

1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) that examines the potential effects of the proposed Civic Center project, which involves the redevelopment of an approximately 16-acre site in downtown Long Beach with a mix of institutional, residential, and commercial uses. The proposed project is described in detail in Section 2.0, *Project Description*. This section describes: (1) the general background of the project; (2) the purpose and legal authority of the SEIR; (3) the scope and content of the SEIR; (4) lead, responsible, and trustee agencies; and, (5) the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

1.1 PURPOSE AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

The proposed project requires discretionary approvals from the City of Long Beach. Pursuant to Section 15060(d) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the project is subject to the requirements of the CEQA. In accordance with Section 15121 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, the purpose of this SEIR is to serve as an informational document that:

"...will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, and identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects..."

This EIR has been prepared as a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) pursuant to Section 15163(a)(2) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. A SEIR is prepared when minor additions or changes are necessary to make a previously certified EIR adequately apply to the project in the changed situation. This SEIR and the Final Program EIR for the Downtown Plan that was adopted in January 2012 comprise the environmental review documentation for the Civic Center project. A copy of the Downtown Plan Final Program EIR (SCH# 2009071006) is available for review on the City of Long Beach website at http://www.lbds.info/planning/environmental_planning/environmental_reports.asp.

This SEIR is to serve as an informational document for the public and City of Long Beach decision-makers. The process will culminate with a City Council hearing to consider certification of the Final SEIR and approval of the project.

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The design of the proposed Civic Center project follows the guidance of the Downtown Plan (the "Downtown Plan"), which was adopted in January 2012. A Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was prepared for the Downtown Plan in accordance with CEQA and was certified in January 2012. The Downtown Plan project area covers approximately 719 acres in Long Beach. The Downtown Plan provides development standards and design guidelines for an expected increase in the density and intensity of existing Downtown land uses by allowing up to: (1) approximately 5,000 new residential units; (2) 1.5 million square feet of new office, civic, cultural, and similar uses; (3) 384,000 square feet of new retail; (4) 96,000 square feet of restaurants; and (5) 800 new hotel rooms. The development assumed in the Downtown Plan would occur over a 25-year time period.



The SEIR tiers from the Downtown Plan Final EIR. In accordance with CEQA, the EIR Supplement is a focused study of key issues that were not identified at a project level as part of the Downtown Plan Final EIR. Specifically, the EIR Supplement addresses issues about which potential impacts were not known at the time of preparation of the Downtown Plan Final EIR or for which Downtown Plan EIR mitigation measures stipulate further analysis on a project-by-project basis.

The City of Long Beach prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an SEIR and distributed it for agency and public review for the required 30-day review period on April 16, 2015. The Initial Study identified the following issue areas as having impacts that are “potentially significant” or “potentially significant without mitigation” and therefore require additional analysis in the SEIR:

- *Aesthetics*
- *Air quality*
- *Cultural resources*
- *Greenhouse gas emissions*
- *Noise*
- *Transportation and traffic*

The City received eight written responses to the NOP during the public review period, as well as one written response after the end of the comment period. The NOP is presented in Appendix A, along with the Initial Study that was prepared for the project and the NOP responses received. The intent of the NOP was to provide interested individuals, groups, public agencies and others a forum to provide input to the City regarding scope and focus of the SEIR. The City held an SEIR scoping meeting on April 30, 2015 during the public review period to solicit further public comment on the scope and content of the SEIR. The meeting was held at the Long Beach Main Library and began at 5 p.m. Four members of the public attended the meeting. Additional attendees included City staff and representatives of Plenary-Edgemoor Civic Partners (PECP), the City’s development partner. Attendees were invited to share comments on the SEIR scope, including suggestions for analyses that should be included in the SEIR and project alternatives that should be considered. Issues raised in written responses to the NOP and by attendees at the Scoping Meeting are summarized below and where the SEIR or Initial Study addresses these comments are indicated in Table 1-1.

**Table 1-1
 NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
<i>Commenter</i>	<i>Comment/Request</i>	<i>How and Where Comment Addressed</i>
Jillian Wong, Ph.D, Program Supervisor, Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources, South Coast Air Quality Management District	Recommends use of CEQA Air Quality Handbook for guidance in preparing air quality analysis and use CalEEMod for analysis.	The CEQA Air Quality Handbook was used for guidance (see Section 4.2.3, “Impact Analysis,” in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>). CalEEMod used for air quality analysis.
	Requests construction-related and operation-related air quality analysis, including impacts from indirect sources, such as those that generate or attract vehicular trips.	Impact AQ-2 in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , includes construction-related air quality analysis from direct and indirect sources. Impact AQ-3 in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , includes operation-related air quality analysis from direct and indirect sources.



