility used for boating, water skiing, and jet skiing; Long Beach Marina, which contains seven smaller basins for recreational craft and a boatyard; a variety of public and private berths; and the Bay proper, which includes several small canals, a bathing beach, and several popular clamming areas. Colorado Lagoon has a tidal connection with Alamitos Bay through an existing culvert that connects to Marine Stadium² (Figure 3.10-1).

3.10.2 Local Watershed

The Lagoon is a relatively small tidal lagoon connected to Alamitos Bay and the Pacific Ocean through a tidal culvert to Marine Stadium. It serves three main functions: hosting sensitive habitat, providing public recreation, and retaining and conveying storm floods.³

The Lagoon watershed lies entirely within the boundaries of the City (Figure 3.10-2) and is identified as Basin 21 in the City of Long Beach Storm Water Management Plan. Basin 21 is 1,172 ac and consists of 773 ac of residential, 125 ac of commercial, 55 ac of institutional, and 219 ac of open space.⁴ The watershed ranges in elevation from 125 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the northwestern portion to sea level within the Lagoon.⁵ The watershed is almost entirely built out; remaining open space includes the City Recreation Park Area, consisting of two golf courses and adjacent park areas, the Pacific Electric (PE) right-of-way (ROW) greenbelt, and to a lesser degree the picnic and park areas surrounding the Lagoon.⁶

¹ County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works, San Gabriel River Watershed, <http://dpw.lacounty.gov/wmd//sg/> accessed 01/30/07.

² Los Cerritos Channel and Alamitos Bay Watershed Management Area, December 2007.

³ Colorado Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study Final Report, Moffatt & Nichol, February 4, 2005.

⁴ Long Beach Stormwater Management Plan, August 2001.

⁵ Colorado Lagoon Watershed Impacts Report/Restoration Feasibility Study, HDR and CGvL, July 30, 2004.

⁶ Ibid.





FIGURE 3.10-1



SOURCE: USGS 7.5' QUAD - Long Beach ('81); CALIF.
 I:\CLB0803\GIS\EA\Lagoon_Bay_Connect.mxd (8/20/2010)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
 Existing Lagoon-Bay Tidal Connection

3.10.3 Surface Water

Surface water runoff within the watershed occurs as overland runoff into curb inlets and catch basins, and as sheet flow near the shores of the Lagoon. There are four major storm drain systems in the project area that outfall into the Lagoon. There is one additional major system that outfalls into Marine Stadium. Currently, the County of Los Angeles Termino Avenue Drain Project (TADP) is under construction. This project will realign the Termino Avenue Drain (TAD) to discharge into Marine Stadium instead of into the Lagoon, as it does currently; the TADP would also include a low-flow diversion system to divert non-storm flows from the storm drain to an existing County sanitary sewer line. Therefore, with implementation of the TADP, three of the major storm drain systems would outfall into the Lagoon, and two major storm drain systems would outfall into Marine Stadium. Construction of the TADP began in October 2009 at Marine Stadium and is anticipated to be complete in approximately 26 months (November 2011).

Seven minor/local storm drains also discharge into the Lagoon. With implementation of the TADP, three minor/local storm drains would be redirected to discharge into Marine Stadium, leaving four minor/local storm drains discharging into the Lagoon.

The Lagoon watershed can be broken down into five subbasins (Figure 3.10-2). Each subbasin discharges to the Lagoon through the individual storm drainage systems. The subbasins are as follows:¹

- **Subbasin A** discharges to the Lagoon via a 63-inch reinforced concrete pipe (Project 452 drain). This drain discharges into the northern tip of the west arm. This major storm drain has the second highest flow discharging into the Lagoon. The drainage pattern is generally to the south and east. Subbasin A represents the highest concentration of commercial uses within the Lagoon watershed (Basin 21). There are currently three retail gasoline stations, seven automotive repair facilities, one car wash, and various restaurants concentrated mainly along Anaheim Street, Redondo Avenue, and to a lesser degree, 10th Street.
- **Subbasin B** discharges to the Lagoon via a 54-inch reinforced concrete pipe at the north part of the north arm (Line I). The drainage pattern is generally to the southwest. Subbasin B predominantly contains park/golf course open space uses with some residential uses in the northeast corner. However, oil well production, the most notable industrial use located in the Lagoon watershed, is located in this subbasin.
- **Subbasin C** discharges to the Lagoon via a 48-inch reinforced concrete pipe at the midpoint of the north arm (Line K). The drainage pattern is generally to the southwest. Subbasin C contains almost entirely residential uses, with a few commercial uses at the eastern boundary.

¹ Colorado Lagoon Watershed Impacts Report/Restoration Feasibility Study, HDR and CGvL, July 30, 2004.





FIGURE 3.10-2



SOURCE: AirPhoto USA (2008); TBM (2007)

I:\CLB0803\GIS\EA\Watersheds and Sub Basins.mxd (8/20/2010)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Colorado Lagoon Watershed and Sub-basins

- **Subbasin D** discharges to the Lagoon via a 24-inch reinforced concrete pipe at the south part of the west arm. The drainage pattern is generally to the northeast. Subbasin C contains almost entirely residential uses, with some schools and other public facilities.
- **Subbasin E** discharges to the Lagoon via a 48-inch reinforced concrete pipe (TAD) at the west arm. The drainage pattern is generally to the southeast. Subbasin E contains a high concentration of commercial uses. There are currently four retail gasoline stations, three automotive repair facilities, one car wash, and various restaurants concentrated mainly along East 7th Street, Redondo Avenue, and to a lesser degree, 4th Street. Several other smaller storm drains serve the areas adjacent to the Lagoon. As stated above, this drain is currently proposed by the County of Los Angeles to be modified to no longer discharge into the Lagoon. The proposed alignment is assumed to be in place at the time of construction for the proposed project.

3.10.4 Tidal Culvert

The Lagoon is hydraulically connected to Marine Stadium through a culvert that allows tidal exchange between the two water bodies. The tidal culvert itself is a reinforced concrete box, which was designed with two distinctive cross-sections. From the Lagoon side, the tidal culvert has a design cross-section of 14 × 7 ft for a length of approximately 160 ft, then transitions to a design cross-section of 12 × 8 ft for approximately 700 ft.

3.10.5 Tides

Since there are no tide stations at Alamitos Bay, the nearest Los Angeles Outer Harbor gauge was used as the ocean boundary tidal condition, as shown in Table 3.10.1. The diurnal tide range is approximately 5.49 ft from mean lower low water (MLLW) to mean higher high water (MHHW), and mean sea level (MSL) is at +2.82 ft relative to MLLW.¹

Seasonal variations in MSL can result in changes in tide levels of 0.5 ft in some areas, such as Los Angeles Outer Harbor. Superimposed on this cycle is a 4.4-year variation in the MSL that may increase the change in tidal levels by as much as 0.25 ft in Los Angeles Outer Harbor. Water level measurement data are typically analyzed over a tidal epoch² to account for these variations and obtain statistical water level information (e.g., MLLW and MHHW).³

¹ Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

² A tidal epoch is a periodic variation in the rise of water above sea level over a period of 19 years.

³ Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

Table 3.10.1: Recorded Water Levels at Los Angeles Outer Harbor (1983–2001 Tidal Epoch)

Description	Elevation (ft, MLLW)	Elevation (ft, NGVD29)
Extreme high water (1/27/83)	+7.82	+5.18
Mean higher high water (MHHW)	+5.49	+2.85
Mean high water (MHW)	+4.75	+2.11
Mean tidal level (MTL)	+2.85	0.21
Mean sea level (MSL)	+2.82	0.18
National Geodetic Vertical Datum 1929 (NGVD29)	+2.64	0.00
Mean low water (MLW)	+0.94	-1.70
Mean lower low water (MLLW)	0.00	-2.64
Extreme low water (12/17/33)	-2.73	-5.37

ft = feet

NGVD29 = National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929

Source: Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

3.10.6 Tidal Influence and Flushing

Numerical modeling of tidal and flood hydraulics was performed for the existing conditions of the Lagoon. The purpose of this modeling was to characterize the existing Lagoon hydraulics under both wet and dry weather conditions. The groundwater flow input into the Lagoon was not considered in the modeling since the groundwater level in the vicinity is lower than that in the Lagoon; therefore, the groundwater movement direction is from the Lagoon. Also, the groundwater movement compared to tidal exchange is negligible. Under the dry weather condition, the local storm drain inputs are not included in modeling, as the dry weather flow quantity is negligible compared to tidal exchange through the culvert. Under the dry weather condition, typically from May to October, the local storm drain inflow is negligible for the hydraulic regime. Tidal flows are the main driving force for the Lagoon circulation and water exchange. A 50-year storm event and an MHHW level at the ocean boundary were used in assessing flood flow impacts within the Lagoon because these conditions represent the worst-case scenario in terms of flood potential.¹

The measured data indicate that the high tidal elevations in the Lagoon are close to the ocean tides; however, the time difference from the Lagoon reaching high tide levels is approximately 1 hour behind. The low tides are significantly muted by 1 ft during the neap² tidal cycle and 2–3 ft during the spring tidal cycle. The time difference from the Lagoon reaching high tide levels during spring tides is approximately 3 hours behind. Therefore, the water exchange between the Lagoon and Marine Stadium is reduced by 1–3 ft per tidal cycle

¹ Ibid.

² Neap tide is a period of lower than average tides. Spring tide is a period of higher than average tides. Both periods are based on the phases of the moon.

compared to the full high tide range. Tidal muting and lag time in the Lagoon is an indication of circulation restriction.¹ The data also show that the tidal ranges were further reduced or muted because the tide gates are not currently able to open fully to their design capability due to degradation of the gates over the years.² As a result, tidal circulation and flushing is significantly reduced by the design and condition of the existing culvert.

The tidal prism (tidal volume exchanged in the Lagoon between spring high and low tides) is approximately 2.8 million cubic feet. This tidal prism essentially serves as the conveyor of relatively poorer-quality dry weather urban runoff and storm water from the Lagoon to Marine Stadium and the ocean. The residence time of the Lagoon water is approximately 8.5 days, while that for Marine Stadium is approximately 6.9 days under similar hydraulic conditions.³ The tide range and phase in Marine Stadium are very similar to the ocean, indicating that Marine Stadium has much better tidal circulation. That is also evidenced by a visual comparison of the clarity of water in these two different water bodies. The water in Marine Stadium is clear and very similar to the ocean in appearance, while the Lagoon water is more turbid and less clear.⁴

Flooding. The Lagoon watershed has a history of flooding problems because the existing drainage facilities of this watershed are not sufficient to convey the flow for a 50-year flood event.⁵ The peak-flow rate during a 50-year storm event from the watershed entering the Lagoon is 802 cubic feet per second (cfs) with a runoff volume of 252.6 acre-feet (af).⁶ Under a combined condition of a severe storm flood and an ocean high tide with the culvert open, the peak water level in the Lagoon reaches 5.7 to 5.9 ft (relative to NGVD29 datum), the same elevation as the boundary of the Lagoon along a reach of approximately 200 ft near the intersection of East Colorado Street and East Eliot Street. The remaining Lagoon boundary varies from elevation 6.38 ft to approximately 8.0 ft (NGVD29). It takes a few days for the Lagoon water level to drop to within the normal tidal fluctuations.⁷

The County's TADP diverts a portion of the watershed area storm waters away from the Lagoon and directly into Marine Stadium. Based on information provided as part of the County's TADP, peak flow entering the Lagoon during a 50-year storm event would be decreased by approximately 391 cfs with a runoff volume decreased by 139.4 af as a result of implementation of the TADP. The TADP results in a significant reduction of water quantity

¹ Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

² Opportunities and Constraints Report – Colorado Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Study, Moffatt & Nichol, September 15, 2004.

³ Development and Evaluation of Restoration Alternatives – Colorado Lagoon Restoration Feasibility Report, Moffatt & Nichol, November 11, 2004.

⁴ Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

⁵ Termino Avenue Drain Hydrologic and Water Quality Analyses Report, Everest International Consultants, Inc., February 2007.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Tidal and Flood Hydraulics Study, Moffatt & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

entering the Lagoon during a 50-year storm event.¹ Therefore, implementation of the TADP provides enough freeboard to protect against flooding in the Lagoon during a 50-year storm event.

Pollutants of Concern. Several pollutants are commonly associated with urban storm water runoff, including sediment, nutrients, bacteria, oxygen-demanding substances, petroleum products, heavy metals, toxic chemicals, and floatables. Urban runoff pollutants and their impacts on water quality and aquatic habitat are described in more detail below.

- **Sediments.** Natural sediment loads are important to downstream environments by providing habitat, substrate, and nutrition; however, increased sediment loads can result in several negative effects to downstream environments. Excessive sediment can be detrimental to aquatic life by interfering with photosynthesis, respiration, growth, and reproduction. In addition, pollutants that adhere to sediment, such as nutrients, trace metals, and hydrocarbons, can have other harmful effects on the aquatic environment when they occur in elevated levels.
- **Nutrients.** Nutrients are typically composed of phosphorus and/or nitrogen. Fertilizers are a main source of nitrogen and phosphorus in urban runoff. Other sources of phosphorus in runoff are lawn clippings and tree leaves that accumulate on streets and in gutters. Elevated levels in surface waters cause algal blooms and excessive vegetative growth. As nutrients are absorbed, the vegetative growth decomposes, utilizing oxygen in the process and reducing dissolved oxygen levels. Dissolved oxygen is critical for support of aquatic life.

The ammonium form of nitrogen (found in wastewater discharges) converts to nitrite and nitrate in the presence of oxygen, which further reduces the dissolved oxygen levels in water.

Kjeldahl-N is defined as the sum of organic nitrogen and ammonia nitrogen, and excludes nitrite and nitrate. Total inorganic nitrogen is comprised of ammonia and nitrate.

- **Heavy Metals.** Bioavailable forms of trace metals are toxic to aquatic life. The most common metals found in urban runoff are lead, zinc, and copper. Other trace metals, such as cadmium, chromium, and mercury are typically not detected or detected at very low levels in urban runoff. Sources of heavy metals in surface waters include emissions and deposits from automobiles, industrial wastewater, and common household chemicals. Heavy metals that impair the Lagoon include lead, cadmium, copper, mercury, zinc, and silver.
- **Organic Compounds.** Organic compounds are carbon-based and are found in pesticides, solvents, and hydrocarbons. Elevated levels can indirectly or directly constitute a hazard to life or health. During cleaning activities, these compounds can be washed off into

¹ Termino Avenue Drain, Draft Environmental Impact Report, Hydrology and Water Quality Section, Edaw, Inc., February 2007.

storm drains. Dirt, grease, and grime may adsorb concentrations that are harmful or hazardous to aquatic life. Organic compounds that impair the Lagoon include PCBs.

- **Trash and Debris.** Trash and debris can have a significant effect on the recreational value of a water body and aquatic habitat. It also can interfere with aquatic life respiration and can be harmful or hazardous to aquatic animals that mistakenly ingest floating debris.
- **Oxygen-Demanding Substances.** Oxygen-demanding substances include plant debris (such as leaves and lawn clippings), animal wastes, and other organic matter. Microorganisms utilize dissolved oxygen during consumption of these substances, which reduces a water body's capacity to support aquatic life.
- **Petroleum Hydrocarbons.** Petroleum hydrocarbons include oil and grease, benzene, toluene, ethyl benzene, xylene (constituents in gasoline), and polyaromatic hydrocarbons. Sources of petroleum hydrocarbons include parking lots and roadways, leaking storage tanks, auto emissions, and improper disposal of waste oil. Some of these materials can be toxic to aquatic life at low concentrations.
- **Bacteria and Viruses.** Bacteria sampling and analysis are used to indicate relative levels of other pathogens such as viruses. Bacterial levels in urban runoff can exceed public health standards for water contact recreation. Bacteria levels in streams within natural watersheds also can exceed standards for water contact recreation. A common source of bacteria is animal excrement, and other sources include soils and plant materials.
- **Pesticides.** A pesticide is a chemical agent designed to control pest organisms. Pesticides can persist in the environment and can bioaccumulate (concentrate within the body) over several years, resulting in health problems for the affected organism. Organochlorine pesticides that impair the Lagoon include DDT, chlordane, and dieldrin.
- **Selenium.** Selenium is a naturally occurring element that persists in soils and aquatic sediments and can bioaccumulate through the food chain at levels that can cause adverse effects on higher-level aquatic life and wildlife, including fish and birds that prey on fish and invertebrates. Selenium can become mobilized and concentrated by weathering and evaporation in the process of soil formation and alluvial fan deposition in arid and semiarid climates. Moreover, selenium may be leached from sediments as a result of irrigation practices, elevation of the groundwater table, or other modifications in the natural hydrologic regime.

3.10.7 Sediment Quality

The 2004 Sediment Testing and Disposal Report provided the first comprehensive examination of sediment accumulation and contamination in the Lagoon since it was originally developed. The primary objective of the study was to document the extent of sediment contamination in the Lagoon. Testing was conducted in three areas of the Lagoon: the western arm (Area CL-1), the southern end at the nexus of the western and northern arms (Area CL-2), and the northern

arm (Area CL-3). Three core samples were taken in each area and composited to form a single sample representing each region.¹

Additional sediment testing was conducted in 2009. The purpose of this study was to provide more detailed information on the horizontal and vertical extent of contamination in the central arm of the lagoon.² Lead and zinc were specifically tested but previous work has demonstrated that lead is a good indicator of other contaminants present in the Lagoon.

