8 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SEIR

8.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Section 15088 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) *Guidelines*, the City of Long Beach, as the lead agency, has reviewed the comments received on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (Draft SEIR) for the Civic Center Project and has prepared written responses to the written comments received. The Draft SEIR was circulated for a 45-day public review period that began August 4, 2015 and concluded on September 17, 2015. A study session to receive public comment on the Draft SEIR was conducted on August 20, 2015.

Each verbal and written comment that the City received is included in this section. Responses to comments have been prepared to address the environmental concerns raised by the commenters and to indicate where and how the Draft SEIR addresses pertinent environmental issues. The comment letters included herein were submitted by public agencies and private citizens or groups.

Any changes made to the text of the Draft SEIR correcting information, data or intent, other than minor typographical corrections or minor working changes, are noted in the Final SEIR text as changes from the Draft SEIR.

The focus of the responses to comments is the disposition of environmental issues that are raised in the comments, as specified by Section 15088(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines*. Detailed responses to comments on the merits of the proposed project are not provided. However, comments that are not directed to an environmental issue have been forwarded to City decision-makers for review and consideration.

Where a comment results in a change to the Draft SEIR text, a notation is made in the response indicating that the text is revised. Changes in text are signified by strikeouts (~~strikeouts~~) where text is removed and by bold font (**bold font**) where text is added. If text is added where the font is already bold, additions are noted using underlined bold font (**underlined bold font**).

8.2 RESPONSES TO PUBLIC TESTIMONY

On August 20, 2015, City Staff conducted a study session during the Planning Commission Public Hearing regarding the Draft SEIR for the Civic Center Project. The hearing provided an opportunity for members of the public to receive a summary presentation of the project as well as the major findings of the Draft SEIR. The primary purpose of the public comment portion of the hearing was to receive input from interested parties regarding the adequacy of the Draft SEIR. Seven individuals spoke at the hearing. Table 8-1 summarizes verbal comments made by the seven speakers in the order received. No approvals or formal actions were taken by the Planning Commission at this hearing.

Table 8-1
August 20, 2015, Study Session and Verbal Comment Summary

Num.	Speaker/Affiliation	Comments
1	Gary Shelton, Long Beach Area Coalition for the Homeless	a. Stated appreciation for mitigation measure to address vermin from demolition. b. Asked about the existing mature trees on the project site and how the project would address removing them.
2	Margaret Smith, Vice President, Long Beach Library Foundation	a. Requested adequate funding for the new library.
3	Laura Myers, Private Citizen	a. Requested adequate funding for the new library.
4	Bob Ladd, Private Citizen	a. Stated that residential uses would be disruptive to the Civic Center. Suggested that the new Library should front Ocean Boulevard and that commercial uses should be at edges of the project site and not near the center.
5	Alice, Friends of Lincoln Park	a. Suggested that information on social services should be available within the new Lincoln Park.
6	Mark Christoffels, Planning Commissioner	a. Expressed concern with potential wind tunnel creation due to the design of the project. b. Asked if project design has addressed glare. c. Stated that programmed spaces should be illuminated. d. Asked why the project does not include any water features.
7	Jane Templin, Planning Commissioner	a. Asked to see details regarding the project's compliance with Title 24 and Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) gold certification.

Responses to verbal comments are provided below.

1. <u>Gary Shelton, Long Beach Area Coalition for the Homeless</u>

a. The commenter asked about the existing mature trees on the project site and how the project would address removing. As discussed in Section IV, *Biological Resources*, of the Initial Study (see Appendix A of the Draft SEIR), the proposed project would involve the reconstruction 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. 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. In accordance with the City's Tree Maintenance Policy, all trees within the public right-of-way would be replaced with an approved 15-gallon tree. In addition, the project proponent looked into the feasibility of relocating some of the mature trees on the project site, but found that it would be infeasible because the existing parking garage cannot bear the weight of the trucks necessary to for tree relocation.

2. <u>Margaret Smith, Vice President, Long Beach Library Foundation</u>

a. This comment has been forwarded to City decision makers for their consideration.

3. <u>Laura Myers, Private Citizen</u>

a. This comment has been forwarded to City decision makers for their consideration.

4. <u>Bob Ladd, Private Citizen</u>

a. This comment is about the project and not the SEIR. This comment has been forwarded to City decision makers for their consideration.

5. <u>Alice, Friends of Lincoln Park</u>

a. This comment has been forwarded to City decision makers for their consideration.