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	Requests calculation of direct and indirect regional and localized air quality impacts and comparison to SCAQMD thresholds.	Impacts AQ-2 and AQ-3 in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , include analysis of direct and indirect regional and localized air quality impacts and utilizes SCAQMD regional and local significance thresholds.
	Recommends preparation of a mobile source health risk assessment for vehicular trips, if the project generates or attracts vehicular trips, especially heavy-duty diesel-fueled vehicles.	Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-4(a) requires a project-level health risk assessment (HRA) for commercial land uses that accommodate more than 100 trucks per day, or 40 trucks equipped with transportation refrigeration units (TRUs), within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. Impact AQ-5 in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , includes analysis of project generated truck trips and determines that the project's impact on mobile source TAC emissions would be less than significant and a project-level HRA is not warranted. See Impact AQ-5 in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , for additional discussion.
	Provides guidance on siting incompatible land uses in California Air Resources Board's <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective</i> .	The <i>Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Perspective</i> was used for guidance (see Impact AQ-5 discussion in Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>).
	Requests to be sent a copy of the Draft SEIR directly with appendices and all electronic files for CalEEMod and HARP (original modeling files and excel spreadsheets, not pdfs) to 21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765.	A copy of the SEIR with appendices and electronic CalEEMod files will be sent to SCAQMD with the Notice of Availability during the public review period.
	Requests utilizing all feasible mitigation measures to minimize or eliminate significant adverse impacts to air quality.	Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i> , includes mitigation measures required of the project by the Downtown Plan EIR and additional mitigation measures to minimize or eliminate significant adverse impacts to air quality, where feasible.
Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse	Confirms that the State Clearinghouse received the NOP.	No response required.
Kevin T. Johnson, Acting Chief, Forestry Division, Prevention Services Bureau, County of Los Angeles Fire Department	Confirms that the project site is not within the emergency response area of the Los Angeles County Fire Department and would not impact the Department's emergency responsibilities.	No response required.
	Confirms that although the project site is in close proximity to the jurisdictional area of the Los Angeles County Fire Department, the project is unlikely to necessitate a comment concerning general requirements from the Land Development Unit.	No response required.



**Table 1-1
 NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	Requests that potential impacts to erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archaeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance be discussed.	<p>Section VI, <i>Geology and Soils</i>, of the Initial Study (Appendix A) includes erosion related analysis.</p> <p>Section IV, <i>Biological Resources</i>, of the Initial Study (Appendix A) includes an analysis of the project's biological resource impact.</p> <p>Impact CR-1 in Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, includes analysis of impacts to cultural resources at the project site. Section V, <i>Cultural Resources</i>, of the Initial Study (Appendix A) includes analysis of archaeological resources and determined that the project's impact to archaeological resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>The project site is within urbanized, Downtown Long Beach. The project site is not within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity or Fire Zone 4 and would not require fuel modification.</p> <p>The project site is within the City of Long Beach and the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance does not apply to the project.</p>
	States that the proposed residential component of the project would likely require environmental oversight of an authorized government agency prior to site grading activities.	The lead agency for the project is the City of Long Beach and the Initial Study and SEIR examine the potential environmental effects of constructing the proposed Civic Center project.
Adriana Raza, Customer Service Specialist, Facilities Planning Department, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	States that the wastewater flow from the proposed project would discharge to a local sewer line for conveyance to the District's De Forest Avenue Trunk Sewer, which, as of 2012, had a design capacity exceeding its peak flow conveyance.	Section XVII, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , of the Initial Study (Appendix A) was revised to include an expanded discussion of wastewater treatment facilities.
	States that the wastewater generated by the project would be treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant in the City of Carson, which has a design capacity of 400 million gallons per day (mgd) and an average flow of 263.4 mgd.	Section XVII, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , of the Initial Study (Appendix A) was revised to include an expanded discussion of wastewater treatment facilities.