California Code of Regulations Title 22 (Title 22) criteria were used to determine if any of the sediments sampled from the Lagoon contained contaminants at concentrations that were high enough to be considered hazardous waste. Results indicate that none of the contaminants exceeded the total threshold limit concentrations (TTLC; hazardous waste identification). Lead, however, was present in two samples at concentrations that were high enough to require waste extraction tests (WET) to determine whether elutriate³ levels exceed the soluble threshold limit concentration (STLC; California toxicity thresholds for lead). WETs were run for lead in sediment composites from the west arm of the Lagoon and those from a southernmost site near the connection with Marine Stadium. Results indicated that elutriate concentrations from the western arm composite (11 milligrams per liter [mg/L]) exceeded the STLC of 5 mg/L. Results of this test indicate that sediments in the west arm of the Lagoon should be considered to be a Title 22 hazardous waste material if they were to be taken to a landfill. WET results for the central Lagoon indicate that sediments sampled from the area of the Lagoon near the tidal gates to Marine Stadium contain contaminants at concentrations below those considered to be hazardous waste material under Title 22 criteria.⁴

Results of the 2004 study demonstrate a clear pollution gradient within the Lagoon. The western arm contains high levels of lead as well as several organochlorine pesticides. Concentrations of total lead in the western arm sediment (409 milligrams per kilogram dry [mg/kg-dry]) exceed EPA Region IX Preliminary Remediation Goals for residential soils (400 mg/kg-dry). Based upon this criterion alone, reuse of the west arm sediment on site (for slope recontouring, for example) is not a feasible option. The use of remediation goals for residential soils is appropriate for this site because they are the most conservative factors (i.e., highest level of safety) for material reuse. Lead concentrations drop dramatically in the central Lagoon (81 mg/kg-dry) and north arm (40 mg/kg-dry). DDT compounds, chlordane, and dieldrin show similar trends with effects range medium (ERM) exceedances for each of these compounds in the western arm. Concentrations of DDT compounds are from 81 micrograms per kilogram dry (µg/kg-dry) in the western arm to 4.3 µg/kg-dry in the north arm. This was the only compound or group of compounds to exceed the effects range low

¹ Colorado Lagoon: Sediment Testing and Material Disposal Report, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc. and Moffat & Nichol, July 30, 2004.

² Sediment Survey of the Central Basin of Colorado Lagoon, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc., April 2010..

³ Material prepared from the sediment dilution water and used for chemical analyses and toxicity testing.

⁴ Colorado Lagoon: Sediment Testing and Material Disposal Report, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc. and Moffat & Nichol, Revised October 27, 2006.

(ERL) in the north arm. The contamination gradient for chlordane was exceptionally dramatic, with concentrations of 105 µg/kg-dry in the west arm, 3.3 µg/kg-dry in the central Lagoon, and below detection limits (<2.8 µg/kg-dry) in the north arm. Dieldrin, one of the compounds cited as causing impairment in tissues, was only detected in the western arm of the Lagoon, where it was present in excess of three times the ERM. PCBs were only detected in the western arm of the Lagoon, with concentrations just above the ERL. PAHs followed the same trend, with phenanthrene and acenaphthene being the only PAHs to exceed ERLs in the central Lagoon. None of the PAH compounds exceeds these ERLs in the central Lagoon or the north arm, respectively.

In summary, the primary contaminants of concern (COCs) identified in the Lagoon are lead and the three groups of organochlorine pesticides (DDT compounds, chlordane, and dieldrin). Secondary COCs include PCBs and a number of metals, including cadmium, copper, mercury, silver, and zinc.

Storm Drain Contaminants. As part of the City's storm water monitoring program, the Lagoon was selected as an appropriate area to conduct an initial pilot investigation designed to identify possible sources of COCs within the storm drain system. The investigation collected storm drain sediments from the three main storm drains near the western arm of the Lagoon. During the field investigation, it was discovered that all three of the major storm drain systems contributing runoff to the western arm of the Lagoon are interconnected at a number of locations in the upper portion of the watershed. The commingling of runoff in these three storm drain systems introduces some difficulty in assessing sources of sediment-associated contaminants.¹

The major candidate sources of contaminants to the Lagoon were considered to be the three storm drain systems that discharge to the western arm of the Lagoon. Two of these storm drains follow a parallel pathway down the former PE ROW greenbelt before discharging through a common headwall into the Lagoon. Therefore, eroding soils from the former railroad ROW were also considered potential sources of contaminants and were included in the initial sampling effort. All initial sampling sites were located as close as possible to the Lagoon while at the same time avoiding areas too heavily influenced by the tide.² Areas heavily influenced by the tide have the potential to wash away soils in the storm drain.

The initial 2005 survey concluded that most COCs occurred in highest concentrations at a site sampled in the TAD line. The study also concluded that soils from the former PE ROW contained relatively low concentrations of persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (persistent bioaccumulative toxic [PBT]) compounds of concern. The only Section 303(d) list COC at

¹ Stormwater Monitoring Report 2006/2007 NPDES Permit No. CA00403 (CI 8052) City of Long Beach, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc., July 2007.

² Ibid.

this site was zinc. Silver was also present in similar concentrations, but this metal is not listed by the Regional Board as causing impairment.¹

Sediments from TAD were found to have substantial levels of metals, primarily lead, copper, and zinc. Concentrations of lead in sediments from TAD were of major interest due to the fact that lead is a primary COC in sediments within the Lagoon and was found again at high levels in the 2005 storm drain investigation. DDT compounds were detected at all sites, with concentrations ranging from 9.9 to 160.7 nanograms per gram dry (ng/g-dry). Chlordane compounds were also detected at all sites. No other organochlorine pesticides were detected at any of the sites.²

Relatively low concentrations of persistent PBT compounds were present in sediments from the samples located in the upper portion of the watershed (areas north of 10th Street) that contributes flow to both TAD and Project 452 Drain. This suggests that upper portions of the watershed do not serve as significant sources of the primary COCs in the Lagoon. Sediment sampled from the TAD in 2005 and 2007 exhibited elevated levels of lead. Lead concentrations at the TAD were nearly five times those found in the contaminated sediments of the Lagoon. Concentrations of lead were over nine times those found in the Lagoon when all results were normalized to the fine-grained sediment. In addition, concentrations of copper, silver, zinc, DDT, and chlordane in storm drain sediments from throughout most of the watershed are typically one to three times the concentrations measured in sediments from the Lagoon. Concentrations of these contaminants in storm drain sediments indicate that sources of these contaminants are likely sufficient to maintain their current elevated levels in the Lagoon if measures are not taken to decrease sediment loads.³

3.10.8 Surface Water Quality

Since the Lagoon is a natural low point in the watershed, it accumulates pollutants deposited over the entire watershed that enter the storm drains by storm flows and dry weather runoff. Nonpoint sources found to be the major contributors to water pollution in the Lagoon are runoff from paved streets and parking lots, construction sites, soil erosion, pesticide/herbicide application from the adjacent golf course, wash down at commercial sites, minor industrial operations such as oil well production, and atmospheric deposition of acidic and/or toxic air pollutants.⁴

Bacteria. The City of Long Beach Health Department conducts weekly sampling at three locations in the Lagoon as part of Assembly Bill 411 (AB 411) sampling requirements. (AB

¹ Stormwater Monitoring Report 2006/2007 NPDES Permit No. CA00403 (CI 8052) City of Long Beach, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc., July 2007.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Colorado Lagoon Watershed Impacts Report/Restoration Feasibility Study, HDR and CGvL, July 30, 2004.

411 established guidelines for ocean water quality in California. The law requires county health officials to test water at public beaches for harmful bacteria and notify the public when levels are too high. These and other bacterial surveys at California beaches only focus on bacteria that are believed to be “indicators” of pathogenic bacteria and viruses. Depending upon the source of the bacteria, these indicators may or may not provide an indication of a significant risk to people involved in water contact recreation.) All sites are located on the pedestrian bridge that crosses the western arm of the Lagoon. With the possible exception of AB 411 sampling requirements, there have not been any consistent sampling programs in the Lagoon to document the concentrations of contaminants in water, sediment, and biota. The City Health Department has been conducting weekly surveys of indicator bacteria since January 2001. Exceedances of AB 411 or Basin Plan criteria at this location are often attributable to high levels of total coliform ($>10,000$ most probable number [MPN]/100 milliliters [ml]) or a combination of total coliform ($> 1,000$ MPN/100 ml) and *E. coli* concentrations that exceed 10 percent of the total coliform.¹

Total and fecal coliform and enterococcal bacteria are used to indicate the likelihood of pathogenic organisms, such as viruses, in surface waters. The levels of these bacteria have been correlated to the incidence of illness in swimmers. The presence of coliform bacteria indicates potential health risks to users of recreational waters, and specifically, enterococcus bacteria have been shown to cause health risks, including stomach flu and other infections. The amount of these indicator bacteria in Southern California waters may be dependent on season and has been linked with rainfall amounts. All three monitoring locations in the Lagoon have had several advisory warnings over the past two years, whereby bacteria levels have exceeded State Standards.²

3.10.9 Groundwater Hydrology

The County of Los Angeles overlies 15 groundwater basins, as established by the LARWQCB Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles Region (1994). The project site is situated within the Los Angeles-San Gabriel Hydrologic Unit, which covers most areas of the County as well as some small areas of southeastern Ventura County. Within this hydrologic unit, the project site is located in the Coastal Plain of Los Angeles Groundwater Basin and overlies the West Coast Subbasin (Basin No. 4-11.03).³ The West Coast Subbasin covers an area of 142 square miles and is bound by the Ballona Escarpment to the north, the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone to the east, and the Pacific Ocean and Palos Verdes Hills to the south and west. Prior to discharge into San Pedro Bay, the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers cross the subbasin through the Dominguez Gap and the Alamitos Gap, respectively. Groundwater recharge occurs primarily as a result of underflow from the Central Subbasin.

¹ Colorado Lagoon: Water Quality Assessment Report, Kinnetic Laboratories, Inc. and Moffat & Nichol, August 2004.

² City of Long Beach Health Department, Water Quality Program, Recreational Water Monitoring, http://www.longbeach.gov/health/bureau/eh/water/water_samples.asp, accessed 03/26/08.

³ California Department of Water Resources, Groundwater Bulletin 118, Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County Groundwater Basin, West Coast Subbasin, February 27, 2004.

Water spread in the Central Subbasin percolates into aquifers and eventually crosses through and over the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, supplementing the groundwater supply in the West Coast Subbasin. Additional recharge occurs from infiltration of surface inflow from the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers and irrigation from fields, lawns, and industrial waters. The general regional groundwater flow pattern is southward and westward from the Central Coastal Plain, toward the ocean.¹

Groundwater Quality. The character of water in the subbasin is variable. Seawater intrusion has produced deterioration of water quality over time. Early tests indicated that the water was sodium bicarbonate in character. It is questionable whether this is representative of the entire zone, because the higher quality water residing outside the subbasin is calcium bicarbonate in nature.² In the coastal region of this subbasin, the water is calcium chloride in character and then transitions into sodium bicarbonate further inland. Data from 45 public supply wells show an average total dissolved solids (TDS) content of 720 mg/L and a range of 170 to 5,510 mg/L.

¹ Ibid.

² California Department of Water Resources, Groundwater Bulletin 118, Coastal Plain of Los Angeles County Groundwater Basin, West Coast Subbasin, February 27, 2004.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

4.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

4.1.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to geology and soils related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.1.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

Alternative 1 would result in the dredging of the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and the trucking of the dredged material to the POLB.

The project site is not located within a currently designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, nor is it currently identified by the regulatory community as being located within zones of either primary or secondary co-seismic surface deformation (e.g., pressure ridges, escarpments, or fissures). Thus, the site is not expected to experience primary surface fault rupture or related ground deformation. According to the California Department of Conservation's Seismic Hazard Zones Map for the Long Beach quadrangle, the site is located within an area where liquefiable materials are mapped and/or where liquefaction has occurred in the past. A potential result of soil liquefaction on site is lateral spreading, which is the differential movement of the ground surface due to open face excavations.

The project area is surrounded by developed areas, and site topography is relatively level; therefore, the possibility of a seismically induced landslide is remote. Additionally, the site is located near any known historical landslides. According to the California Department of Conservation's Seismic Hazard Zones Map for the Long Beach quadrangle, the project area does not fall within any earthquake-induced landslide zones. The soils testing on the project site indicate variation in pattern of stratification in the area. The soil sample core logs, however, do indicate that clays and sandy clays are abundant in this area, which indicate a potential for volume changes. However, because groundwater levels are approximately 5 ft bgs in the area, the soils are anticipated to remain relatively wet and are not anticipated to experience cycles of wetting and drying or volume changes, which would reduce the potential effects of the expansive soils on site.

Although the project site is located in a seismically-active area with several active earthquake faults in the region, the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project is not expected to result in an increased exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death from the rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. The proposed project will not cause a landslide because placement of dredged material would be trucked to the POLB and distributed over a wide area.

4.1.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to Geology and Soils as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to this issue. Refer to Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with Geology and Soils.

4.1.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to Geology and Soils as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts associated with this issue. Refer to Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with seismic hazards, underlying soil characteristics, slope stability, and erosion.

4.1.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredge area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to Geology and Soils as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to this issue. Refer to Section 4.1.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with Geology and Soils.

4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.2.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to biological resources related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved. The Lagoon would still be impaired and would not meet TMDLs established by the RWQCB.

4.2.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The intention of this alternative is to dredge the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and truck the dredged material to the POLB. The dredged area would be isolated by a silt curtain, and closed "environmental" buckets would be used to maintain water quality. Clamshell/bucket-type dredging equipment would be used or temporary shore-perpendicular berms or piers would be built into the Lagoon to allow a land-based dredger to access depths not within reach from the Lagoon's shores. The dredged material would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the northern shore of the Lagoon until it is treated with cement and loaded onto trucks. Plastic tarps and containment structures would be placed under and around the stockpile areas to minimize runoff back into the Lagoon and surrounding areas.

The dredged material would be treated on site (at the Lagoon) through cement stabilization and solidification. The treatment process would most likely occur with a pug mill that would mix the dredged material with cement lime and/or other chemical reagents to stabilize the sediments. Once the treatment is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and transported to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 24-mile [mi] roundtrip truck trip from the Lagoon). The trucked material would be put into the Slip 1 fill site at the POLB from dockside. The amount of dredged material is anticipated to be 32,500 cy (52,000 tons). Approximately 10,400 tons of cement would be required to maintain a 20 percent mixture ratio for the cement stabilization process.

Dredging will result in a temporary loss of subtidal benthic habitat. The benthic community, those species that are associated with the bottom including invertebrates such as worms, clams, and small arthropods as well as some fish, such as gobies, will be disturbed and many lost during construction and dredging. However, these species reproduce quickly and in large numbers and are well adapted to repopulate an area following disturbance. Recruits from other areas of the Lagoon will rapidly recolonize the benthic habitat after completion of sediment modifications. The community is expected to be colonized by a similar suite of species that is currently found in the area and construction will not result in a permanent loss.

Historically eelgrass has existed in the Colorado Lagoon, but has not been found in recent surveys. Improvements to sediment and water quality resulting from this project may make conditions in the Lagoon favorable for eelgrass. Eelgrass beds do exist in the Marine Stadium, which may supply seeds and or individual grass shoots that could enter the Lagoon and restore past eelgrass beds.

Threatened and Endangered Species. The California least tern is known to use the project area. The California least tern is listed as State and federally endangered. This species is not expected to be adversely affected as a result of the Lagoon improvements since the Lagoon is a poor quality foraging site, are only rarely seen at the site, and higher quality foraging sites are available short distances up or down the coast.

Fish and Essential Fish Habitat. The proposed project, in summary, intends to improve water quality by increasing natural tidal flushing, removing contaminated sediments, and reducing the influx of stormwater (dry and wet season) runoff into the Colorado Lagoon. This would benefit all the marine biota, including any and all federally managed species, in the area. The area has not been identified as principle spawning habitat for any of the applicable species (previously referenced Table 3.2.2), but larval forms of several species do occur in the area in varying densities. Juveniles and adults may be affected during the construction activities. The most consistent temporary impacts to FMP species may occur in conjunction with isolation and dewatering of active construction areas. This isolation and dewatering will reduce natural flushing into parts of the Lagoon which may diminish the dissolved oxygen concentration as well as expose those individuals within the dewatered areas to desiccation and reduced forage opportunities for planktivorous species such as northern anchovy and Pacific sardine. Additional potential temporary impacts will derive from loss of infaunal/epifaunal prey items when sediments are removed. It is assumed these prey items will recolonize the area. The general increase in water quality and sediment quality resulting from most activities will potentially result in long-term benefits to all FMP species in the area.