6. <u>Mark Christoffels, Planning Commissioner</u>

a. Expressed concern with potential wind tunnels due to the design of the project. The project is consistent with the Downtown Plan, which envisions buildings of up to 150 feet in height. This type of development may increase overall wind tunnel effects, but such effects would not constitute a significant environmental effect under CEQA.
b. Asked if project design has addressed glare. The Initial Study that was prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix A of the Draft EIR) included an initial evaluation of aesthetic impacts, and determined that the project would not result in a significant impact associated with the introduction of a new source of substantial light or glare; therefore, this issue is not further addressed in the SEIR.
c. Stated that programmed spaces should be illuminated. The project would comply with City lighting requirements.
d. Asked why the project does not include any water features. This comment is about the project rather than the SEIR. Water features have not been proposed, but presumably could be if desired.

7. <u>Jane Templin, Planning Commissioner</u>

a. Asked to see details regarding the project's compliance with Title 24 and LEED gold certification. The proposed project would be required to exceed Title 24 standards that are in effect at the time of development by 20 percent (Downtown Area Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-2). The project would be equipped with equipment (e.g. HVAC systems), lighting fixtures, and lighting that exceed Title 24 requirements.

8.3 WRITTEN COMMENTS AND RESPONSES ON THE DRAFT SEIR

Each written comment regarding the Draft SEIR that the City received is included in this section (refer to Table 8-2). Responses to these comments have been prepared to address the environmental concerns raised by the commenters and to indicate where and how the Draft SEIR addresses pertinent environmental issues. The comment letters included herein were submitted by public agencies, local interest groups, and private citizens. Each comment letter has been numbered sequentially and each separate issue raised by the commenter, if more than one, has also been assigned a number. Each comment letter is reproduced in its entirety with

the issues of concern lettered in the right margin. The responses to each comment identify first the number of the comment letter, and then the number assigned to each issue (Response 2.1, for example, indicates that the response is for the first comment raised in Letter 2).

Table 8-2
Written Comments on the Draft SEIR

Letter	Commenter	Affiliation	Date Received
State Public Agencies			
1	Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer	California Office of Historic Preservation	September 14, 2015
2	Dianne Watson, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief	California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 7	September 17, 2015
3	Scott Morgan, Director	State Clearinghouse	September 28, 2015
Regional Public Agencies			
4	Kevin T. Johnson, Acting Chief, Forestry Division	County of Los Angeles Fire Department	September 1, 2015
5	Jillian Wong, Ph.D., Program Supervisor, Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources	South Coast Air Quality Management District	September 16, 2015
6	Adriana Raza, Customer Service Specialist, Facilities Planning Department	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County	September 23, 2015
Local Interest Groups			
7	Cheryl Perry, President	Long Beach Heritage	September 10, 2015
8	Adrian Scott Fine, Director of Advocacy	Los Angeles Conservancy	September 17, 2015
Private Citizen			
9	Jim Coke	Private Citizen	September 7, 2015

Letter 1

OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
1725 23rd Street, Suite 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-7100
(916) 445-7000 Fax: (916) 445-7053
calshpo@parks.ca.gov
www.ohp.parks.ca.gov

September 14, 2015

Craig Chalfant
Planning Bureau, Development Services Department
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
Sent via email September 14, 2015

Dear Mr. Chalfant,

RE: **DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

Thank you for including the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) in the environmental review process for the proposed Long Beach Civic Center Project. Pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act and the California Public Resources Code, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the OHP have broad responsibility for the implementation of federal and state historic preservation programs in California. We have a long history of working with the City of Long Beach (Lead Agency) through our Certified Local Government program. Our comments are offered with the intent of protecting historic and cultural resources, while allowing the City of Long Beach to meet its program needs. The following comments are based on the information included in the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for the Civic Center Project.

The proposed project is located in downtown Long Beach, and includes demolition and replacement of the existing Courthouse, City Hall, Public Library, and Lincoln Park. The proposed project also includes construction of a new Port of Long Beach administration facility. In addition to these civic buildings, the proposed project includes construction of three residential/commercial buildings, one at the corner of 3rd Street and Pacific Boulevard, and two on the site of the existing City Hall. The two existing parking structures currently occupying the site would remain. In previous comments provided to the Lead Agency on May 13, 2015, the OHP suggested several mitigation measures that might be considered if impacts to historic resources could not be avoided through project alternatives. The OHP also suggested the Draft SEIR include an updated study of the project area to determine if the Civic Center merits local, state, or national register listing as a historic district. 1