**Table 1-1
 NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	States that the District charges a connection fee in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project and that expansion of facilities would be sized and service phased in a manner that is consistent with the Southern California Association of Government's regional growth forecast.	Section XVII, <i>Utilities and Service Systems</i> , of the Initial Study (Appendix A) was revised to include an expanded discussion of wastewater treatment facilities.
Gary Shelton, Advocacy Chairman, Long Beach Area Coalition for the Homeless	States that the project would displace 55 persons during the construction period, dismantling community cohesion at the project site, and that displacement should be analyzed in the Draft SEIR and considered potentially significant unless mitigation is incorporated.	Section XIII, <i>Population and Housing</i> , of the Initial Study (see Appendix A) has been revised to include a discussion regarding displacement of this population.
	Recommends potential mitigation could include the creation of "Day Shelters" to fill the gap caused by nighttime accommodations being closed during the day and the project site being unavailable during the construction period. Also recommends that social services be included to lead people to permanent housing.	Section XIII, <i>Population and Housing</i> , of the Initial Study (see Appendix A) has been revised to include a discussion regarding displacement of this population.
Ping Chang, Program Manager II, Land Use and Environmental Planning, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)	The commenter encourages the use of a side-by-side comparison of SCAG goals with discussions of consistency, non-consistency, or non-applicability of the policy and supportive analysis in a table format. Recommends referring to SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS strategies when considering if the proposed project within the context of SCAG's regional goals and policies.	Table 4.4-6 in Section 4.4, <i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions/Climate Change</i> , is a side-by-side comparison between SCAG's 2012 RTP/SCS strategies and the proposed project.



**Table 1-1
 NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	<p>Provides SCAG forecasts for the region and applicable jurisdictions and recommends a review of the SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR Mitigation Measures for guidance.</p>	<p>SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS forecasts for the Long Beach have been used for air quality analysis for the proposed project (see Section 4.2, <i>Air Quality</i>, Impact AQ-1 discussion). Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a) includes implementing transit facilities and programs to encourage public transit usage and Transportation Demand Management Policies, which is reflective of guidance in SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR Mitigation Measures, particularly Mitigation Measure AQ1, which recommends Transportation Control Measures, such as programs to improve the use of public transit. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measures AQ-2(a) includes measures to require commercial development to promote a ride-share program for employees, and secure bicycle parking areas, which also reflects SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR Mitigation Measure AQ1. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) requires construction contractors to implement Enhanced Exhaust Control Practices, which is reflective of SCAG 2012 RTP/SCS Final Program EIR Mitigation Measure AQ2, which recommends reducing emissions from in-use fleet and encourages cleaner construction equipment.</p>
<p>Dianna Watson, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief, Caltrans District 7</p>	<p>Requests that a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) be conducted to evaluate potential transportation impacts to the I-710. Requests that the TIA evaluate potential traffic impacts to the regional transportation system, including I-710 mainline south of the Anaheim Street interchange, nearest on-and-off ramps, and ramp intersections.</p>	<p>The Downtown Plan EIR found that implementation of the Downtown Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic and transportation, including to the I-710. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a) required enhancement to freeway access to the I-710 from the Downtown area and Mitigation Measure Traf-1(b) required a series of traffic signal improvements. As discussed in the TIA prepared for the proposed project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers (LLG) in July 2015 (see Appendix E), the proposed project would generate fewer trips than buildout of the Civic Center Area analyzed in the Downtown Plan EIR. Therefore, the project would not result in any new transportation impacts, or increase the severity of significant impacts to the I-710 beyond those identified in the Downtown Plan EIR. Additional analysis in the SEIR is not warranted.</p>