There is a potential for temporary adverse impacts on FMP species due to turbidity limited to project area with the deployment of a silt curtain. There is additional potential for temporary impacts due to loss of infaunal prey items with sediment removal. It is anticipated that prey would recolonize area. Long-term benefits would potentially be realized from reduced sediment contaminant levels.

As part of the Section 404 Clean Water Act permitting process, the Regulatory Division of the Corps initiated Essential Fish Habitat consultation pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act with the NMFS on September 22, 2009. The consultation included evaluation of dredging from the central and western arms of the Lagoon. In a letter dated November 25, 2009, the NMFS concluded that mitigation measures

MM BIO-1 through BIO-5 on pages 15–16 of the Marine Resources Report prepared for the project should adequately address many of the adverse impacts to EFH.

Reduction in the area of the EFH or water quality of the EFH of the Lagoon as a result of construction activities would be temporary. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an enhancement of water quality and an increase in area of open water available to managed fisheries species. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.1.

Based on the biological resource analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

4.2.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). The dredged area would be isolated by a silt curtain, and closed “environmental” buckets would be used to maintain water quality. The dredged material would be treated on site through cement stabilization and solidification or similar process. Similar to Alternative 1, the treatment process would occur using a pug mill to mix the dredged material with cement/reagent at an up to 20 percent mixture ratio.

Alternative 2 differs from Alternative 1 in the mode of transport to the disposal site at the POLB. For Alternative 2, once the treatment process is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and transported to Marine Stadium (an approximately 2 mi roundtrip truck trip from the Lagoon). The treated dredged material would be transferred from the trucks onto a barge/scow located at Marine Stadium. From there, the barge would transport treated dredged material to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 20 mi roundtrip barge trip from Marine Stadium).

Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to biological resources as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.2.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to biological resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.1.

Based on the biological resource analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

4.2.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. It is anticipated that the piping of the dredged material would require the use of a diesel-fueled booster pump and that the pug mill operation would be powered with a diesel-fueled generator. Once the piped dredged material reaches the Marine Stadium barge or land-based treatment facility, the dredged material would be dewatered. This process may include a flocculation process, where a chemical reagent (e.g., coagulants or flocculants) is added to the dredged material and causes the separation of sediment and water to occur. Water resulting from the dewatering process would be treated prior to discharge into the Marine Stadium/Colorado Lagoon. Sediment resulting from the dewatering process would be treated through cement stabilization or similar process and loaded onto a barge located at the northwest end of Marine Stadium. From there, the barge would transport treated dredged material to the POLB disposal site (an approximately 20 mi roundtrip barge trip from Marine Stadium to POLB).

Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to biological resources as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to in Section 4.2.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to biological resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.1.

Based on the biological resource analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

4.2.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon. Plastic tarps and containment structures would be placed under and around the stockpile area to minimize runoff back into the Lagoon and surrounding areas. The dredged material would be treated on site through the cement stabilization or similar process. Once the treatment process is complete, the treated dredged material would be loaded onto trucks and trucked to Marine Stadium where it would be transferred from the trucks onto a barge/scow located at the northwest end of Marine Stadium and transported to the POLB disposal site.

While dry excavation may result in a larger initial loss based on area affected, it will also recover following inundation by seawater.

There is a potential temporary impact on FMP species due to loss of water flow and dehydration after arm is pumped dry. Additional temporary impacts may occur due to loss of infaunal prey items with sediment removal. It is anticipated that prey would recolonize area. Long-term benefits would potentially be realized from reduced contaminant levels.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to Biological Resources as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.2.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to biological resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.1.

Based on the biological resource analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on biological resources.

4.3 TRAFFIC

4.3.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to traffic related to dredging activities. However, this alternative would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon and habitat areas in and around the Lagoon would not be improved. There are no new sources of traffic with implementation of this alternative.

4.3.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

Under this alternative, there would be trips associated with trucking the cement/reagent to the north shore parking lot for the treatment process, trips associated with the transport of treated dredged material from the Lagoon to the POLB disposal site, and construction worker trips. As identified in the EIR for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Program, during Phase 1 (which includes the dredging of the Lagoon), approximately 10 construction workers will be on site per day. These workers will add 20 daily passenger car trips (10 inbound in the morning and 10 outbound in the evening). Worker commute trips will not add a.m. peak-hour trips to construction traffic because the workers will arrive on site before the 7:00 a.m.–9:00 a.m. peak period. However, worker commute trips will add p.m. peak-hour trips because the workers will depart between 5:30 and 6:00 p.m. Other trips associated with cement importation and the trucking of treated dredged material are anticipated to occur throughout

the day. Table 4.3.1 provides a summary of trip generation that is associated with Alternative 1 dredging activities.

Table 4.3.1: Alternative 1 Construction Trips by Component

Dredging Activity Components	Trips
Delivery of cement/reagent for sediment treatment process	325 truck trips
Removal of dredged material from the Lagoon to Port of Long Beach disposal site	1,950 truck trips
Construction worker trips	1,600 car trips


Note: This table represents the total number of trips that would occur during all the dredging activities.

Trucks containing the treated dredged material and headed for the POLB disposal site would travel east on East 7th Street, north on I-405, and then south on I-710. Figure 4.3-1 illustrates the haul routes.

As identified in the overall environmental documentation for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Program, Phase 1 construction activity (which includes the dredging activities) is anticipated to add approximately 90 daily passenger car equivalent (PCE) trips, 28 a.m. peak-hour PCE trips, and 30 p.m. peak-hour PCE trips. All of the truck trips would travel on East 7th Street.

As described previously, East 7th Street is a four-lane roadway with an hourly capacity of 6,400 vehicles and an existing LOS of F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours at the intersection of East 7th Street and PCH. The addition of up to 28 p.m. peak-hour, construction-related, short-term trips would add less than 0.5 percent of the capacity of the roadway during the peak hour. In addition, most truck trips would occur during the day, when ambient traffic is less. Therefore, since the dredging activities are only a small portion of the overall Phase 1 construction of the Lagoon, the dredging activities would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load of the street system. In addition, construction traffic effects are temporary during the period of construction, and the number of construction workers and truck trips would vary depending on the specific construction activities. However, because the intersection of East 7th Street and PCH has an existing LOS of F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (which is below the City's established threshold of LOS D as the minimum operating level for roadway segments and intersections) and is located in the project vicinity and along the haul route, additional measures in the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.2, which require implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, and timing considerations for dredged haul trips have been included to reduce the impact of construction traffic on the local circulation system.

Based on the traffic analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic.



LEGEND

- ← to PORT OF LONG BEACH
- to MARINE STADIUM



0 2500 5000

FEET

SOURCE: Thomas Guide, 2007

I:\CLB0803\G\Haul Rt.cdr (3/23/10)

FIGURE 4.3-1

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project

Construction Haul Routes

4.3.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

Trips associated with this alternative would come from trucking cement/reagent onto the site for the treatment process, the trips associated with trucks transporting treated dredged material to Marine Stadium, barge trips of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to the POLB disposal site, and construction worker trips. Table 4.3.2 provides a trip summary associated with this alternative.

Table 4.3.2: Alternative 2 Construction Trips by Component

Dredging Activity Components	Trips
Delivery of cement/reagent for sediment treatment process	325 truck trips
Removal of dredged material from the Lagoon to Marine Stadium	1,950 truck trips
Barge transport of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to Port of Long Beach disposal site	35 barge trips
Construction worker trips	1,600 car trips

Note: This table represents the total number of trips that would occur during all the dredging activities.

It is expected that the barge dock would be located on the northwest side of Marine Stadium, with an anticipated route from the Lagoon to the barge dock as follows: from the Colorado Lagoon access road, left on 6th Street, left on Park Avenue, left on Appian Way, left on Nieto, and right onto the Marine Stadium access road.

The dredging activities would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load of the street system. Also, while Alternative 2 would result in the same number of haul trips for treated dredged material, the trips would be substantially shorter in length (2 mi rather than 12 mi) because the destination would be Marine Stadium rather than the POLB. In addition, construction traffic effects are temporary during the period of construction, and the number of construction workers and truck trips would vary depending on specific construction activities. However, because the intersection of East 7th Street and PCH has an existing LOS of F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (which is below the City's established threshold of LOS D as the minimum operating level for roadway segments and intersections) and is located in the project vicinity and along the material and equipment delivery route, additional measures in the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.2, which require implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, have been included to reduce the impact of construction traffic on the local circulation system.

Based on the traffic analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic.

4.3.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

Under this alternative, dredged material would be piped to Marine Stadium to be treated and loaded directly onto the Marine Stadium barge. Therefore, trips associated this alternative

would be limited to truck trips to transport cement/reagent to the site for the treatment process, barge trips of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to the POLB disposal site, and construction worker trips. Table 4.3.3 provides a trip summary associated with this alternative.

Table 4.3.3: Alternative 3 Construction Trips by Component

Dredging Activity Components	Trips
Delivery of cement/reagent for sediment treatment process	325 truck trips
Barge transport of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to Port of Long Beach disposal site	35 barge trips
Construction worker trips	1,600 car trips

Note: This table represents the total number of trips that would occur during all the dredging activities.

The temporary increase in local traffic due to construction worker commutes, including hauls and construction equipment truck traffic to and from the site, would not add substantially to existing traffic in the project area. However, because the intersection of East 7th Street and PCH has an existing LOS of F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (which is below the City's established threshold of LOS D as the minimum operating level for roadway segments and intersections) and is located in the project vicinity and along the haul route, additional measures in the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.2, which require implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, and timing considerations for dredged haul trips have been included to reduce the impact of construction traffic on the local circulation system.

Based on the traffic analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic.

4.3.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Trips associated this alternative would come from the transport of cement/reagent to the site for the treatment process, the trips associated with the haul of treated dredged material to Marine Stadium, barge trips of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to the POLB disposal site, and construction worker trips. Table 4.3.4 provides a trip summary associated with this alternative.

Table 4.3.4: Alternative 4 Construction Trips by Component

Dredging Activity Components	Trips
Delivery of cement/reagent for sediment treatment process	325 truck trips
Removal of dredged material from the Lagoon to Marine Stadium	1,950 truck trips
Barge transport of treated dredged material from Marine Stadium to Port of Long Beach disposal site	35 barge trips
Construction worker trips	1,600 car trips

Note: This table represents the total number of trips that would occur during all the dredging activities.

As identified in the overall environmental documentation for the Colorado Lagoon Restoration Program, Phase 1 construction activity (which includes the dredging activities) is anticipated to add approximately 90 daily PCE trips, 28 a.m. peak-hour PCE trips, and 30 p.m. peak-hour PCE trips. All of the truck trips would travel on East 7th Street.

The addition of up to 28 a.m. peak-hour, construction-related, short-term trips would add less than 0.5 percent of the capacity of the roadway during the peak hour. In addition, most truck trips would occur during the day, when ambient traffic is less. Therefore, since the dredging activities are only a small portion of the overall Phase 1 construction of the Lagoon, the dredging activities would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load of the street system. However, because the intersection of East 7th Street and PCH has an existing LOS of F in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours (which is below the City's established threshold of LOS D as the minimum operating level for roadway segments and intersections) and is located in the project vicinity and along the haul route, additional measures in the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.2, which require implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan, and timing considerations for haul trips of dredged material have been included to reduce the impact of construction traffic on the local circulation system.

Based on the traffic analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic.

4.4 AIR QUALITY

Air quality impacts under any of the alternatives would be significant if emissions (including mobile and stationary sources) permanently exceed the following federal emission criteria pollutant thresholds:

- 10 tons per year (tons/yr) of reactive organic compounds (ROC);
- 10 tons/yr of NO_x;
- 100 tons/yr of CO;
- 100 tons/yr of SO_x;
- 70 tons/yr of PM₁₀; and/or
- 100 tons/yr of PM_{2.5}.

Air quality impacts under any of the alternatives would also be significant if emissions (including mobile and stationary sources) permanently exceed any of the following SCAQMD thresholds:

- 70 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROC;
- 100 lbs/day of NO_x;
- 550 lbs/day of CO;
- 150 lbs/day of SO_x;
- 150 lbs/day of PM₁₀; and/or
- 55 lbs/day of PM_{2.5}.

4.4.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to air quality related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved. There are no new sources of air emissions with implementation of this alternative.

Table 4.4.1 lists the equipment that would be utilized for dredging activities. The other equipment on site (bulldozers, loaders, etc.) would be diesel fueled.

Table 4.4.1: Proposed Dredging Equipment

Type of Equipment	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
Barge-based excavator or clamshell dredge ¹	✓	✓		✓
Non-electric hydraulic dredge			✓	
Dredge pipeline booster pump (diesel-fueled)			✓	
Bulldozer	✓	✓	✓	✓
Small Track Loader	✓	✓	✓	✓
Excavator	✓	✓	✓	✓
Front-end Loader	✓	✓	✓	✓
Grader	✓	✓	✓	✓
Small Crane	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dewater Equipment/Pumps				✓
Pug mill	✓	✓	✓	✓
Conveyor				
Generator (diesel-fueled)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Barge		✓	✓	✓
Tugboat		✓	✓	✓
End-Dump Trucks	✓	✓		✓
Cement/Reagent Delivery Trucks	✓	✓	✓	✓

¹ Electric dredge equipment will be utilized if feasible.

4.4.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The proposed dredging activities under Alternative 1 would generate air pollutant emissions from heavy equipment and from vehicles used to transport dredged material from the Lagoon to the POLB. Dredging activities under Alternative 1 would require the use of equipment identified in Table 4.4.1. Dredge equipment could be electrically powered, in which case it would not result in on-site emissions. However, because the City and the Corps have been unable to confirm the feasible availability of electric dredge equipment, diesel-powered dredge is assumed for purposes of air pollutant emission calculations and conformity determination. Table 4.4.2 provides a summary of emissions generated from the use of equipment, transport of concrete and dredged material, and construction worker commutes.

Table 4.4.2: Alternative 1 Dredging Activity Emissions

Type of Equipment ¹	Pollutants of Concern						
	CO	ROC	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO ₂
2 Loaders	5.0	1.0	5.1	0.0	0.8	0.7	1,068.9
1 Generator	2.5	0.5	5.8	0.0	0.5	0.4	322.0
1 Dozer	4.1	0.7	14.9	0.0	0.6	0.6	956.4
1 Grader	2.0	0.5	8.2	0.0	0.5	0.5	1,061.9
1 Crane	0.8	0.2	4.6	0.0	0.2	0.1	257.3
1 Pug Mill	1.1	0.4	7.4	0.0	0.4	0.3	1,088.0
1 Clamshell Dredge	8.0	1.4	29.2	0.0	1.3	1.2	1,872.0
Haul Trucks ²	9.4	1.4	17.6	0.0	0.6	0.6	2,490.6
Worker Commute ³	3.3	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	514.4
Total (lbs/day)	36.2	6.3	93.1	0.1	4.8	4.4	9,631.6
SCAQMD Threshold (lbs/day)	550	75	100	150	150	55	N/A
Exceeds SCAQMD thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Alternative Total (tons)	1.8	0.3	4.7	0.0	0.2	0.2	481.6
<i>De Minimis</i> Thresholds (tons/year)	100	10	10	100	70	100	N/A
Exceeds <i>De Minimis</i> thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

¹ All off-road construction equipment is modeled using Tier 1 emission rates.

² Assumes that a total of 30 truck trips at 24 miles would be required per day.

³ Assumes that a total of 20 trips at 40 miles would be required per day.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO₂ = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROC = reactive organic compounds

SO_x = sulfur oxides

An action is presumed to conform and is exempt from a conformity determination if analysis shows that the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action would be less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds and if the project-related emissions are not regionally significant (would be less than 10% of the area emissions budget). The Proposed Action is dredging to remove contaminated sediment from the Lagoon and would result in emissions from the operation of equipment, the delivery of materials and equipment,

removal of dredged material from the site, and construction worker commutes. The emissions from these sources represent the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action. As shown in Table 4.4.2, the emissions levels for this alternative are less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds.

The most recent EPA-approved SIP at the time of the release of the final general conformity determination is used for emission budget analyses. The 1997 AQMP together with supplemental information form the basis for the current, EPA-approved O₃ SIP. The emissions inventories developed by SCAQMD and fully documented in the AQMPs are delineated by source types. The applicable source types for the proposed action include heavy-duty diesel truck, commercial boats, and mobile equipment. Table 4.4.3 summarizes the emission budgets for these sources in the approved SIP.

These daily source emission budgets were annualized (daily budget × 365) and compared to the annual emission generated by the project alternatives. The project-related emissions are substantially less than 10 percent of the area emissions budget (less than 0.01%) and therefore are not considered to be regionally significant.

Table 4.4.3: Area Air Pollutant Emission Budget (tons Per Day)

Source Category	TOG	VOC	CO	NO _x	SO _x	TSP	PM ₁₀
Heavy Duty Diesel Trucks	17.62	17.12	180.60	153.08	12.49	7.96	6.68
Commercial Boats	0.51	0.49	2.00	10.22	1.71	0.19	0.18
Mobile Equipment	46.77	45.07	918.49	119.16	3.53	8.85	8.50
Total Applicable Source Categories	64.90	62.68	1,101.09	282.46	17.73	17.00	15.36

CO = carbon monoxide

NO_x = nitrogen oxide

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter

SO_x = sulfur oxide

TOG = total organic gases

TSP = total suspended solids

VOC = volatile organic compound

Source: 1997 AQMP

Emissions from the dredge and other support equipment would result in minimal air quality impacts that are temporary and short-term during dredging activity. Air quality would return to pre-project conditions following completion of dredging. Therefore, the Corps has concluded that the air quality impacts generated by the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project would be temporary, short-term, and minimal, and the Proposed Action will not have a significant adverse effect on air quality.