Mitigation Measures

The Draft SEIR § 4.3-14 suggests that the mitigation measures offered by the OHP lack a nexus to the impacts of the proposed project and therefore would not constitute mitigation under CEQA. The CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4 acknowledge the

constitutional requirements that mitigation measures must have an "essential nexus" to a legitimate government interest, and that those mitigation measures imposed as ad hoc exactions must bear a "rough proportionality" to the project's significant impacts. (14 Cal. Code Regs., § 15126.4(a)(4)(A), (B), citing Nollan v. California Coastal Com'n (1987) 483 U.S. 825, 837; Dolan v. City of Tigard (1994) 512 U.S. 374, 391; Ehrlich v. City of Culver City (1996) 12 Cal.4th 854, 866-877.) In order for the Lead Agency to determine if there is an essential nexus between the mitigation measures suggested by the OHP and the impacts of the proposed project, the Lead Agency should consider whether the mitigation measures are rationally connected to a valid governmental purpose. Creative mitigation, including funding of historic preservation planning documents has a clear "nexus" to projects with significant impacts to historical resources; historic preservation more broadly has been found to serve a legitimate public benefit and be a valid exercise of municipal police powers. We ask that the Lead Agency reconsider the essential nexus test and consider adopting the suggested off site mitigation measures as a required condition of project approval, including dedicating funding for future local historic preservation efforts that have a tangible public benefit component. 1, cont'd

Evaluation and Identification

The SEIR includes a survey of the project area (Appendix C) and identifies three historical resources eligible for listing on the CRHR as landmarks (Courthouse, City Hall, and Library). The three resources identified in the cultural resources survey appear to be unified geographically, historically, and architecturally. The three landmarks taken together may meet the definition of a historic district provided in Public Resources Code (PRC) Title 14, Chapter 11.5, Section 4852 (a)(5). It is somewhat unclear why this grouping of landmarks is not being treated as a historic district in light of their historic context and similar architectural style. Additionally, the landscape of the Civic Center is not discussed or evaluated as being a potential contributing resource to a potential district. The historic district criteria and determination of ineligibility should be further clarified in the Final SEIR. 2

The Cultural Section (4.3) of the SEIR and the historical resources survey report (Appendix C) both determine the Courthouse, Library, and City Hall are eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criteria # 3 for their architectural merit, but the evaluation is largely silent on CRHR Criteria # 1. Based on the historic context statement included in Appendix C, the Civic Center appears to be associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Long Beach history. As described by the *National Register Bulletin: How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation* (incorporated by reference into the CRHR, § 4852), when evaluating the integrity of resources eligible under this criteria, design and workmanship may be less important than the other aspects of historic integrity (location, setting, materials, feeling, and association). In the Final SEIR please discuss Criteria # 1 within the historic context of the Long Beach Civic Center and clarify why the buildings and park are ineligible under this criterion. 3

We thank the Lead Agency for seriously considering our previous suggestion to include an adaptive reuse alternative in the Draft SEIR. To reduce impacts to cultural resources, we encourage the Lead Agency to adopt the reuse scheme developed for the Courthouse building. Given the significant impacts to historical resources, we again encourage the Lead Agency to adopt mitigation measures that go beyond commonly considered measures such as HABS documentation and salvaging historic artifacts, and to adopt mitigation measures that have a public benefit component. 4

If you have questions, please contact Sean de Courcy of the Local Government and Environmental Compliance Unit, at (916) 445-7042 or at Sean.deCourcy@parks.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Julianne Polanco
State Historic Preservation Officer

Letter 1

COMMENTER: Julianne Polanco, State Historic Preservation Officer, California Office of Historic Preservation

DATE: September 14, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 1.1

The commenter asks that the Lead Agency reconsider the essential nexus test and consider adopting the off site mitigation measures suggested by the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) in the May 13, 2015 comment letter it submitted during the scoping period. Recommended mitigation included dedicating funding for future local historic preservation efforts that have a "tangible public benefit component."

Mitigation Measures CR-1(a), Historic Artifact Collection Program, and CR-1(b), Building Documentation, described on pages 4.3-13 through 4.3-14 provide both a tangible public benefit and directly mitigate the impacts of the proposed project. The measures suggested by OHP in its May 13, 2015 comment letter include: (1) additional historic surveys in parts of the City that have previously not been surveyed; (2) development of design guidelines for future re-use of public buildings; and (3) creation of a Historic Preservation Mitigation Fund. These suggestions would have a tangible public benefit, but do not mitigate the impacts of the proposed project. For example, as OHP suggests, the creation of a Historic Preservation Mitigation Fund may have a governmental purpose, but the measure does not address the identified impact related to demolition of the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex. Nonetheless, this comment has been forwarded to City decision makers, who may consider including one or more of the commenter's suggestions as conditions of project approval.