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	States that vehicle queues to mainline freeway lanes should be avoided and requests mitigation improvements if off-ramp storage capacity is exceeded.	See response above regarding the Downtown Plan EIR's determination that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a) requires enhancement to freeway access to the I-710 from the Downtown area and Mitigation Measure Traf-1(b) requires a series of traffic signal improvements.
	Requests that the TIA present its assumptions and methods and that travel modeling be consistent with other regional and local modeling forecasts.	The TIA prepared by LLG in July 2015 (see Appendix E) presents its assumptions and methods in Section 4.0, <i>Traffic Forecasting Methodology</i> .
	Requests inclusion of all appropriate, project and cumulative, traffic volumes. Including justification for vehicle trip reduction assumptions.	Section 4.6, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , includes project and cumulative traffic volumes. Justifications for vehicle trip reduction assumptions are included in Table 5-1, <i>Project Trip Generation Forecast</i> , of the TIA prepared by LLG in July 2015 (see Appendix E).
	Requests analysis of a.m. and p.m. peak hours for both existing and future conditions. Future conditions should extend to horizon year build-out of the Downtown Plan.	See Section 4.6 <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , Impacts T-1 and T-2 for analysis of a.m. and p.m. peak hour traffic conditions. Future conditions extend to Year 2020, which is when the proposed project would be operational.
	Requests mitigation measures for traffic impacts, including specifics concerning improvements, schedule, and costs. Requests a plan of realistic mitigation measures or a specific percent of costs for mitigation actions undertaken by other agencies.	See response above regarding the Downtown Plan EIR's determination that traffic impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a) requires enhancement to freeway access from the Downtown area and implementation of transportation improvements. Mitigation Measures Traf-1(b) and Traf-1(c) require a series of traffic signal improvements. Mitigation Measure Traf-1(d) requires traffic calming and pedestrian amenities. Impacts T-1 and T-2 in Section 4.6, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , determined that impacts would be less than significant. No additional mitigation is required.
	Encourages the City to consider vehicle demand-reducing strategies, such as incentives for commuters to use transit, discounts on monthly bus and rail passes, and more.	Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure Traf-1(a) includes implementing transit facilities and programs to encourage public transit usage and Transportation Demand Management Policies.



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	Recommends that the City establish a transportation fund or a funding plan to implement improvements that may be too costly for one specific development.	Section 4.6, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , determined that impacts to traffic would be less than significant. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measures Traf-1(a) through Traf-1(d) include transportation improvements for the entire Downtown Plan Area to reduce significant and unavoidable traffic impacts to the extent feasible. City decision makers may, nevertheless, consider establishing a transportation fund.
	States that Caltrans does not consider the Los Angeles County's Congestion Management Program adequate for analysis of transportation impacts to State highway facilities. Requests that Caltrans be consulted for the analysis of State highway facilities.	Caltrans does not consider the Los Angeles County's Congestion Management Program (CMP) adequate for analysis of transportation impacts to State highway facilities; nevertheless, the Section 4.6, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , considered the CMP methodology and standards in accordance with local CEQA requirements. Caltrans will continue to be consulted regarding impacts to state highway facilities.
Cheryl Perry, President, Long Beach Heritage	Asks what the impediment is to adaptive re-use for the court house. States that impacts to the cultural and physical environment should be assessed, as defined in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1508.14.	See Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Impact CR-1 and the Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C) for analysis regarding cultural resources. Section 6, <i>Alternatives</i> , includes analysis of an Adaptive Reuse Alternative.
	States that the State Historic Preservation Officer should be consulted about the project.	The State Historic Preservation Officer was included in the distribution list for the Notice of Preparation. The City received a letter from the State Historic Preservation Officer on May 19, 2015. That letter is discussed below.
	States that the City's compliance with Section 106 should be addressed.	The cultural resources assessment for the project did evaluate the buildings and structures within the project area for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
	Recommends that a project team comprised of preservation-architects and –engineers should demonstrate how the courthouse could be adaptively reused for the proposed Port building.	RRM Design Group prepared an Adaptive Reuse Study for the courthouse, which was included as Appendix H of the Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. Section 6, <i>Alternative</i> , includes analysis of an Adaptive Reuse Alternative based on the study prepared by RRM Design Group.