The Corps has concluded that the air conformity analyses described above, and the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.3 of this report adequately address impacts from the diesel operated dredge and supporting equipment during the proposed dredging of the Lagoon.

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. These odors would be limited to the time that the equipment is operating during the period for the Proposed Action. Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.3 of this report reduce impacts associated with objectionable odors from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment.

The dredged material may be spread out on site to dry before being treated and hauled off site. It is anticipated that the dredged sediment will contain organic materials and that decomposition of the organic matter when exposed to air may generate unpleasant odors. The decaying marine vegetation that was not previously exposed may create unpleasant odors. Therefore, the dredged material may result in odor impacts at the adjacent and nearby sensitive land uses.

Alternative 1 would result in approximately 482 tons (or 437 metric tons) of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions during dredging activities. CO₂ is a greenhouse gas (GHG) that is considered to contribute to global climate change (GCC). GCC describes alterations in weather features (e.g., temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) that occur across the Earth as a whole. GCC and GHG emissions are an emerging environmental concern being raised on statewide, national, and global levels.

The ARB has published draft preliminary guidance to agencies on how to establish interim significance thresholds for analyzing GHG emissions called *Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases Under the California Environmental Quality Act* (October 2008). The ARB document supports identifying emissions up to 1,600 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (CO_{2e}) per year as less than significant. The ARB report indicates that emissions under 1,600 metric tons would not interfere with achieving the State's emission reduction objectives in AB 32 (and EO S-03-05) and thus may be deemed categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Traffic and other equipment associated with Alternative 1 would emit approximately 437 metric tons of CO₂ per year, well below the screening threshold of 1,600 metric tons. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in significant global climate change impacts.

Based on the air quality analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on air quality. The total emissions of each criterion pollutant under Alternative 1 meets or is below the SCAQMD thresholds and *De Minimus* levels identified for federal criteria pollutant thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 1 of the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project conforms to the CAA as amended (1990).

4.4.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

The proposed dredging activities under Alternative 2 would generate air pollutant emissions from dredging, other heavy equipment, barges, ancillary vessels, and vehicles used to

transport dredged material from the Lagoon to the POLB. Dredging activities under Alternative 1 would require the use of equipment identified in previously referenced Table 4.4.1. Table 4.4.4 summarizes emissions generated from the use of equipment transport of concrete and dredged material and from construction worker commutes.

Table 4.4.4: Alternative 2 Dredging Activity Emissions

Type of Equipment ¹	Pollutants of Concern						
	CO	ROC	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO ₂
2 Loaders	5.0	0.7	4.2	0.0	0.4	0.4	1,068.9
1 Generator	2.5	0.4	4.9	0.0	0.2	0.2	322.0
1 Dozer	3.4	0.5	10.7	0.0	0.4	0.4	956.4
1 Grader	2.0	0.5	5.9	0.0	0.3	0.3	1,061.9
1 Crane	0.6	0.1	3.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	257.3
1 Pug Mill	1.1	0.4	5.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	1,088.0
1 Clamshell Dredge	6.6	0.9	21.1	0.0	0.8	0.8	1,872.0
1 Tug Boat ²	7.6	1.7	40.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	1,743.1
1 gas skiff	75.3	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	60.6
Haul Trucks (Cement) ³	1.3	0.2	2.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	332.1
Haul Trucks (Stadium) ⁴	0.7	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	173.0
Worker Commute ⁵	3.3	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	514.4
Total (lbs/day)	109.3	38.6	100.0	0.7	4.3	3.9	9,449.7
SCAQMD Threshold (lbs/day)	550	75	100	150	150	55	N/A
Exceeds SCAQMD thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Alternative Total (tons)	5.5	1.9	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	472.5
<i>De Minimis</i> Thresholds (tons/year)	100	10	10	100	70	100	N/A
Exceeds <i>De Minimis</i> thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

¹ All off-road construction equipment is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

² The diesel tug boat is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

³ Assumes that a total of 4 truck trips at 24 miles would be required for cement import activities per day.

⁴ Assumes that a total of 25 truck trips at 2 miles would be required for transfer of dredged material from the Lagoon to the Marine Stadium barge per day.

⁵ Assumes that a total of 20 trips at 40 miles would be required.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO₂ = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROC = reactive organic compounds

SO_x = sulfur oxides

As described above, a proposed action is presumed to conform and is exempt from a conformity determination if analysis shows that the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action would be less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds and if the project-related emissions are not regionally significant (would be less than 10% of the area emissions budget). The Proposed Action is dredging to remove contaminated sediment from the Lagoon and would result in emissions from the operation of equipment, the delivery of materials and equipment, removal of dredged material from the

site, and construction worker commutes. The emissions from these sources represent the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action. As shown in Table 4.4.4, the emissions levels for this alternative are less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds. Also, the daily source emission budgets for the area (previously referenced Table 4.4.3) were annualized and compared to the annual emission generated by the project alternatives. The project-related emissions are substantially less than 10 percent of the area emissions budget (less than 0.01%) and therefore are not considered to be regionally significant.

Emissions from the dredge and other support equipment would result in minimal air quality impacts that are temporary and short-term during dredging activity. Air quality would return to pre-project conditions following completion of dredging. Therefore, the Corps has concluded that the air quality impacts generated by the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project would be temporary, short-term, and minimal, and will not have a significant adverse effect on air quality.

The Corps has concluded that the air conformity analyses described above and the Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.3 of this report adequately address impacts from the diesel-operated dredge and supporting equipment during the proposed dredging of the Lagoon.

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. These odors would be limited to the time that the equipment is operating during the period for the Proposed Action. Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.3 of this report reduce impacts associated with objectionable odors from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment.

The dredged material may be spread out on site to dry before being treated and hauled off site. It is anticipated that the dredged sediment will contain organic materials and that decomposition of the organic matter when exposed to air may generate unpleasant odors. The decaying marine vegetation that was not previously exposed may create unpleasant odors. Therefore, the dredged material may result in odor impacts at the adjacent and nearby sensitive land uses.

Alternative 2 would result in approximately 473 tons (or 429 metric tons) of CO₂ emissions during dredging activities. CO₂ is a GHG that is considered to contribute to GCC. GCC describes alterations in weather features (e.g., temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) that occur across the Earth as a whole. GCC and GHG emissions are an emerging environmental concern being raised on statewide, national, and global levels.

The ARB has published draft preliminary guidance to agencies on how to establish interim significance thresholds for analyzing GHG emissions called *Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases Under the California Environmental*

Quality Act (October 2008). The ARB document supports identifying emissions up to 1,600 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year as less than significant. The ARB report indicates that emissions under 1,600 metric tons would not interfere with achieving the State's emission reduction objectives in AB 32 (and EO S-03-05) and thus may be deemed categorically exempt from CEQA. Traffic and other equipment associated with Alternative 2 would emit approximately 429 metric tons of CO₂ per year, well below the screening threshold of 1,600 metric tons. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in significant global climate change impacts.

Based on the air quality analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant impact on air quality. The total emissions of each criterion pollutant under Alternative 2 meets or is below the SCAQMD thresholds and *De Minimis* levels identified for federal criteria pollutant thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 2 of the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project conforms to the CAA as amended (1990).

4.4.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

As described above, a proposed action is presumed to conform and is exempt from a conformity determination if analysis shows that the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action would be less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds and if the project-related emissions are not regionally significant (would be less than 10% of the area emissions budget). The Proposed Action is dredging to remove contaminated sediment from the Lagoon and would result in emissions from the operation of equipment, the delivery of materials and equipment, removal of dredged material from the site, and construction worker commutes. The emissions from these sources represent the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action. As shown in Table 4.4.5, the emissions levels for this alternative are less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds. Also, the daily source emission budgets for the area (previously referenced Table 4.4.3) were annualized and compared to the annual emission generated by the project alternatives. The project-related emissions are substantially less than 10 percent of the area emissions budget (less than 0.01%) and therefore are not considered to be regionally significant.

Emissions from the dredge and other support equipment would result in minimal air quality impacts that are temporary and short-term during dredging activity. Air quality would return to pre-project conditions following completion of dredging. Therefore, the Corps has concluded that the air quality impacts generated by the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project would be temporary, short-term, and minimal, and will not have a significant adverse effect on air quality.

Table 4.4.5: Alternative 3 Dredging Activity Emissions

Type of Equipment ¹	Pollutants of Concern						
	CO	ROC	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO ₂
2 Loaders	5.0	0.7	4.2	0.0	0.4	0.4	1,068.9
1 Pump ²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 Dozer	3.4	0.5	10.7	0.0	0.4	0.4	956.4
1 Grader	2.0	0.5	5.9	0.0	0.3	0.3	1,061.9
1 Crane	0.6	0.1	3.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	257.3
1 Pug Mill ²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 Hydraulic Dredge	5.5	1.1	28.3	0.0	1.6	1.4	2,760.0
1 Tug Boat ³	7.6	1.7	40.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	1,743.1
1 Gas Skiff	75.3	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	60.6
Haul Trucks (Cement) ⁴	1.3	0.2	2.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	332.1
Worker Commute ⁵	3.3	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	514.4
Total (lbs/day)	104.0	37.9	95.8	0.7	4.5	4.1	8,754.8
SCAQMD Threshold (lbs/day)	550	75	100	150	150	55	N/A
Exceeds SCAQMD thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Alternative Total (tons)	5.2	1.9	4.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	437.7
<i>De Minimis</i> Thresholds (tons/year)	100	10	10	100	70	100	N/A
Exceeds <i>De Minimis</i> thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

¹ All off-road construction equipment is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

² The pug mill and pump will be electrically powered.

³ The diesel tug boat is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

⁴ Assumes that a total of 4 truck trips at 24 miles would be required for cement import activities per day.

⁵ Assumes that a total of 20 trips at 40 miles would be required per day.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO₂ = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROC = reactive organic compounds

SO_x = sulfur oxides

The Corps has concluded that the air conformity analyses described above and the Environmental Commitments cited in Section 8.3 of this report adequately address impacts from the diesel-operated dredge and supporting equipment during the proposed dredging of the Lagoon.

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. These odors would be limited to the time that the equipment is operating during the period for the Proposed Action. Environmental Commitments identified in Section 8.3 of this report reduce impacts associated with objectionable odors from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment.

It is anticipated that the dredged sediment will contain organic materials and that decomposition of the organic matter when exposed to air may generate unpleasant odors. The decaying marine vegetation that was not previously exposed may create unpleasant odors.

Therefore, the dredged material may result in odor impacts at the adjacent and nearby sensitive land uses.

Alternative 3 would result in approximately 438 tons (or 397 metric tons) of CO₂ emissions during dredging activities. CO₂ is a GHG that is considered to contribute to GCC. GCC describes alterations in weather features (e.g., temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) that occur across the Earth as a whole. GCC and GHG emissions are an emerging environmental concern being raised on statewide, national, and global levels.

The ARB has published draft preliminary guidance to agencies on how to establish interim significance thresholds for analyzing GHG emissions called *Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases Under the California Environmental Quality Act* (October 2008). The ARB document supports identifying emissions up to 1,600 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year as less than significant. The ARB report indicates that emissions under 1,600 metric tons would not interfere with achieving the State's emission reduction objectives in AB 32 (and EO S-03-05) and thus may be deemed categorically exempt from CEQA. Traffic and other equipment associated with Alternative 3 would emit approximately 397 metric tons of CO₂ per year, well below the screening threshold of 1,600 metric tons. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in significant global climate change impacts.

Based on the air quality analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant impact on air quality. The total emissions of each criterion pollutant under Alternative 3 meets or is below the SCAQMD thresholds and *De Minimis* levels identified for federal criteria pollutant thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 3 of the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project conforms to the CAA as amended (1990).

4.4.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

The proposed dredging activities under Alternative 4 would generate air pollutant emissions from dredging, other heavy equipment emissions, barges, ancillary vessels, and vehicles used to transport dredged material from the Lagoon to the POLB. As described above, a proposed action is presumed to conform and is exempt from a conformity determination if analysis shows that the total net direct and indirect emissions from the Proposed Action would be less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds and if the project-related emissions are not regionally significant (would be less than 10% of the area emissions budget). As shown in Table 4.4.6, the emissions levels for this alternative are less than the applicable SCAQMD and *De Minimis* thresholds. Also, the daily source emission budgets for the area (previously referenced Table 4.4.3) were annualized and compared to the annual emission generated by the project alternatives. The project-related emissions are substantially less than 10 percent of the area emissions budget (less than 0.01%) and therefore are not considered to be regionally significant.

Table 4.4.6: Alternative 4 Dredging Activity Emissions

Type of Equipment ¹	Pollutants of Concern						
	CO	ROC	NO _x	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO ₂
2 Loaders	5.0	0.7	4.2	0.0	0.4	0.4	1,068.9
4 Pumps ²	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1 Dozer	3.4	0.5	10.7	0.0	0.4	0.4	956.4
1 Grader	2.0	0.5	5.9	0.0	0.3	0.3	1,061.9
1 Crane	0.6	0.1	3.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	257.3
1 Pug Mill	1.1	0.4	7.4	0.0	0.4	0.3	1,088.0
1 Excavator	6.6	0.9	21.1	0.0	0.8	0.8	1,872.0
1 Tug Boat ³	7.6	1.7	40.6	0.6	1.3	1.2	1,743.1
1 gas skiff	75.3	33.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	60.6
Haul Trucks (Cement) ⁴	1.3	0.2	2.3	0.0	0.1	0.1	332.1
Haul Trucks (Stadium) ⁵	0.7	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	173.0
Worker Commute ⁶	3.3	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	514.4
Total (lbs/day)	106.8	38.2	95.1	0.7	4.1	3.7	9,127.7
SCAQMD Threshold (lbs/day)	550	75	100	150	150	55	N/A
Exceeds SCAQMD thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Alternative Total (tons)	5.3	1.9	4.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	456.4
<i>De Minimus</i> Thresholds (tons/year)	100	10	10	100	70	100	N/A
Exceeds <i>De Minimus</i> thresholds?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No

¹ All off-road construction equipment is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

² The pumps will be electrically powered.

³ The diesel tug boat is modeled using Tier 2 emission rates.

⁴ Assumes that a total of 4 truck trips at 24 miles would be required for cement import activities per day.

⁵ Assumes that a total of 25 truck trips at 2 miles would be required for transfer of dredged material from the Lagoon to the Marine Stadium barge per day.

⁶ Assumes that a total of 20 trips at 40 miles would be required per day.

CO = carbon monoxide

CO₂ = carbon dioxide

lbs/day = pounds per day

NO_x = nitrogen oxides

PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size

PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than 10 microns in size

ROC = reactive organic compounds

SO_x = sulfur oxides

Heavy-duty equipment in the project area during construction would emit odors. These odors would be limited to the time that the equipment is operating during the period for the Proposed Action. Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.3 of this report reduce impacts associated with objectionable odors from the operation of diesel-powered construction equipment.

As a result of the dry-dredge technique, areas that were previously submerged will become exposed during the new lower tide levels. The decaying marine vegetation that was not previously exposed may create unpleasant odors. It is anticipated that the dredged sediment will contain organic materials and that decomposition of the organic matter when exposed to

air may generate unpleasant odors. Therefore, the proposed action may result in odor impacts at adjacent and nearby sensitive land uses.

Alternative 4 would result in approximately 456 tons (or 414 metric tons) of CO₂ emissions during dredging activities. CO₂ is a GHG that is considered to contribute to GCC. GCC describes alterations in weather features (e.g., temperature, wind patterns, precipitation, and storms) that occur across the Earth as a whole. GCC and GHG emissions are an emerging environmental concern being raised on statewide, national, and global levels.

The ARB has published draft preliminary guidance to agencies on how to establish interim significance thresholds for analyzing GHG emissions called *Recommended Approaches for Setting Interim Thresholds for Greenhouse Gases Under the California Environmental Quality Act* (October 2008). The ARB document supports identifying emissions up to 1,600 metric tons of CO_{2e} per year as less than significant. The ARB report indicates that emissions under 1,600 metric tons would not interfere with achieving the State's emission reduction objectives in AB 32 (and EO S-03-05) and thus may be deemed categorically exempt from CEQA. Traffic and other equipment associated with Alternative 4 would emit approximately 414 metric tons of CO₂ per year, well below the screening threshold of 1,600 metric tons. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in significant global climate change impacts.

Based on the air quality analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant impact on air quality. The total emissions of each criterion pollutant under Alternative 4 meets or is below the SCAQMD thresholds and *De Minimus* levels identified for federal criteria pollutant thresholds. Therefore, Alternative 4 of the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project conforms to the CAA as amended (1990).