Response 1.2

The commenter requests that the historic district criteria and determination of ineligibility be further clarified in the Final SEIR.

The project site and the adjacent Public Safety Building were assessed for potential eligibility in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) or at the local level as a historic district. Five resources were identified within the study area and were considered as a potential contributors to a Civic Center historic district; these include: (1) the City Hall-Library Complex, (2) the Old Courthouse, (3) Public Safety Building, (4) Lincoln Park and the (5) Broadway Parking Garage. The City Hall-Library Complex and associated landscaping (the landscape elements designed by Peter Walker, which include the "berm" around the Main Library, the tiled plaza and the rooftop garden elements, but do not include Lincoln Park) were designed and constructed as a singular entity and evaluated as one historic resource for this study. Each of the buildings and structures within the Civic Center are functionally related and were designed for municipal purposes. However, three of the extant resources - the Public Safety Building, Lincoln Park and the Broadway Parking Garage -were found ineligible for listing in the CRHR or as local landmarks. With a majority of the resources identified as not eligible for

the CRHR or local designation, it was determined that a historic district is not present due to the lack of contributing resources.

The landscape elements found within the City Hall-Library Complex are discussed in detail in the Cultural Resources Study (Appendix C of the Draft SEIR) and are noted as contributing elements to the project site's significance. These include the brick surfaced Centennial Plaza, and terraced roof gardens with seating areas, stairs and walkways that connect each of the buildings. None of these elements extend beyond the footprint of the City Hall-Library Complex property and were not incorporated into the site plan for the Old Courthouse, Public Safety Building or Lincoln Park. In addition, there is an overall lack of cohesion throughout the site. Therefore, there is no overall landscape theme or specific elements to consider for historic designation or as a contributing element to a historic district.

Response 1.3

The commenter requests that the SEIR include a discussion of the eligibility of the cultural resources within the context of CRHR Criterion 1.

The City Hall-Library Complex and the Old Courthouse are also considered eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 for their contribution to the civic development of the City of Long Beach.

Pages 4.3-8 and 4.3-9 of the Draft SEIR have been revised to include the following information:

> **The Old Long Beach Courthouse also appears eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Competed in 1960 the Old Courthouse was one of the first projects of the long-awaited Civic Center Master Plan.** The Old Long Beach Courthouse **also** appears eligible for listing in the CRHR as an individual resource under Criterion 3 within the context of the architectural evolution of Long Beach, as one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Corporate International Style of architecture remaining in the City. The building embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Corporate International Style, and is a representative example of the style designed by local architects, Francis Heusel and Kenneth S. Wing. Despite having undergone a 60,000 square foot alteration in 1971, the building's exterior appearance still reflects its period of construction and retains a high degree of integrity of location, feeling, association, setting, design, materials and workmanship. The building has retained most of its character-defining features: curtain wall construction and glass windows inset in recliner grids, recessed first floor and use of squared columns, terrazzo floors, and windows and vertical surfaces on the same plane. ~~Competed in 1960 the Old Courthouse was one of the first projects of the Civic Center Master Plan.~~

And

> Completed in 1977 by Allied Architects, the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex is an intact example of Late Modern architecture that retains integrity of design, materials, feeling, workmanship, association and location. The City

> Hall-Library Complex appears individually eligible for listing in the CRHR **under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Designed in fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project. The complex also appears eligible for individual listing** ~~as an individual resource~~ under Criterion 3 as a representative example of the Late Modern-style with unique landscape design elements and as the work of a group of local master architects. The complex is one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Late Modern Style of architecture remaining in the city. Designed by a consortium of local architects that consisted of Hugh and Donald Gibbs, Frank Homolka, Ed Killingsworth, Brady and Associates, and Kenneth S. Wing Jr. and Sr., each considered local masters in their own right, the complex is unique for its collaborative design amongst local architects and represents the collective work of a group of masters. The Library rooftop design contributions of master landscape architect Peter Walker also contribute to the significance and eligibility of the complex. ~~Designed in fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project.~~

Page 1of the Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C of the Draft SEIR) has been revised to include the following information:

> The Old Courthouse was previously evaluated and found individually eligible for historic significance on two occasions: in 2006, it was found eligible for local listing as a City of Long Beach Historic Landmark, and in 2008, the property was found eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) **under Criterion 3, as an example of Corporate International style architecture. Rincon concurs with this finding and** ~~.~~**notes it is also eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criteria 1, for its association with the civic development of Long Beach, it** ~~It~~ is therefore considered a historical resource for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

And

> Rincon found that the City Hall-Library Complex appears individually eligible for listing in the CRHR as an individual resource under Criterion **1, for its association with the civic development of Long Beach and under** ~~on~~ **Criteria** 3 as a representative example of the Late Modern-style with unique landscape design elements and as the work of a group of local master architects.