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	Requests that a Historic Structures Report be completed with recommendations on adaptive reuse of the courthouse and potential mitigation.	RRM Design Group prepared an Adaptive Reuse Study for the courthouse, which was included as Appendix H of the Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. The Adaptive Reuse Study is a conceptual feasibility assessment that provides recommendations on the adaptive reuse of the former Long Beach Courthouse. The Cultural Resources Study prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix C) includes analysis of the project's cultural resource impacts and recommends mitigation to reduce impacts to the extent feasible.
	Asks that the specific impacts of demolishing the old courthouse on Long Beach's cultural resources be assessed. States that the courthouse is the only link the city has to its traditional civic core.	Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Impact CR-1, and the Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C) include analysis of impacts related to demolition of the former Long Beach Courthouse.
	States that significant and meaningful mitigation/restitution be applied to the project, if the old courthouse is demolished. Suggested mitigation measures include: (1) the City building and funding a viable Long Beach History Museum with artifacts from the City and private collections, and (2) mitigation dollars be used for Long Beach preservation projects.	See Section 4.3 <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) and (b) for mitigation, which includes collection of historic artifacts and archival building documentation.
Carol Roland-Nawi, Ph.D., State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation	States that the EIR should include an updated study of the project area to determine if the Civic Center meets the eligibility criteria for local, state, or national listing as a historic district, and should be considered historic resources. States that the study should meet the requirements of Public Resources Code § 5024.1(g) and include contributing resources and non-contributing resources and identify character defining features of the contributing resources.	A Cultural Resources Study was prepared for the proposed project, see Appendix C. The Study determined that the Civic Center area is ineligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources or as a locally eligible historic district.
	States that demolition of the City Hall, Library, Lincoln Park, and the surrounding designed landscape may be significant impacts to historical resources and should be analyzed in the EIR.	See Section 4.3 <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Impact CR-1, and the Cultural Resources Study (Appendix C) for analysis of impacts to historical resources.
	States that the historic resources survey included in Appendix D of the Downtown Plan EIR is insufficient to evaluate historic resources and impacts of the proposed project because it did not include a survey of the Civic Center	A Cultural Resources Study was prepared for the proposed project, see Appendix C. Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , is based on the findings of this study, not the historic resources survey included in Appendix D of the



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	complex.	Downtown Plan EIR.
	States that the Draft EIR should focus and seriously consider a range of feasible alternatives. States that Pursuant to <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> (§15126.6) the Draft EIR should fully explore the following alternatives: No Project Alternative, Alternate Site Alternative, Rehabilitation Alternative, Adaptive Reuse Alternative, Infill Alternative, and Alternative-use Alternative.	Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives</i> , includes a discussion of an Adaptive Reuse Alternative, or rehabilitation alternative, in subsection 6.3 and the No Project Alternative in subsection 6.1. An Alternate Site Alternative, Infill Alternative, and Alternative-use Alternative are discussed in subsection 6.5, <i>Alternatives Considered But Rejected</i> .
	Cites <i>CEQA Guidelines</i> §615126.6(b) and states that the alternatives discussed in the Draft EIR should not be discounted because they may be more costly than the proposed project. States that all feasible alternatives should be considered in the Draft EIR.	Section 6.0, <i>Alternatives</i> , includes analysis of four alternatives, No Project Alternative, Downtown Plan Buildout of Civic Center Area Alternative, Adaptive Reuse Alternative, and Reduced Density Alternative. The alternatives were selected for evaluation without consideration of building cost.
	States that the Long Beach Courthouse is eligible as a landmark building, but may be part of a larger historic district (the entire Civic Center complex) that should be evaluated.	The Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C) and Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , include analysis of the entire project site, including the Civic Center as a historic district, the former Long Beach Courthouse, and the City Hall-Library Complex.
	States that the City of Long Beach Cultural Heritage Commission should be included in the environmental review process pursuant to Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1a.	Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(b) requires the City's Development Services Department staff to refer properties to the Cultural Heritage Commission, if they determine that the property may be eligible for designation. Impact CR-1 in Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , and the Cultural Resources Study prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix C) determined that the former Long Beach Courthouse and City Hall-Library Complex are both eligible for historical designation; therefore, the Cultural Heritage Commission's involvement in the environmental review process is not required.
	States that mitigation measures should go beyond Historic American Building Survey (HABS) documentation, plaques, and/or incorporating design features into the new project. Requests that the City involve the Cultural Heritage Commission, local preservation groups, and other members of the public to develop meaningful mitigation measures. Suggests as mitigation: (1) additional historic surveys in parts of the city that have not been surveyed, (2)	As discussed in Section 4.3 <i>Cultural Resources</i> , although the State Office of Historic Preservation's recommendations may mitigate the impacts of potential future projects, they would not mitigate the impact of the currently proposed project. Consequently, there is no nexus between these suggested measures and the impact associated with the proposed project and these suggestions would not constitute "mitigation" under CEQA. City decision makers may, nevertheless, consider including one or more of these