4.5 NOISE

4.5.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse noise effects related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Colorado Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon and habitat areas in and around the Lagoon would not be improved. There are no new sources of noise with implementation of this alternative.

4.5.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

Noise impacts from construction activities of the proposed project are a function of the noise generated by construction equipment, the equipment location, the sensitivity of nearby land uses, and the timing and duration of the noise-generating activities.

The proposed dredging activities in the Lagoon are located in an area of established and varied noise sources that include automobiles and recreational facilities/activities. The project area already experiences some elevated noise levels from traffic along adjacent access roads.

Two types of short-term noise impacts would occur during the proposed dredging activities. The first is the increase in traffic flow on local streets associated with the transport of workers, equipment, and materials to and from the project site. The pieces of heavy equipment to be utilized during dredging will be moved to the site and remain for the duration of dredging activities. The increase in traffic flow on the surrounding roads due to construction traffic would not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load of the street system. The associated increase in long-term traffic noise will not be perceptible. However, there will be short-term, intermittent, high-noise levels associated with trucks passing by from the project area.

The second type of short-term noise impact is related to the noise generated by heavy equipment operating within the project area. It is anticipated that the dredging activities under Alternative 1 would require the use of the following construction equipment:

- Electric barge-based excavator/clamshell dredge;
- Bulldozer;
- Small-track loader;
- Excavator;
- Front-end loader;
- Grader;
- Small crane;
- Pug mill;
- Generator (diesel-fueled);
- End-dump trucks; and
- Cement/reagent delivery trucks.

Table 4.5.1 lists typical construction equipment noise levels recommended for noise impact assessments, based on a distance of 50 ft between the equipment and a noise receptor.

Table 4.5.1: Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels

Type of Equipment	Range of Maximum Sound Levels Measured (dBA at 50 ft)	Suggested Maximum Sound Levels for Analysis (dBA at 50 ft)
Pile Drivers, 12,000 to 18,000 ft-lb/blow	81–96	93
Rock Drills	83–99	96
Jackhammers	75–85	82
Pneumatic Tools	78–88	85
Pumps	74–84	80
Scrapers	83–91	87
Haul Trucks	83–94	88
Cranes	79–86	82
Portable Generators	71–87	80
Rollers	75–82	80
Dozers	77–90	85
Tractors	77–82	80
Front-End Loaders	77–90	86
Hydraulic Backhoe	81–90	86
Hydraulic Excavators	81–90	86
Graders	79–89	86
Air Compressors	76–89	86
Trucks	81–87	86

dBA = A-weighted decibels

ft = feet

ft-lb/blow = foot-pounds per blow

Source: Noise Impact Analysis, May 2008.

As previously discussed, the decibel level decreases with distance from the sources, usually at a rate of 6 dB for every doubling of distance. Noise emissions vary from each piece of equipment utilized such that it is not possible to specifically quantify the exact project-related noise impact. However, as a worst-case scenario, it was determined that dredging noise is comparable to an earth scraper working in soft dirt (approximately 80 dBA at 50 ft away from the equipment). Other construction equipment used on site, such as loaders and backhoes, would generate up to 86 dBA L_{\max} at a distance of 50 ft.

Table 4.5.2 identifies the noise levels at various distances from an 80 dBA noise source.

Table 4.5.2: Typical Noise Attenuation Levels

Distance (feet)	Resulting Noise Level (dBA)
100	74
200	68
400	62
500	60
1,000	54
2,000	46
3,000	40

Note: Calculated using a point source spherical radiator equation

dBA = A-weighted decibel

Source: Caltrans Noise Manual, 1980.

Noise attenuation may reduce construction noise levels at the nearest sensitive land uses. The following sensitive land uses are located within the vicinity of the proposed dredging activities:

- On-site Preschool.** The on-site preschool is located within the vicinity of the central Lagoon dredge area. Standard construction equipment that would generate noise levels up to 86 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 ft would be required for the central Lagoon dredging. Standard construction activities that occur within 315 ft of the preschool would generate noise levels in excess of the City's daytime exterior noise standard of 70 dBA L_{max} . This is an adverse noise effect. However, as identified in Environmental Commitments Section provided in 8.4, the preschool shall be closed whenever construction occurs within 315 ft.
- Residential Developments.** The nearest residential developments are located approximately 100 ft from the proposed dredging activities. As a result, they would be exposed to dredging activity noise levels of up to 80 dBA L_{max} , which is above the City's daytime exterior noise standard of 70 dBA L_{max} .

Due to the distance between dredging activities and the existing sensitive receptors, project construction activities would result in an exceedance of the City's Noise Ordinance. However, noise associated with the dredging activities under this alternative is anticipated to be intermittent and temporary, with noise levels returning to ambient conditions upon project completion. The City of Long Beach Municipal Code allows elevated construction-related noise levels as long as the construction activities are limited to the hours specified. Dredging activity noise impacts would result in adverse effects; however, adherence to the City's Noise Ordinance and adherence to Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.4 would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

Based on the noise analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to noise.

4.5.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

Under this alternative, the locations of the dredging activities and the treatment of the dredged material would be the same as identified for Alternative 1. It is anticipated that the dredging activities under Alternative 2 would require the use of the following construction equipment:

- Non-electric barge-based excavator or clamshell dredge;
- Bulldozer;
- Small-track loader;
- Excavator;
- Front-end loader;
- Grader;
- Small crane;
- Pug mill;
- Generator (diesel-fueled);
- Barge;
- Tugboat;
- End-dump trucks; and
- Cement/reagent delivery trucks.

Non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment would be utilized and treated dredged material would be trucked into Marine Stadium for barge loading. The barge would then transport the treated dredged material to the POLB disposal site. It is anticipated that the use of the dredging equipment would generate a similar level of noise during the dredging activities at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor as identified in Alternative 1.

For the loading of treated dredged material onto the barge at Marine Stadium, it is anticipated that the nearest noise-sensitive receptors would be exposed to a noise level of 86 dBA L_{max} . This noise level would be above the City's daytime exterior noise standard of 70 dBA L_{max} .

Similar to what was identified for Alternative 1, due to the distance between dredging activities and the existing sensitive receptors, project construction activities would result in an exceedance of the City's Noise Ordinance. However, noise associated with the dredging

activities under this alternative is anticipated to be intermittent and temporary, with noise levels returning to ambient conditions upon project completion. The City of Long Beach Municipal Code allows elevated construction-related noise levels as long as the construction activities are limited to the hours specified. Dredging activity noise would result in adverse effects; however, adherence to the City's Noise Ordinance and adherence to Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.4 would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

Based on the noise analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to noise.

4.5.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

Under this alternative, the locations of the dredging activities would be the same as identified for Alternative 1. It is anticipated that the dredging activities under Alternative 3 would require the use of the following construction equipment:

- Non-electric hydraulic dredge;
- Dredge pipeline booster pump (diesel-fueled);
- Bulldozer;
- Small track loader;
- Excavator;
- Front-end loader;
- Grader;
- Small crane;
- Pug mill;
- Generator (diesel-fueled);
- Barge;
- Tugboat; and
- Cement/reagent delivery trucks.

Alternative 3 would utilize a non-electric hydraulic dredge machine that would dredge and pipe dredged material through the underground culvert to Marine Stadium. Once at Marine Stadium, the dredged material would be treated and loaded onto a barge to the POLB disposal site. It is anticipated that the use of the dredging equipment would generate a similar level of noise during dredging activities at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor as identified in Alternative 1.

Under this alternative, there are four potential areas where treatment and loading of the dredged material could occur (Figure 4.5-1). The nearest noise-sensitive receptors would be existing residences along Boathouse Lane and Paoli Way, approximately 50 ft from the proposed treatment and loading areas. Ancillary construction equipment used for the treatment and the loading of the dredged material would generate up to 86 dBA L_{max} at a distance of 50 ft. This would be above the City's daytime exterior noise standard of 70 dBA L_{max} . Dredging noise impacts would result in adverse effects; however, adherence to the City's Noise Ordinance and to measures identified in the Environmental Commitments Section 8.4 would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

Based on the noise analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to noise.

4.5.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Under this alternative, the locations of dredging activities and where the dredge material would be treated would be the same as identified for Alternative 1. It is anticipated that the dredging activities under Alternative 4 would require the use of the following construction equipment:

- Non-electric barge-based excavator or clamshell dredge;
- Bulldozer;
- Small track loader;
- Excavator;
- Front-end loader;
- Grader;
- Small crane;
- Dewater equipment/pumps;
- Pug mill;
- Generator (diesel-fueled);
- Barge;
- Tugboat;
- End-dump trucks; and
- Cement/reagent delivery trucks.

Alternative 4 would utilize a non-electric barge-based excavator during dredging activities. The west arm and central Lagoon would be dewatered, and dredged material would be treated at the north shore parking lot. Treated materials would be trucked to Marine Stadium. Once at Marine Stadium, the dredged material would be loaded onto a barge to the POLB disposal site. It is anticipated that the use of the dredging equipment would generate a similar level of noise during dredging activities at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor as identified in Alternative 1.

Similar to what was identified for Alternative 1, due to the distance between dredging activities and the existing sensitive receptors, project construction activities would result in an exceedance of the City's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, dredging activity noise would result in a temporary adverse change in the existing noise environment. However, once the project is completed, the existing ambient noise levels would return to baseline conditions. The City of Long Beach Municipal Code allows elevated construction-related noise levels as long as the construction activities are limited to the hours specified. Dredging activity noise would result in adverse effects; however, adherence to the City's noise regulations and adherence to Environmental Commitments provided in Section 8.4 would reduce construction noise impacts to sensitive receptors.

Based on the noise analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to noise.

4.6 LAND USE AND RECREATION

4.6.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to land use and recreation related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.6.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The intention of this alternative is to dredge the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and truck the dredged material to the POLB.

Land Use. The project site is presently used for park and recreation activities. The proposed project would implement water and sediment quality improvements. The proposed project would not change the existing uses within or adjacent to the project site. The Lagoon is an

existing parkland/open space uses. The proposed dredging action would support the City's implementation of water quality and other improvements that would enhance, but not change, the existing open space/recreation use of the site, which would continue with implementation of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed action would not alter the existing physical arrangement of the surrounding area and adverse impacts related to this issue would not occur.

The Lagoon is owned and operated by the City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine. Existing on-site facilities include the Colorado Lagoon Marine Science Center (which is staffed by the City and FOCL), restrooms, parking, a pedestrian bridge, a lifeguard station, sandy shoreline areas, play equipment, picnic areas, grassy open space areas, a preschool, and a model boat shop. Implementation of the proposed dredging action would support the implementation of long-term water quality control measures and enhance the Lagoon's value as a recreational resource. The proposed project would result in improved water quality within the Lagoon that will provide more opportunities for swimming.

Dredging activities would be temporary and would result in a short-term impact on land use. All of the project components are consistent with the existing park, open space, and natural resources at the Lagoon. The proposed project would make long-term improvements to the existing land uses at the Lagoon. These improvements would enhance the value of the site's existing uses, and no conflict would occur.

Recreation. Implementation of the proposed dredging action would provide improvements to enhance the existing recreation uses on the project site. The primary goal of the proposed project is to implement long-term water quality control measures and improve water quality to enhance the swimming amenity.

The proposed project does not include residential development or other factors that will increase demand beyond capacity on City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine services and facilities. In addition, the proposed project will not preclude the use of any existing recreation facilities in the project vicinity.

The Lagoon is owned and operated by the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine. Existing on-site facilities include the Colorado Lagoon Marine Science Center (which is staffed by the City and FOCL), restrooms, parking, a pedestrian bridge, a lifeguard station, sandy shoreline areas, play equipment, picnic areas, grassy open space, a preschool, and a model boat shop.

Implementation of the proposed dredging action would provide improvements to enhance the existing uses within and adjacent to the Lagoon. The primary goal of the proposed project is

to implement long-term water quality control measures and enhance the Lagoon's value as a recreational resource, including the swimming amenity.

Short-term construction-related effects will result from development of the proposed dredging action. Use of the project area for recreational activities would be adversely affected during the construction phase of the project. Figure 4.6-1 shows the staging and stockpile areas that would be utilized during construction activities for the various project components. The Lagoon will be closed to the public (swimming) during dredging activities. During these times, opportunities for passive and active recreation, including swimming, at the Lagoon will be affected.

To offset these short-term construction use impacts, Environmental Commitments described in Section 8.5 would provide coordination between the City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine and the affected park users, including identification of other available recreation facilities within the project vicinity. For example, Mother's Beach is a recreational beach area within Marine Stadium that provides many of the amenities also provided by the Lagoon, including swimming. This area, in addition to the 247 ac of ocean beaches located between the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers, could be used as a substitute during construction. In addition, there are several swimming pools that are available for public use, including five City swimming pools located at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, Silverado Park, and the Belmont Plaza Pool Complex (3 pools); four swimming pools at LBUSD high schools that are open to the public during the summer through City/LBUSD joint use agreements; and four pools at the City colleges and California State University Long Beach that offer public pool use.

Based on the land use and recreation analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on land use and recreation.


4.6.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to Land Use and Recreation as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.6.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Land Use and Recreation. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.5.

Based on the land use and recreation analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on land use and recreation.



FIGURE 4.6-1



SOURCE: Air Photo USA (2008)

I:\CLB0803\GIS\EA\ProposedStaging_StockpileAreas.mxd (8/20/2010)

Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project
Proposed Staging and Stockpile Areas

4.6.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to Land Use and Recreation as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.6.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Land Use and Recreation. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.5.

Based on the land use and recreation analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on land use and recreation.

4.6.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to Land Use and Recreation as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.6.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Land Use and Recreation. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.5.

Based on the land use and recreation analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on land use and recreation.

4.7 AESTHETICS

4.7.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to aesthetics related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.7.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The intention of this alternative is to dredge the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and truck the dredged material to the POLB.

There are no designated scenic highways or scenic roadways adjacent or in close proximity to the project area. The project area can be viewed from public areas including adjacent streets, on-site areas within the Lagoon, Marina Vista Park, the Recreation Pak golf course (a 9-hole course), and Marine Stadium.

Scenic vistas are defined as greater than 1 mile from a receptor and consist of horizon line views. As described above, the areas surrounding the project area on the east and west are fully developed with urban residential uses. The closest residential use on the east is approximately 40 ft and the closest residential use on the west is approximately 150 ft. The areas north and south of the project area are developed with open space/recreational uses; however, there are no designated scenic vistas on site or in the surrounding area. Views from the Lagoon, south toward Marine Stadium, currently do not provide sweeping scenic vista views because there are numerous large mature trees and small building structures that obstruct views greater than 1 mile.

Implementation of the proposed project will not disrupt existing scenic vistas or viewsheds on or from the project area. There are no scenic vistas located on site or in the surrounding vicinity that have been designated by the City or other agency in an adopted policy or plan. Therefore, the effect of the proposed project on a scenic vista is not considered adverse, and no Environmental Commitments are proposed.

The roadways surrounding the project site are not designated State scenic highways or roadways and there is no scenic rock outcroppings located within the project. Therefore, there are no designated scenic resources on the project site pertaining to rock outcroppings, scenic highways, or historic buildings.

Regarding visual character and quality, dredging the contaminated water from the Lagoon would result in significantly improved water quality. The improved water quality would be similar to the ocean and Marine Stadium in appearance, which will result in clearer water with fewer algae blooms.

As noted above, residential areas are located east, west, and south of the project site, the Recreation Park 9-hole golf course is adjacent to the north of the project site, and Marine Stadium is adjacent to the south of the project site. The sensitive land uses within the vicinity of the proposed project include the existing residences to the west, south, and northeast, Marina Vista Park to the east, the north and south Lagoon beaches, the on-site preschool, and the Recreation Park golf course. These land uses are located within 50 to 100 ft of the on-site

construction areas. The nearest residence is approximately 50 ft from the project site. Most of the residential areas are separated from the project site by roadways, the Lagoon water body, and landscaping. Therefore, views of the project site from the residences, parks, and adjacent open areas are generally unobstructed. As a result, views of the project site from these areas would be temporarily affected by construction activities with views of construction equipment and stockpiles. There will be heavy equipment on site throughout the approximately 4-month dredging period. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.6.

Based on the aesthetics analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics.

4.7.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to Aesthetics as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Refer to Section 4.7.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Aesthetics. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.6.

Based on the aesthetics analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics.

4.7.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to Aesthetics as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to aesthetics. Refer to Section 4.7.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Aesthetics. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.6.

Based on the aesthetics analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics.

4.7.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to Aesthetics as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to aesthetics. Refer to Section 4.7.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects to Aesthetics. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.6.

Based on the aesthetics analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on aesthetics.

4.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES

4.8.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to cultural resources related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.8.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

The intention of this alternative is to dredge the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and truck the dredged material to the POLB. An assessment of effects to cultural resources was prepared in accordance with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations (revised January 11, 2001) for the identification of historic properties (prehistoric or historic sites, buildings, structures, objects, or districts listed in, or eligible for listing in, the NRHP as required by 36 CFR Part 800, the regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (Section 106). The assessment concluded that there would no effect to historic properties per the Section 106 Guidelines (refer to Appendix D).