**Table 1-1
NOP Responses**

Written Responses		
Commenter	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
	development of design guidelines for future re-use of public buildings, and (3) creation of a Historic Preservation Mitigation Fund.	suggestions as conditions of project approval.
Scoping Meeting Comments		
Topic	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
Cultural Resources	Expresses concern that many buildings that were built by locally famous Long Beach architects are being demolished.	Impact CR-1 in Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , includes analysis of impacts to historical buildings and resources.
	Requests that cultural resource impacts be mitigated as much as possible and the SEIR should identify creative mitigation measures beyond a history walk and photodocumentation/historic structures report of buildings to be demolished.	See Section 4.3, <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) and (b) for mitigation, which includes collection of historic artifacts and archival building documentation.
	Suggests dedication of some part of the new library to a museum documenting the history of the area. Also suggests that various artifacts stored at the Main Library, City Hall, and Port of Long Beach, and with private collections, as well as key components of the buildings to be demolished, could be included in this museum.	See Section 4.3 <i>Cultural Resources</i> , Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) and (b) for mitigation which includes collection of historic artifacts and archival building documentation.
Hazards	Expresses concern that during demolition vermin would invade adjacent properties. Requests mitigation, such as fumigation of buildings to be demolished, to address this impact.	Section 5.0, <i>Other CEQA</i> , includes Mitigation Measure Other-1, which requires fumigation prior to building demolition.
Population and Housing	Expresses concern regarding the large homeless population residing in Lincoln Park.	Section XIII, <i>Population and Housing</i> , of the Initial Study (see Appendix A) has been revised to include a discussion regarding displacement of this population
Aesthetics	Requests that sight lines from Third Street to First Congregational Church (at southwest corner of Third Street and Cedar Avenue), particularly of the church tower, be preserved.	Impact AES-1 of Section 4.1, <i>Aesthetics</i> , includes analysis of impacts related to scenic resources. Impact AES-1 found that the proposed project would obstruct the view of First Congregational Church currently available from east of the project site, however, Third Street is not a state scenic highway or a designated local view corridor; therefore, this view alteration would not be a significant impact.
Biological Resources	States that there are approximately 197 mature trees present on the project site and that urban forest loss should be considered in the SEIR.	As discussed in Section IV, <i>Biological Resources</i> , of the Initial Study (see Appendix A), the proposed project would involve the relocation of Lincoln Park, which would require the removal of vegetation, including mature trees. All vegetation within the park is ornamental landscaping that does not include native biological resources or habitats. The proposed project would include the



Scoping Meeting Comments		
Topic	Comment/Request	How and Where Comment Addressed
		planting of trees within the new Lincoln Park and throughout the project site. In accordance with the City's Tree Maintenance Policy, the project would be required to replace all trees within the public right of way with an approved 15-gallon tree. Therefore, the Civic Center Project would not result in any significant impacts to biological resources or increase the severity of significant impacts to biological resources beyond those identified in the Downtown Plan EIR.
Transportation and Traffic	Requests that traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods due to the changes to First Street, Chestnut Avenue, and Cedar Avenue be considered in the SEIR.	Impacts T-1 and T-2 in Section 4.6, <i>Transportation and Traffic</i> , include traffic impact analysis for key intersections in the vicinity of the project site, including Pacific Avenue at First Street, Chestnut Avenue at Broadway, Cedar Avenue at Broadway, Chestnut Avenue at Ocean Boulevard, and Cedar Avenue at Ocean Boulevard.
Hydrology and Water Quality	Requests details about where water supply for the project would come from and what water conservation measures would be included in the project.	For details related to the project's water supply in the context of recent drought conditions, see pages 46 through 48 of the Initial Study (see Appendix A). The Long Beach Water Department would supply water to the project site. The recent drought has led to restrictions on water use in southern California. The proposed project would be required to comply with any additional restrictions on water use implemented by the Long Beach Water Department.

1.3 SCOPE AND CONTENT/ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

Section 15163(b) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that, "the supplemental EIR need contain only the information necessary to make the previous EIR adequate for the project as revised." In accordance with CEQA, the SEIR is a focused study of key issues that were not identified at a project level as part of the Downtown Plan Final Program EIR. Specifically, the EIR Supplement addresses issues for which Downtown Plan EIR mitigation measures stipulate further analysis on a project-by-project basis.

The issues addressed in this SEIR are listed in subsection 1.2. This SEIR identifies potentially significant environmental impacts, including site-specific and cumulative effects, of the project in accordance with the provisions set forth in the *CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, the SEIR recommends feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects. In preparing the SEIR, use was made of pertinent City policies and guidelines, certified EIRs and adopted CEQA documents, and background documents prepared by the City. A full reference list is contained in Section 7.0, *References and Report Preparers*.



The Alternatives section of the SEIR (Section 6.0) was prepared in accordance with Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*. The alternatives discussion evaluates the CEQA-required “no project” alternative and four alternative development scenarios for the site. It also identifies the environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives assessed.

The level of detail contained throughout this SEIR is consistent with the requirements of CEQA and applicable court decisions. The *CEQA Guidelines* provide the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15151 states:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of the proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.4 LEAD, RESPONSIBLE, AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The *CEQA Guidelines* define lead, responsible and trustee agencies. The City of Long Beach is the lead agency for the project because it holds principal responsibility for approving this SEIR.

A responsible agency refers to a public agency other than the lead agency that has discretionary approval over the project. There are no responsible agencies for the project.

A trustee agency refers to a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project. There are no trustee agencies for the proposed project.

1.5 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The major steps in the environmental review process, as required under CEQA, are outlined as follows. The steps are presented in sequential order.

1. **Notice of Preparation (NOP).** After deciding that an SEIR is required, the lead agency must file an NOP soliciting input on the SEIR scope to the State Clearinghouse, other concerned agencies, and parties previously requesting notice in writing (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15082; Public Resources Code Section 21092.2). The NOP must be posted in the County Clerk’s office for 30 days. The NOP may be accompanied by an Initial Study that identifies the issue areas for which the proposed project could create significant environmental impacts.
2. **Draft SEIR Prepared.** The Draft SEIR must contain: a) table of contents or index; b) summary; c) project description; d) environmental setting; e) discussion of significant impacts (direct, indirect, cumulative, growth-inducing and unavoidable impacts); f) a discussion of alternatives; g) mitigation measures; and, h) discussion of irreversible changes.



3. **Notice of Completion and Notice of Availability.** A lead agency must file a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse when it completes a Draft SEIR (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15085) and prepare a Public Notice of Availability of a Draft SEIR. The lead agency must file the Notice of Availability with the County Clerk's office for a 45 day posting period and send a copy of the Notice of Availability to anyone requesting it (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15087). Additionally, public notice of the Draft SEIR availability must be given through at least one of the following procedures: a) publication in a newspaper of general circulation; b) posting on and off the project site; and c) direct mailing to owners and occupants of contiguous properties. The lead agency must solicit input from other agencies and the public, and respond in writing to all comments received (PRC Sections 21104 and 21153). The minimum public review period for a Draft SEIR is 30 days. When a Draft SEIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, the public review period must be 45 days unless the Clearinghouse (Public Resources Code Section 21091) approves a shorter period.
4. **Final SEIR.** A Final SEIR must include: a) the Draft SEIR; b) copies of comments received during public review; c) list of persons and entities commenting; and, d) responses to comments.
5. **Certification of Final SEIR.** Prior to making a decision on a project, the lead agency must consider the previous EIR and certify that: a) the Final SEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; b) the Final SEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency; and c) the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the Final SEIR prior to approving a project (*CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15090 and 15163(e)).
6. **Lead Agency Project Decision.** A lead agency may: a) disapprove a project because of its significant environmental effects; b) require changes to a project to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects; or, c) approve a project despite its significant environmental effects, if the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted (*CEQA Guidelines* Sections 15042 and 15043).
7. **Findings/Statement of Overriding Considerations.** For each significant impact of the project identified in the SEIR, the lead or responsible agency must find, based on substantial evidence, that either: a) the project has been changed to avoid or substantially reduce the magnitude of the impact; b) changes to the project are within another agency's jurisdiction and such changes have or should be adopted; or c) specific economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15091). If an agency approves a project with unavoidable significant environmental effects, it must prepare a written Statement of Overriding Considerations that sets forth the specific social, economic, or other reasons supporting the agency's decision.
8. **Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program.** When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the SEIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects.



9. **Notice of Determination.** An agency must file a Notice of Determination within five working days after deciding to approve a project for which an SEIR is prepared (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15094). A local agency must file the Notice with the County Clerk. The Notice must be posted for 30 days and sent to anyone previously requesting notice. Posting of the Notice starts a 30-day statute of limitations on CEQA legal challenges [Public Resources Code Section 21167(c)].



This page intentionally left blank.