Historic Resources. The Lagoon will continue to operate as public parks after project implementation. Therefore, this discussion is limited to potential impacts to archaeological resources during construction as the proposed project would not involve operational activities that would disturb or destroy underlying archaeological or paleontological remains or other cultural/scientific resources.

Dredging the Lagoon would not affect Marine Stadium. Marine Stadium is not eligible for listing in the NRHP; therefore, the project would not result in adverse effects to the Marine Stadium as a locally designated historical resource or as a resource eligible for the NRHP (refer to Appendix E). No other historic resource or potential historic resource is located within or adjacent to the APE.

Archaeological Resources. As detailed previously, the records search identified six archaeological sites within 0.25 mi of the project area, but none within the APE. Much of the proposed dredged material within the Lagoon consists of sediment that has been deposited via the storm drains and non-native replenishment beach sand that has eroded into the Lagoon. The archaeological survey results, which are consistent with the history of the site, indicate that soil in the project area is loamy sand and that marine shell was observed over the majority of the project area. These are conditions consistent with an area of dredge and fill.

Therefore, implementation of the proposed project should not disturb native soils.

Paleontological Resources. Most of the dredged material within the Lagoon consists of sediment that has been deposited via the storm drains and non-native beach replenishment sand that has eroded into the Lagoon. Because of this, sensitive paleontological sediments that contain fossil remains are not likely to exist on site. Excavation and trenching for the various components of the proposed project would occur within the previous dredge and fill areas. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or unique geologic feature, and would not result in an adverse effect.

Human Remains. The project area does not contain any formal cemeteries. Archival research and the archaeological survey in connection with the proposed project did not indicate the presence of any previous or existing known human remains in the project area. As a result, the proposed project is not anticipated to disturb any human remains, including those outside of formal cemeteries. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.7.

Based on the cultural resources analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources.

4.8.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to Cultural Resources as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.7.

Based on the cultural resources analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources.

4.8.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to Cultural Resources as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.7.

Based on the cultural resources analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources.

4.8.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts to Cultural Resources as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to these resources. Environmental Commitments are provided in Section 8.7.

Based on the cultural resources analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on cultural resources.

4.9 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

4.9.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to hazards and hazardous materials related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.9.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

Alternative 1 would result in the dredging of the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and the trucking of the dredged material to the POLB.

Implementation of the proposed action would result in the removal of sediment from within the western and central portions of the Lagoon. Under this alternative, the wet dredge method would be utilized. The wet dredge method would not dewater the west arm of the Lagoon prior to dredging. The dredged area would be isolated by a silt curtain to maintain water quality. Clamshell/bucket-type dredging equipment would be used and temporary shore-perpendicular berms or piers would be built into the Lagoon to allow the dredger to access depths not within reach from the Lagoon's shore. The dredged material would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the northern shore until it is drained, treated, and loaded onto trucks. Plastic tarps and containment structures would be placed under and around the stockpile areas to minimize runoff back into the Lagoon and surrounding areas.

All sediments will be hauled off site as dry and non-hazardous material. Therefore, the dredged material will be stockpiled in two designated holding areas until dry. The stockpile areas total approximately 56,000 square feet (sf) and will be located in the north parking lot and along the southwestern perimeter of the Lagoon. The main construction staging area will be located adjacent to the west arm of the Lagoon.

Due to the contamination levels of lead within the Lagoon, the dredged materials from the western arm would be disposed of at an approved POLB landfill site after treatment. The POLB constructs landfill areas to provide additional land for the expansion of port facilities. Development of the landfill areas requires large amounts of rock and fill material. Several

existing POLB projects will require large volumes of fill material. However, disposing of dredged and treated sediment at a Port landfill project is constrained by the timing between the Lagoon dredge activities and the construction of the Port landfill.

The dredging, stockpiling, and disposal process may involve the use of limited quantities of chemical agents, solvents, paints, vehicle fuel, and other hazardous materials. However, with the implementation of hazardous waste BMPs and compliance with local, state, and federal regulations regarding hazardous materials use and storage, potential effects associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials are not anticipated to be adverse. Similarly, adherence to these existing regulations would not result in an adverse effect associated with reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials. These standard measures include but are not limited to provisions in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), Air Quality Rule 403, the General Construction Permit issued by LARWQCB, and Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) for Discharges of Groundwater from Construction and Project Dewatering to Surface Waters in Coastal Watersheds of Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.

As identified in the Treatment of Colorado Lagoon Sediments Report (Kinnetics, June 2010), sediment contamination issues in the western arm of Colorado Lagoon are largely limited to the top four feet of sediment and are most substantial in Areas A and B (farthest from the footbridge). Composites from Areas A and B exceeded California Title 22 criteria, thus classifying the sediment as hazardous. Lead contamination is generally lower in Area C (closer to the footbridge), but Area C also exhibited more variability and inconsistent spatial patterns. Sediments in Area C also have higher sand content, which would correlate with the lower lead levels. Elevated levels of lead extend into the deeper sediments (4–7 feet) in the vicinity of the two major storm drains that discharge into the Lagoon’s west arm. Removal of the top four feet of sediment throughout the western arm of Colorado Lagoon and selective removal of deeper sediment in the vicinity of the major storm drains would be expected to result in removal of all contaminated sediments. A variety of treatment technologies were investigated. Use of the Synthetic Metals Mineralization System (SMMS) treatment was found to be highly effective in stabilizing the soluble lead. The SMMS or a similar treatment would be expected to make the sediment nonhazardous and thus allow for disposal at the POLB unconfined disposal facility or at an upland landfill.

Without treatment, the existing sediments within the Lagoon would be characterized as hazardous for disposal and treated at a State-certified landfill. Due to elevated levels of lead, contaminated sediments will be removed as a part of the proposed project. This is considered only a temporary condition that is subject to regulatory oversight. Once the project site is considered “clean” by the Corps, project operation would involve the use and storage of hazardous materials typical to public facility maintenance operations and would not present an adverse hazard to the environment with regulatory compliance procedures in place.

Based on the Sediment Survey of the Central Basin of Colorado Lagoon (Kinnetics, June 2010), sediment contamination in the central portion of Colorado Lagoon is limited to the top

two feet of sediment. The highest concentrations of lead and zinc were found in the upper two feet of sediment at the two sites closest to the footbridge (G1 and G2) and at the site nearest to the culvert connecting Colorado Lagoon with Marine Stadium (H3) (Figure 4.9-1). Concentrations of lead in these three locations exceeded the NOAA ERM levels and, when subjected to the California Waste Extraction Test, were found to exceed the California Title 22 STLCL. Concentrations of zinc measured in the upper two feet of sediment were consistently above ERLs at all sites but never exceeded ERMs. None of the sediments from the 2–4 foot and 4–6 foot core segments were found to exceed Title 22 criteria for lead. Concentrations of lead and zinc in these deeper sediments were also consistently below NOAA ERLs. Figure 4.9-1: Composite Areas and Sampling Locations lead tend to co-occur with elevated concentrations of the other contaminants of concern.

The proposed dredge plan calls for grading of the side slopes of Colorado Lagoon in order to enhance intertidal habitat. Recently, testing was conducted to document levels of contaminants in these areas such that all disposal/reuse options could be considered. As identified in the Sediment/Soil Characterization of the Side Slopes of Colorado Lagoon Report (Kinnetics, June 2010), composites of sediment/soil cores from three segments of the Lagoon (T1 through T3) were analyzed for lead, organic carbon, and pH. Sediment testing in other areas of Colorado Lagoon had demonstrated that lead was an effective indicator of other contaminants of concern present in the Lagoon. A full suite of metals and organic compounds was analyzed at the fourth site in the northern arm of the Lagoon since no previous testing had been conducted in this area. All composites were analyzed for grain size. Concentrations of all target compounds were found to be far below sediment benchmarks used to assess potential ecological impacts in the marine environment, Title 22 standards for hazardous materials in California, and Regional Screening Levels for residential soils. Therefore, this material is considered suitable to be either reused or disposed of without treatment.

As noted above, sediment testing at Colorado Lagoon has confirmed that soluble lead concentrations exceed California Title 22 criteria, and is thus considered hazardous material. This project proposes to treat the sediments prior to transporting them to an approved disposal site. The treatment will consist of cement, lime and/or other chemical reagents that will reduce the levels of soluble lead to acceptable and non-hazardous levels. The proposed target level, post-treatment, of soluble lead is below 2.5 mg/L. A bench-scale evaluation of the treatment process was conducted over a period between October 2009 to April 2010, and the results are available in Appendix D. The bench-scale evaluation was conducted with consultation from the Southern California Dredged Material Management Team (SC-DMMT) and the Contaminated Sediments Task Force (CSTF). After multiple attempts at treating the contaminated sediments, a highly successful reagent mixture was found to successfully reduce the solubility of lead. Stabilizing reagents used as part of the treatment includes sulfates, sulfides, calcium compounds, and pH-adjusting materials in various combinations and at additive rates determined by the characteristics of the sediment. This treatment binds the lead in the sediment using a combination of mineral forms and hydroxyl

anion fixation chemistry which lower the leachability of the lead and similar metals present in the sediments. The final treatment process will be approved by SC-DMMT and CSTF through the Clean Water Act Section 404 permit, as managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Confirmatory testing will be required during construction to demonstrate that lead concentrations are maintained within acceptable levels prior to transport of the materials to the approved disposal site.

Based on the hazards and hazardous materials analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

4.9.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of effects to this issue. Refer to Section 4.9.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the hazards and hazardous materials analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

4.9.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts associated with this issue. Refer to Section 4.9.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with the removal, transport, and disposal of hazards and hazardous materials.

Based on the hazards and hazardous materials analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

4.9.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts related to Hazards and Hazardous Materials as Alternative 1. The difference between dredge methods (wet versus dry) would not result in a significant difference in the nature or extent of impacts to this issue. Refer to Section 4.9.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with this issue.

Based on the hazards and hazardous materials analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous materials.

4.10 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

4.10.1 No Action Alternative

This alternative would avoid all short-term adverse effects to hydrology and water quality related to dredging activities; however, it would not fulfill any of the project's objectives. The No Action Alternative would have a negative impact of not removing contaminated sediment from the Lagoon, and the environmental benefits to the project area would not be achieved. The water and sediment quality of the Lagoon would not be improved.

4.10.2 Alternative 1 (Mechanical Dredge and Truck Option Alternative)

Alternative 1 would result in the dredging of the central and western areas of the Lagoon using mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell/excavator or land-based excavator) and the trucking of the dredged material to the POLB.

The project site is not located within a groundwater recharge basin and there are no production wells within the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater supply with implementation of the proposed project. Due to the variable depth of groundwater at the project site, groundwater dewatering may be required during construction dredging activities. Dewatering activities would be temporary and the volume of groundwater that may be removed would not be substantial. No groundwater withdrawal would be required during operation of the project. Therefore, impacts to groundwater would not be adverse.

Temporary impacts to water quality will occur as the result of construction of the physical improvements to the Lagoon. These project components include the removal of contaminated sediments. The potential impacts of construction activities on water quality focus primarily on sediments, turbidity, and pollutants that might be associated with sediments (e.g., phosphorus and legacy pesticides). Construction-related activities that are primarily responsible for sediment releases are related to exposing soils to potential mobilization (erosion) by rainfall/runoff and wind. Environmental factors that affect erosion include topographic, soil, and rainfall characteristics. Non-sediment-related pollutants that are also of concern during construction include waste construction materials; chemicals, liquid products, and petroleum products used maintenance of heavy equipment; and concrete-related waste streams.

Water quality monitoring will be conducted during dredging to ensure that impacts are minimal and insignificant. Measures, including changes to dredging operations, will be imposed depending on monitoring results to ensure that impacts remain localized and insignificant.

Due to the contamination levels within the Lagoon, the dredged materials from the Lagoon location would be hauled to an approved POLB site. Approximately 32,500 cy of sediment would be removed from the western arm and central Lagoon.

The RWQCB and EPA are responsible for determining appropriate dredged material testing and discharge standards and for ensuring that dredging and the disposal of dredged materials are consistent with the maintenance of water quality. Criteria for determining the appropriate disposal method and a list of permits required for proper disposal of material are described in Section 4.10, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. As described in that section, material that is classified as a hazardous waste would require proper disposal as a hazardous waste. Final determination of a suitable disposal method is specified in the permit issued for the dredging project by the Corps.

Construction dredging and disposal of wet dredged materials could affect water quality if water quality protection measures were not implemented. Proposed dredging activities in the Lagoon would result in short-term disturbance of localized Lagoon sediments, which contain elevated concentrations of lead and organochlorine pesticides. As is typical for dredging projects, construction dredging of Lagoon sediments could adversely affect water quality by temporarily resuspending sediments, thereby increasing turbidity. In addition, chemicals such as lead and organochlorine pesticides that are present in the sediments could be released into the water column during resuspension, which could temporarily degrade water quality. Dredging could also expose deeper sediments with higher concentrations of lead and organochlorine pesticides to the water column, which could result in long-term degradation of water quality. Impacts related to resuspended sediments (turbidity) and resuspended metals and chemicals are described in more detail below.

Suspended sediments in the water column can lower levels of dissolved oxygen, increase salinity, increase concentrations of suspended solids, and possibly release chemicals present in sediments into the water. The degree of turbidity resulting from the suspended sediments would vary with the quantity and duration of the construction activity and would also depend on the methods used, the quality of equipment, and the care of the operator. In all cases, increased turbidity levels would be relatively short-lived and generally confined to within a few hundred yards of the activity. After initially high turbidity levels, sediments would disperse and background levels would be restored within hours of disturbance. Substantially depressed oxygen levels (i.e., below 5 mg/L) can cause respiratory stress to aquatic life, and levels below 3 mg/L can cause mortality. However, oxygen levels resulting from project construction activities are not expected to remain low for long periods. Also, tidal flushing would improve depressed oxygen levels by introducing oxygenated water into the project area, and releases of anoxic (oxygen-poor) sediments would occur for relatively short time periods. Normal circulation and tidal effects in the Lagoon would generally disperse and dilute the water temporarily affected by construction activities. Therefore, only temporary water quality impacts related to suspended solids in the water column would be expected during dredging activities.

As discussed above, sediments would be resuspended during construction of Alternative 1 (wet dredging). Because these sediments contain lead and organochlorine pesticides, water quality in the Lagoon could be temporarily degraded during construction dredging, resulting in a potentially adverse, but temporary, impact to water quality. Equipment used for dredging would be modified or specifically designed to control the dispersion of sediments and achieve precise control over the depth and area of sediment removal. In addition, dredge operators could use automatic rather than manual monitoring of the dredging operations, which would allow continuous data logging with automatic interpretation and automatic adjustments to the dredging operations for real-time feedback for the dredge operator. Automatic systems could also be used to monitor turbidity and other water quality conditions in the vicinity of the dredging operations and allow real-time adjustments by the dredging operators to control temporary water quality effects. Water quality impacts related to the dredging of sediments containing lead and organochlorine pesticides would not result in adverse effects.

Water from the dredged material would be allowed to sheet flow back into the Lagoon if the analysis indicates that the contaminants will not leach into the runoff, or the runoff water from the dredged material will be treated by either filtering or by binding with Portland cement for removal to a landfill. Once the material is sufficiently dried, it will be hauled off by trucks. With implementation of BMPs, impacts to water quality from stockpiled dredged material would not result in adverse effects.

The sediments in the central region of the Lagoon contain levels of lead, mercury, silver, DDT, and chlordane that are not hazardous per State standards. This project component

would remove sediment and sand that has eroded and been deposited into the Lagoon waters over the years and create a larger subtidal area.

Based on the hydrology analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on hydrology.

4.10.3 Alternative 2 (Mechanical Dredge Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative involves dredging activity using non-electric mechanical dredge/excavation equipment (barge-based clamshell or land-based excavator). Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts to water quality as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts to this issue. Refer to Section 4.10.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with hydrology and water quality.

Based on the hydrology analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on hydrology.

4.10.4 Alternative 3 (Non-Electric Hydraulic Equipment and Barge Alternative)

This alternative would result in the dredging of the Lagoon using non-electric hydraulic dredge equipment. Dredged material would be piped through an underground culvert to either the Marine Stadium barge or a land-based treatment facility. Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts to water quality as Alternative 1. The difference in the type of dredging equipment that is utilized would not result in a difference in the nature or extent of impacts associated with this issue. Refer to Section 4.10.2 for a discussion of Alternative 1 effects associated with this issue.

Based on the hydrology analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on hydrology.

4.10.5 Alternative 4 (Dry Dredge and Barge Alternative)

Alternative 4 differs from the other alternatives, as it implements a dry dredge method rather than a wet dredge method. The dry dredge method would install a temporary cofferdam just west of the footbridge to isolate the west arm of the Lagoon for dredging. The dredged area would be drained of water, and the bottom sediment would be dewatered. An excavator would be used to remove the dry sediment, which would be temporarily stockpiled in the parking lot along the Lagoon's north shore and the southwest shore of the Lagoon.

Impacts to water quality would be minimal under this scenario and are limited to dewatered groundwater discharged back to the central Lagoon. The groundwater on site is variable and has been recorded at depths ranging from 5 to 7 ft bgs. Groundwater is anticipated to be encountered during dredging activities associated with the dry dredge of the west arm. Therefore, groundwater may need to be discharged back into the central Lagoon during construction. Discharge of groundwater into the Lagoon has the potential to adversely affect water quality since the overlying sediments in the west arm of the Lagoon are hazardous or contaminated. Dewatered groundwater from the site may need to be filtered prior to discharge into the Lagoon to ensure that surface water quality is protected.

Any dewatering or construction-related, non-storm water discharges would be controlled in compliance with the LARWQCB groundwater dewatering permit (Order No. R4-2003-0111, NPDES No. CAG994004). This permit requires permittees to conduct monitoring of dewatering discharges and adhere to effluent and receiving water limitations contained within the permit so that water quality of surface waters is ensured protection. If the groundwater is found to contain contaminants, the discharge permit would require the dewatered groundwater to be treated prior to discharge into the storm drain system or surface waters. Compliance with the applicable dewatering permit would further ensure that the impacts of these discharges are appropriately addressed.

The dry dredged material would be stockpiled on the north beach parking lot prior to trucking to a landfill or the POLB. The stockpiled material would be placed on a tarp or moisture barrier to prevent contamination/leaching from the material back to the Lagoon waters. Once the material is sufficiently dried, it will be hauled off by trucks.

Based on the hydrology analysis discussed above, the Corps has concluded that the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration Project will not have a significant adverse impact on hydrology.

5.0 UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE EFFECTS

Pursuant to discussions cited in Section 4.0 (Environmental Effects) and Environmental Commitments detailed in Section 8.0, there are no unavoidable adverse effects to the existing environment as a result of the Proposed Action/Alternatives.

6.0 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

The Corps has concluded that the proposed federal action would not result in an irreversible disturbance on the existing environment.

An analysis of significant irreversible and irretrievable effects is required by 40 CFR Section 1502.16. *Irreversible commitments* are damages to the environment (e.g., soils, wetlands, and waterfowl habitats) that cannot be reversed, even after the life of a project. Irreversible commitments are those that cause either directly or indirectly the use of natural resources so that they cannot be restored or returned to their original conditions. They are considered irreversible because their implementation would affect a resource that has deteriorated such that renewal takes extensive time or financial resources or because they would destroy a resource. The proposed action will support the City's Lagoon restoration project and would not incur an irreversible commitment of resources.

Irretrievable commitments are those that are lost for a long period of time (e.g., the life of a project). This includes the use of nonrenewable resources, such as metal, wood, fuel, paper, and other natural or cultural resources, which are considered consumption of energy resources to implement the proposed Colorado Lagoon Estuary Restoration project. These resources are considered committed because they would be used for the proposed action when they could have been conserved or used for other purposes. Energy resources necessary for the proposed action would use diesel fuel to power dredge equipment and sea boats, gasoline for the commuter vehicles, and diesel fuel for truck transport of materials and supplies. The No Action Alternative would result in no energy resources expended.

7.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

7.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The existing uses on the project site are a combination of passive and active recreation uses. The proposed project would implement improvements to these existing uses on the project site. The proposed project site is currently served by all utilities and public services required for the existing and proposed uses, and no expansion or increase in these services is required for the operation of the project. The project will not remove obstacles to growth in a previously undeveloped area because the recreational and open space land uses will not change.

The potential for the proposed action to generate growth in the City is unlikely because the proposed action is the transport and disposal of approximately 32,500 cubic yards of treated dredged material. Furthermore, the existing Lagoon facilities will continue to serve existing residents of the City. The project does not result in the creation of new long-term jobs and would therefore not create a need for any additional housing. Based on these considerations, the proposed action would not induce population growth in the community or result in economic growth.

7.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The Corps has concluded that the cumulative impacts of projects, including the dredging activities and forecast (future) actions in the vicinity of the Colorado Lagoon would not result in an adverse effect to the quality of the existing natural or built environments.

Future projects in the vicinity of the Colorado Lagoon include the Alamitos Bay Marina Rehabilitation Project, the Termino Avenue Drain Project, and development projects.

The City of Long Beach is preparing to renovate the Alamitos Bay Marina dock system and conduct dredging in the Alamitos Bay marina basins. The project will be conducted within seven marina basins and phased over a 6-year period beginning in 2008. The Alamitos Bay Rehabilitation project will renovate the existing Alamitos Bay Marina facilities that are 50+ years old and have physically deteriorated over time. This project involves renovations to restroom facilities, dredging the seafloor of the marina, sea wall repairs, and dock and piling replacement. Alamitos Bay is adjacent to the Lagoon and contains 7 mi of inland waterways for recreational water-related uses, private dock and slip facilities, guest slips, a fuel dock, and federal anchorage areas.

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works is proposing to replace and reroute the TAD that currently drains to the Lagoon. The proposed project would involve the construction of a storm drain mainline, six lateral drains, low-flow treatment pump station, catch basin screens, and an outlet to Marine Stadium in the City. The proposed TADP would contain two key components: the storm drain to Marine Stadium and the diversion system to the County Sanitation District sewer line. The construction was initiated in the fall of 2009 and will continue over a period of approximately 26 months. The TAD is a major outfall structure that consists of two side-by-side storm water drainage lines. The project is extending and rerouting the drain to empty into Marine Stadium, thereby bypassing the Lagoon. The TAD has been identified as a primary source of the contamination detected in the Lagoon. The TADP would also intercept three additional drain pipes that currently discharge into the Lagoon. The combined effects of these projects would benefit water quality within the Lagoon. The additional measures included within this proposed project would provide long-term benefits to water quality, habitat restoration, and recreation.

The Corps concludes that the project will not result in any operational/long-term cumulative impacts. All cumulative impacts associated with the project will be temporary/short-term and associated with construction activities.

The following is a discussion of short-term cumulative project impacts:

- **Air Quality:** Construction of the project would contribute cumulatively to the local and regional air pollutants, together with other projects under construction. The project would result in short-term construction-related air quality impacts pertaining to NO_x emissions. Thus, it is anticipated that these additional NO_x emissions would result in short-term cumulative air quality impacts. The proposed action would also contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts because construction activity would result in additional emissions of pollutants, which may exacerbate ambient levels currently in excess of applicable NAAQS or CAAQS for O₃.
- **Biological Resources:** Short-term impacts to biological resources resulting from the construction phase of the TADP include potential impacts to nesting birds as a result of tree removal, potential impacts to eelgrass in Marine Stadium as a result of permanent removal and turbidity related to construction, potential impacts to native landscaping, potential impacts to intertidal and benthic invertebrate species due to turbidity and sediment loading, permanent loss of benthic invertebrate biomass and goby biomass within the footprint of the outlet structure. The TADP recirculated Draft EIR (County of Los Angeles 2008) has determined that the TADP will not have any cumulative impacts associated with biological resources. Therefore, cumulatively, the projects will not have an adverse effect on biological resources.

Impacts to wildlife and plant species will not result in significant contributions to cumulative impacts on any species. Impacts to species and habitats as a result of project construction and grading will be temporary, and the net result of the project will be to

increase and improve habitat for these species. The cumulative effects of restoration in Alamitos Bay and the Lagoon, as well as improvements to the TAD, will be beneficial to residents in the vicinity and those that use the areas for recreation.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** The proposed action in conjunction with TADP would improve storm water runoff quality and flooding conditions in the project area, thereby improving the existing water quality and hydrologic conditions in the Lagoon. No cumulative hydrology impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the related projects, when considered together with the proposed action, would reduce impacts to hydrology and water quality.
- **Noise:** The construction activity for the proposed project and construction of the TADP in the vicinity of and at the project site may occur at the same time. These projects, when combined, have the potential to contribute to short-term construction noise impacts, which could be cumulatively adverse; however, adherence with the City's Noise Ordinance would reduce the severity of construction noise impacts.
- **Recreation:** The Colorado Lagoon and the Alamitos Bay Marina provide very different recreation facilities; neither project would have a cumulative effect on the other during construction. The proposed project, in combination with the planned future projects, involves improvements to recreation and open space lands that would result in a cumulative benefit or overall enhancement of existing recreation facilities.
- **Traffic:** TADP construction that would occur adjacent to the dredge area would occur along East Appian Way, which is adjacent to the south shore of the Lagoon. The construction activity for the proposed project and construction of the TADP in the vicinity of and at the project site may occur at the same time. TADP construction workers and equipment and haul vehicles working in the vicinity of the proposed project may utilize the same haul route. Therefore, when combined, these projects have the potential to contribute to short-term construction traffic impacts.

The proposed Colorado Lagoon dredging project's minimal, temporary, and short-term activity is outweighed by the long-term benefits of the project including improved sediment and water quality of the Colorado Lagoon.

8.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

The Corps and contractors commit to avoiding or minimizing for adverse effects during the proposed Lagoon dredging and placement of treated dredged material activities. Based on the information available to the Los Angeles District Corps and recommendations of Resource Agencies, the following environmental commitments will be implemented to minimize potential environmental impacts. Applicable commitments will be incorporated into the project plans and contract specifications.

8.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- A field survey to investigate the presence of the invasive algae *Caulerpa taxifolia* will be conducted 30 to 60 days prior to commencement of construction by qualified divers certified by the CDFG and NMFS to conduct such surveys. The preconstruction caulerpa surveys will be conducted according to the accepted criteria of the Southern California Caulerpa Action Team (SCCAT) for conducting surveys for the invasive algae and in accordance with the NMFS and CDFG caulerpa survey protocols. Surveys will be conducted at a Surveillance level for Caulerpa-free Systems.

8.2 TRAFFIC

- Prior to the issuance of a permit for dredging activities, the Corps and the City shall, under the direction of the City Traffic Engineer, design and implement a Construction Traffic Management Plan. The plan shall be designed by a registered Traffic Engineer and shall address traffic control for any street closure, detour, or other disruption to traffic circulation and public transit routes. The plan shall identify the routes that construction vehicles will use to access the site, the hours of construction traffic, traffic controls and detours, and off-site vehicle staging areas. The plan shall also require the City to keep all haul routes clean and free of debris including, but not limited to, gravel and dirt.
- The Construction Contractor shall time the activities so as to not interfere with peak-hour traffic and minimize obstruction of through traffic lanes adjacent to the site. If necessary, a flagperson shall be retained to maintain safety adjacent to existing roadways.
- No truck trips for the hauling of dredged material will occur on PCH or 7th Street during the 7:00–9:00 a.m. or 5:00–7:00 p.m. peak traffic periods.

8.3 AIR QUALITY

- Haul trucks, dredges, and other construction equipment will be properly maintained in order to minimize release of diesel and hydrocarbon effluent into the atmosphere. The contractor will follow all air quality standards, including those regarding emissions, fuel use, and fuel consumption. Appropriate measures will be taken to reduce fugitive dust caused by dredge operations. Vehicle speed will be kept at 15 mph on all unpaved surfaces to avoid the formation of dust clouds. Water sprayers or other stabilization techniques should be proactively employed to prevent dust from occurring. Other dust minimization measures recommended include reducing the amount of the disturbed area where possible; spraying dirt stockpile areas daily if needed; and coverings or maintenance of 2 ft of freeboard (in accordance with California Vehicle Code [CVC] Section 23114) for trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose material.
- Dredging equipment and cranes are subject to permit requirements by the SCAQMD and/or statewide registration through the CARB portable equipment registration program. The contractor shall obtain a permit from the SCAQMD if and as necessary, pay all associated fees, and follow all permit requirements. A list of all equipment to be operated in the project area will be submitted to the SCAQMD. Once permits have been received, the SCAQMD Enforcement Group will be notified prior to bringing the dredge equipment on site. For any dredge that is not currently permitted, coordination with SCAQMD staff is required to determine the most appropriate measures to satisfy Best Available Control Technology (BACT) requirements.
- The Construction Contractor shall ensure that on-road construction trucks and other vehicles shall be shut off when not in use and shall not idle for more than 5 minutes.
- Construction equipment operating on site shall be equipped with two- to four-degree engine timing retard or precombustion chamber engines, where applicable.
- All off-road diesel construction equipment and on-road heavy duty trucks shall be fueled using low-sulfur fuels.

8.4 NOISE

- Haul trucks and construction equipment will be properly maintained and scheduled in order to minimize unsafe and nuisance noise effects to sensitive biological resources, residential areas, and the socioeconomic environment.
- The City Noise Control Officer shall ensure that the Construction Contractor limits construction activity that produces loud or unusual noise that annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity to between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday and federal holidays, and between 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturdays, with no construction activities on Sundays in accordance with the City's Noise Ordinance.

- During all dredging activities, the Project Contractors shall equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained mufflers consistent with manufacturers' standards.
- The Project Contractor shall place all stationary construction equipment so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors nearest the project site.
- The Construction Contractor shall locate equipment staging in areas that will create the greatest distance between construction-related noise sources and noise-sensitive receptors nearest the project site during all project construction.
- Prior to initiation of dredge activities, the Director of Parks, Recreation, and Marine shall hold a community pre-construction meeting, in concert with the Construction Contractor, to provide information regarding the construction schedule (which includes dredging activities). The construction schedule information shall include the duration, location, days, and frequency of the dredging activities.
- Noise Coordinator will be available to respond to public complaints about noise. Signs shall be posted at the construction site with this individual's name and a telephone number for individuals to report noise complaints.

8.5 LAND USE AND RECREATION

- The City of Long Beach Director of Parks, Recreation, and Marine will ensure that during dredging activities affecting the Lagoon, City Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine staff will provide local residents and neighborhood groups with information regarding the availability of other nearby City parks and facilities that offer swimming, picnicking, and other passive recreation opportunities enjoyed at the Lagoon. Information regarding Lagoon and Marine Stadium closures will also be made available on the City's website, through outreach to the neighborhood groups, and other means as appropriate.

8.6 AESTHETICS

- Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the City of Long Beach Director of Development Services designee shall require the construction contractor to provide screened construction fencing around construction area boundaries to temporarily screen views of construction activities.

8.7 CULTURAL RESOURCES

- An archaeologist meeting, at a minimum, the standards of the Secretary of the Interior shall be retained, shall be present at the pregrading conference, shall be on call in the event of inadvertent discovery of cultural resources and shall establish procedures for temporarily halting or redirecting work if unrecorded cultural resources are discovered

during grading to permit the sampling, identification, and evaluation of cultural materials as appropriate. If cultural materials are identified during construction, standard professional archaeological practices shall be initiated to characterize the resources and mitigate any impacts to those resources. Included within this approach will be the development of a curation agreement for the permanent care of materials collected from the project. This agreement would be negotiated with a suitable repository.

- If human remains are encountered, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). With the permission of the landowner or his/her authorized representative, the MLD may inspect the site of the discovery. The MLD shall complete the inspection within 48 hours of notification by the NAHC. The MLD may recommend scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.
- In accordance with the recommendations of the Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California Tribal Council and the Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians, monitoring by a qualified Native American from either one or both of these groups shall be allowed when, and if, ground-disturbing activities occur in undisturbed native soil. The project archaeologist will notify the Director of Development Services immediately upon exposure of native soils, so that a qualified Native American monitor may be invited to monitor further excavation and/or grading.

9.0 COORDINATION

The principal agencies with which this project has and will continue to coordinate include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Coastal Commission (CCC), the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) Central Coast (Region 4), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), and the City of Long Beach Parks, Recreation, and Marine Department.

10.0 COMPLIANCE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

This proposed project complies with applicable environmental regulations as outlined in the following paragraphs:

10.1 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT OF 1969

NEPA declares it a national policy to “encourage productive and enjoyable harmony between man and the environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; and to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to the Nation” (42 USC 4321). NEPA authorized and directed “that, to the fullest extent possible, the policies, regulations and public laws of the United States shall be interpreted and administered in accordance with the policies of the Act,” and imposes general and specific requirements on all federal Agencies (42 USC 4332).

The EA for dredging of the Colorado Lagoon was prepared in compliance with NEPA. Alternatives to the proposed action have been included in this document. Full compliance will be completed upon preparation of the final EA and the signing of the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

10.2 CLEAN WATER ACT, SECTION 401

A Section 401 Water Quality Certification (Permit No. 09-024) from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board, dated February 10, 2010, was issued to the City for discharges of fill associated with the overall Colorado Lagoon Restoration Project including dredging of the central and western arms. The Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board issued a separate Waste Discharge Requirement authorization, which satisfies requirements pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA for disposal of dredged material at Middle Harbor Project at POLB. With implementation of all terms and conditions of the above Water Quality Certification and Waste Discharge Requirement, the project would be in compliance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.

10.3 CLEAN WATER ACT, SECTION 404

The proposed action would result in the discharge of dredged material at POLB’s Middle Harbor CDF. This discharge of fill has already been authorized by a Section 404 Department

of Army permit (SPL-2004-1053-AJS) issued to POLB. The proposed project would also result in the discharge of fill if treated elutriate is discharged into waters of the United States. As indicated above, the City would be responsible for dredging and treatment of elutriate. Therefore, the City would be required to obtain a Section 404 permit from the Corps if final project design would result in the discharge of treated elutriate into waters of the United States. Based on the above, the transport and disposal of dredged material would be in compliance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

10.4 COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1972 (PL 92-583; 16 USC 1456 ET SEQ.)

As a Federal agency, the Los Angeles District Corps is responsible for ensuring project compliance with the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA). Section 307 of the CZMA [Title 16, U.S. Code Section 1456(c)] states that Federal Actions must be consistent with approved state coastal management programs to the maximum extent practicable. The California Coastal Act (CCA) is California's approved coastal management program applicable to the Proposed Action.

The Corps has completed an Environmental Assessment that (1) identifies and discusses the purpose and needs related to this action, (2) evaluates alternatives, and (3) addresses the impacts of the proposed project and alternatives as part of the decision process. The determination of consistency with the CCA is based on the analysis performed for this EA. This EA was prepared in compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 1500–1508) and the procedural provisions of Section 102(2) (c) of NEPA, 42 USC 4321, as amended.

The CCA establishes the California Coastal Commission (CCC) as having jurisdiction over California's Coastal Zone. The CCC issued Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 5-09-071 on August 20, 2009, finding that the City's Lagoon Restoration Project, including the proposed action to be funded by the Corps, is consistent with the CCA because it would improve the biological, water quality, and recreation conditions of the Lagoon, a coastal resource. Thus, the Los Angeles District has determined that the proposed action is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the CZMA. Accordingly, the CCC, in a letter dated October 5, 2010, concurred with the Corps' Negative Determination (ND-049-10) and agrees with the Corps that the proposed activities are the same as those analyzed in the above-referenced CDP 5-09-071.

10.5 FEDERAL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1972, SECTION 7(C)

Section 7 of the FESA requires that any federal agency authorizing, funding, or carrying out an action that "may affect" a federally listed threatened or endangered species or its designated critical habitat consult with the USFWS prior to commencing with the federal

action. Consultation culminates either with a concurrence from the USFWS that the action is not likely to adversely affect the species and/or designated critical habitat, or with a Biological Opinion if the action is likely to result in adverse effects.

The only threatened and endangered species which may occur at the Colorado Lagoon during construction activities is the California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*). However, based on the results of the study conducted by Keane, the Lagoon is considered to rarely support foraging least terns (Keane 2004). Additionally, construction activities for the federal project (transportation and disposal of treated sediments) would have no effect on foraging by the California least tern at the Colorado Lagoon. The Corps has determined that no listed species will be adversely affected by this project. Therefore, consultation with USFWS pursuant to Section 7(c) of the FESA is not required.

10.6 MAGNUSON-STEVENSON FISHERY MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION ACT, AS AMENDED

In compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act, the National Marine Fisheries Service has been consulted regarding potential impacts to Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). Although adverse impacts will occur associated with dredging operations, NMFS believes the project will result in a net benefit to EFH. Furthermore, as part of the Section 404 Clean Water Act permitting process, Regulatory Division of the Corps of Engineers initiated EFH consultation pursuant to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act with the NMFS on September 22, 2009. The consultation included evaluation of dredging from the central and western arms of the Lagoon. The NMFS in a letter dated November 25, 2009 concluded that mitigation measures MM BIO-1 through BIO-5 on pp.15-16 of the Marine Resources Report prepared for the project should adequately address many of the adverse impacts to EFH. Based on the above, the proposed action would be in compliance with the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

10.7 NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

The project is in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) as implemented by 36 CFR 800. In accordance with 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1), the Corps has determined that the proposed project will not cause impacts to properties listed on, or eligible for, the National Register of Historic Places. Accordingly, no further action, or coordination is required unless inadvertent discovery of cultural resources occurs.

10.8 FISH AND WILDLIFE COORDINATION ACT

Agencies must consult with the USFWS on wildlife conservation measures to be implemented during construction and maintenance of federal projects. The Corps is

responsible for requesting USFWS participation to identify project impacts and conservation measures pursuant with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA). The FWCA also requires consultation with the head of the state agency that administers wildlife resources in the affected state. Although the recommendations of the USFWS and state officials are not binding, the federal agency must give them full consideration.

The proposed project was coordinated with the USFWS, the NOAA, NMFS, and the CDFG in accordance with the FWCA. The Corps has concluded that the proposed project is in compliance with the FWCA.

10.9 CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1970, AS AMENDED

Air quality regulations were first promulgated with the Clean Air Act (CAA). The CAA is intended to protect the Nation's air quality by regulating emissions of air pollutants. Section 118 of the CAA requires that all Federal agencies engaged in activities that may result in the discharge of air pollutants comply with state and local air pollution control requirements. Section 176 of the CAA prohibits federal agencies from engaging in any activity that does not conform to an approved State Implementation Plan.

The CAA established the NAAQS and delegated enforcement of air pollution control to the states. In California, the Air Resources Board (CARB) has been designated as the state agency responsible for regulating air pollution sources at the state level. The CARB, in turn, has delegated the responsibility of regulating stationary emission sources to local air pollution control or management districts that, for the proposed project, is the San Diego Air Pollution Control District.

The CAA states that all applicable federal and state ambient air quality standards must be maintained during the operation of any emission source. The CAA also delegates to each state the authority to establish their own air quality rules and regulations. State adopted rules and regulations must be at least as stringent as the mandated federal requirements. In states where the NAAQS are exceeded, the CAA requires preparation of a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that identifies how the state will meet standards within timeframes mandated by the CAA.

The 1990 CAA established new nonattainment classifications, new emission control requirements, and new compliance dates for areas presently in nonattainment of the NAAQS, based on the design day value. The design day value is the fourth highest pollutant concentration recorded in a 3-year period. The requirements and compliance dates for reaching attainment are based on the nonattainment classification.

One of the requirements established by the 1990 CAA was an emission reduction amount, which is used to judge how progress toward attainment of the ozone standards is measured. The 1990 CAA requires areas in nonattainment of the NAAQS for ozone to reduce basin

wide VOC emissions by 15 percent for the first 6 years and by an average 3 percent per year thereafter until attainment is reached. Control measures must be identified in the SIP, which facilitates reduction in emissions and show progress toward attainment of ozone standards.

The 1990 CAA states that a federal agency cannot support an activity in any way unless it determines the activity will conform to the most recent EPA-approved SIP. This means that Federally supported or funded activities will not: (1) cause or contribute to any new violation of any air quality standard; (2) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard; or (3) delay the timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area. In accordance with Section 176 of the 1990 CAA, the EPA promulgated the final conformity rule for general Federal actions in the November 30, 1993 *Federal Register*.

Project emissions do not exceed “de minimis” levels established as a criteria for a finding of conformity. Therefore, the project is consistent with the SIP and meets the requirements of Section 176(c).

10.10 MIGRATORY BIRD ACT, AS AMENDED

The proposed action will not entail the taking, killing, or possession of any migratory birds and is therefore in compliance with the MBTA. The proposed action also complies with Executive Order 13186, Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds through implementation of Environmental Commitments.

11.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

This EA was co-prepared by:

Mona McGuire DeLeon, AICP, Principal, LSA Associates, Inc.
Crystahl Taylor, Senior Environmental Planner, LSA Associates, Inc.
Laurel Frakes, Environmental Planner, LSA Associates, Inc.
Kelly Czechowski, Environmental Planner, LSA Associates, Inc.
Keith Lay, Associate, LSA Associates, Inc.

This EA was reviewed by:

Eric Lopez, City of Long Beach
Craig Chalfant, City of Long Beach
John J. Killeen, Corps
Julian E. Serafin, Corps
Lawrence J. Smith, Corps
Se-Yao Hsu, Corps
David Witting, Corps
Summer Morlock, Corps
Kenneth Wong, Corps

12.0 DISTRIBUTION LIST

State Clearinghouse
Terry Roberts
Office of Planning & Research
1400 10th Street, Room 121
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dave Pirazzi
President
Friends of Colorado Lagoon
445 Los Altos Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814

Eastman, Kent W.
370 Orlena Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1848

SCAQMD
Ian MacMillan
21865 Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Lenny Arkinstall
Los Cerritos Wetland Stewards
6289 E. PCH #F39
Long Beach, CA 90803

McLane, Thomas J
366 Orlena Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1848

California Dept of Fish and Game
Loni Adams
4949 Viewridge Avenue
San Diego, CA 92123

Sarah Swain
Aquarium of the Pacific
100 Aquarium Way
Long Beach, CA 90802

Walley, James
5298 E Vermont Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1830

National Oceanic and Atmospheric
Administration (NOAA)
Bryant Chesney
501 West Ocean Boulevard Suite 4200
Long Beach, CA 90802□4221

Belmont Shore Resident's Association
Mike Ruehle
160 La Verne Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90803

Demler, Everett E
369 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1950

California Coastal Commission
Larry Simon
45 Fremont Street Suite 1900□2000
San Francisco, CA 94105□2219

Alamitos Heights Improvement
Association
Lee Ostendorf
5390 E 8th Street
Long Beach, CA 90804

Gebhart, Frank and Roberta trs
5300 E Vermont Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1916

USEPA, Region 9
Jorine Campopiano
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105□3901

Long Beach Unified School District
Carrie Matsumoto
Facilities Planning
1515 Hughes Way
Long Beach, CA 90810

Miller, Richard L
364 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1908

State Historic Preservation Office
Milford Wayne Donaldson
Office of Historic Preservation
1416 9th Street, Room 1442□7
Sacramento, CA 95814

National Marine Fisheries Service
Jeff Shenot CFP, PWS
Strategic Planning and Policy
Coordinator
1315 East-West Hwy
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Nickelsen, Phyllis
5330 E Vermont Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1916

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
Christine Medak
6010 Hidden Valley Road
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Owl Clan
Qun-tan Shup
48825 Sapaque Road
Bradley, CA 93426

Frenette, Daniel and Robin J
367 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1912

LARWQCB
Michael Lyons
320 W. 4th Street, Suite 200
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Gabrielino/Tongva San Gabriel Band of
Mission Indians
Anthony Morales, Chairperson
P.O. Box 693
San Gabriel, CA 91778

Stanton, David and Jocelyn
360 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1911

Mark Sandoval
Marine Bureau, PRM
2760 Studebaker Rd.
Long Beach, CA 90815

Gabrielino Tongva Indians of California
Tribal Council
Robert Dorame, Tribal Chair/Cultural
Resources
5450 Slauson Ave, Suite 151 PMB
Culver City, CA 90230

Dickey, Stephen F and Julie A
356 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1911

Dougherty, David A and Anita M
363 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1915

Williams, Kelly C and Susan E
357 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1915

Kaiser, John h and Karin
360 Terraine Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1914

Gardner, Thomas F
354 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1914

Medina, Christie C
365 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1905

Hodges, James R
PO Box 458
Montebello, CA 90640-0458

Benedict, Henry C
1615 Catalina Avenue
Seal Beach, CA 90740-5708

Wright, Thomas F and Jody K
362 Orlena Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1848

Rick, James H and Tami L
354 Orlena Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1848

Breig, Frances tr
5279 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1839

Busch, John F
363 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1950

Merlino, Maxine O and Dante R
359 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1950

Luarca, Roberto and Lorena
357 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1950

Kilmer, Bonnie N
5120 Breckenridge Avenue
Banning, CA 92220-7153

Cook, Walter R III and Lee Lan K
358 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1908

Webb, Patricia P
352 Panama Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1908

Palmer, Joseph J and Linda L
5315 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1901

Greeno, Frank S
689 E 200 S
Bountiful, UT 84010-3709

Shinozaki, Gyo and Laura
359 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1912

Byrne, James P
355 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1912

Travers, Martyn
353 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1912

Albers, Lawrence J
354 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1911

Dhein, James S and Annette N
352 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1911

Ramezani, Kourosh
350 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1911

Lambros, Ernest and Mary
355 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1915

Williams, Virginia
353 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1915

Hernandez, Lorenzo and Ramona
351 Terraine Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1915

Tyo, Michael J and Marilyn A
352 Terraine Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1914

Bell, Claud K Jr and Grace J
5407 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1903

Martin, Jean A
5415 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1903

Groen, Glenn V and Annette M
5425 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1903

Goldstein, David M and Jeri L
357 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1905

Wallis, Robert L and Natalia M
5455 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1903

Pruett, David P and Leanne K
351 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1905

Curry, Kent G and Ruth A
364 Havana Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1904

Sohl, Bertram E
362 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1904

Weber, Larry and Linda M
358 Havana Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1904

Fallon, Tom and Debbie
5475 E Colorado Street
Long Beach, CA 90814-1949

Miller, John
355 Los Altos Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1907

King, Kevin K and Joni M
351 Santiago Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1912

Litzinger, Ronald and Sheila
349 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Knob of Naples LLC
321 12th Street, Ste 2
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-5354

Post, Tina
348 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1955

Shattuck, Virginia J
346 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Davis, Richard T and Margaret J
5501 Windward Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1960

Nicholas, Charles T
5503 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1960

Hirsch, Alain
347 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Spoeri, Darlene A
345 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Nguyen, Thomas T and Kimberly P
343 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Dinapoll, John and Mary E
341 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Hambrick, Peter C and Judy P
5421 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Mazzocio, Diane
5400 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Rehan, Khalid and Mahboobeh
5420 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Mills, Jean S
6681 E 26th Street
Los Angeles, CA 90040-3215

Ross, Ernest A and Vlia A
5402 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Harrison, Thomas C
PO Box 699
Nogales, AZ 85628-0699

Persidsky, Igor V
5434 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Shipley, Jon T and Paula C
5432 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Bowton, Heidi H
5430 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Comyns, Louis S
5416 Heron Bay 2
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Rappoport, Arnold S
5414 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Kilpatrick, Robert J and Judith E
5407 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Shafer, Harry T and Ruth S
5409 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Long Beach Travel Center Inc
5413 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Schurdevin, Christelle
5415 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Blackmore, Donald W
5417 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Jones, Brian M
5419 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Maciog, Patricia A
5412 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Cruickshank, Simon and Xianhua
5410 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Nickel, Dennis
5408 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Rees, Alexander S and Janet M
5406 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Buck, Kenneth J
5404 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Werton, Marianne
5426 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Westervelt, Juliana
5422 Heron Bay 23
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Riley, Raymond L
633 W 5th Street 70th
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2005

Harris, Joyce
5401 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Thacker, Thomas
5428 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Larison, Ralph G and Patricia
5403 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Johnson, Glen M
5405 Heron Bay
Long Beach, CA 90803-4821

Schaub, Peter and Antonella
344 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1955

Recchia, Richard D and June G
342 Havana Avenue
long beach ca 90814-1955

Davies, David and Jaime
340 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1955

Belliveau, James B and Mary K
5465 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1962

Doty, Stephen and Lori R
5462 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1963

Samulski, John
5464 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1963

Luckey, Larry and Pamela S
5448 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1961

Rile, Howard C Jr
339 Havana Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1956

Vose, Charles S
5450 Windward Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1961

Tippett, Mark J and Suzanne M
5452 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1961

Estorga, Albert J and Jeri L
5454 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1961

Tang , Edwin and Patricia S
5456 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1963

Coe, David G and Larissa F
5458 Windward Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814-1963

Stansbury, Thomas and Clarene
5460 Windward Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90814-1963

Baumel, Keith and Deborah
371 Bayside Drive N
Long Beach, CA 90803-1943

Pearson, John M and Karen L
375 bayside Drive N
Long Beach, CA 90803-1943

Eagan, John T and Chryl A
381 bayside Drive N
Long Beach, CA 90803-1943

Ces, Pierre and Claudie
385 Bayside Drive N
Long Beach, CA 90803-1943

Rainey, Naomi
374 Bayside Drive N
long beach ca 90803-1942

Lewis, Robert H
380 Bayside Drive N
Long Beach, CA 90803-1942

Bonholtzer, John Jr and Joan
1001 Briarcliff Road
Monrovia, CA 91016-1703

Neil, Martha A
5560 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Putnam, Lawrence and Carol
PO Box 2728
Seal Beach, CA 90740-1728

Barcus, Beth A
5558 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Hartfield, Lulu
5526 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Shirloo, Ahmad
5524 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Holdaway, Richard E and B Jeanne
5522 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Hendrickson, Peter E
5520 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Hilt, Sally A
5556 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Smith, Jerome A and Melanie R
5554 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Gorman, Debra L
5552 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Wavell, John C
PO BOX 727
Los Alamitos, CA 90720-0727

Taylor, James R and Cathy A
5548 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Donaldson, Brian C
5546 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Serles, James C
5544 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Johnston, David R
5542 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Durnin, John and Natalie
5532 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Blair, William T
5534 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Ross, Steven J and Sandra L
5536 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Powell, Doyle W and Suzanne L
5540 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Suma, Norman S
5538 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Johnson, George E
5530 Azure Way
Long Beach, CA 90803-4823

Northern Trust Bank of California
355 S Grand Avenue 26th fl
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560

Long Beach Public Library
Main Library
101 Pacific Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90822

Long Beach Public Library
Brewitt Neighborhood Library
4036 E. Anaheim St.
Long Beach, CA 90804

Long Beach Public Library
Bay Shore Neighborhood Library
195 Bay Shore Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90803

Northern Trust Bank of California
355 S. Grand Avenue 26th fl
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560