Page 53 of the Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C of the Draft SEIR) has been revised to include the following information:

> Completed in 1977 by Allied Architects, the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex is an intact example of Late Modern architecture that retains integrity of design, materials, feeling, workmanship, association and location. The complex appears eligible for individual listing in the CRHR **under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Designed in**

fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project. The complex also appears eligible for individual listing under Criterion 3 within the context of the architectural evolution of Long Beach. Although the City Hall-Library Complex is less than 50 years in age (constructed in 1977) the complex is one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Late Modern Style of architecture remaining in the city. Designed by a consortium of local architects that consisted of Hugh and Donald Gibbs, Frank Homolka, Killingsworth, Brady and Associates, and Kenneth S. Wing Jr. and Sr., **e**~~E~~ach considered local masters in their own right, the complex is unique for its collaborative design amongst local architects and represents the collective work of a group of masters. The Library rooftop design contributions of master landscape architect Peter Walker also contribute to the significance and eligibility of the complex. ~~Designed in fulfillment of the goals of centralization outlined in the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, the City Hall-Library Complex represents the final completed element of the project.~~

Although completion of the Civic Center took over two decades to complete and deviates from the original 1950s design layout, the buildings within the Civic Center represent a distinct grouping of civic and governmental properties ~~united historically by plan and physical development~~.

Page 54 of the Cultural Resources Study (see Appendix C of the Draft SEIR) have been revised to include the following information:

The Old Long Beach Courthouse also appears eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 for its association with the civic development of Long Beach. Competed in 1960 the Old Courthouse was one of the first projects of the long-awaited Civic Center Master Plan. The Old Long Beach Courthouse **also** appears eligible for listing in the CRHR as an individual resource under Criterion 3 within the context of the architectural evolution of Long Beach, as one of a limited number of ~~fine~~ examples of the Corporate International Style of architecture remaining in the City. The building embodies the distinctive characteristics of the Corporate International Style, and is a representative example of the style designed by local architects, Francis Heusel and Kenneth S. Wing. Despite having undergone a 60,000 square foot alteration in 1971, the building's exterior appearance still reflects its period of construction and retains a high degree of integrity of location, feeling, association, setting, design, materials and workmanship. The building has retained most of its character-defining features: curtain wall construction and glass windows inset in recliner grids, recessed first floor and use of squared columns, terrazzo floors, and windows and vertical surfaces on the same plane. ~~Competed in 1960 the Old Courthouse was one of the first projects of the Civic Center Master Plan.~~

Response 1.4

The commenter encourages the City to adopt the Adaptive Reuse Alternative to reduce cultural resource impacts. The commenter also encourages the City to adopt its suggested mitigation measures.

The Draft SEIR included a partial preservation alternative, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative, discussed in Section 6.3. This alternative would preserve the former Courthouse building, but demolish the City Hall-Library complex. The Draft SEIR found that the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would reduce impacts to cultural resources, as well as greenhouse gas emissions/climate change.

As discussed in Section 6.5, *Alternatives Considered But Rejected*, an alternative that would adaptively reuse the Courthouse as office space (similar to that described in the Adaptive Reuse Alternative) and rehabilitate the seismic deficiencies within the City Hall-Library Complex in the Courthouse Adaptive Reuse and City Hall-Library Complex Rehabilitation Alternative was considered. However, as discussed on pages 6-14 and 6-15 of the Draft SEIR, this alternative was rejected because of the functional and physical deficiencies of the buildings and because most of the project objectives would not be feasibly attainable.

It is acknowledged that an alternative that preserves and rehabilitates existing structures would reduce impacts to historic resources and is physically feasible. However, such an alternative would conflict with objectives for the currently proposed project as well as those of the adopted Downtown Plan and would be prohibitively expensive, ranging from more than $124,650,000 to $138,500,000 for conversion of the former Courthouse alone. Therefore, a full preservation alternative is not a feasible alternative under CEQA.

This comment has been forwarded to City decision makers for their consideration.

Letter 2

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7-OFFICE OF REGIONAL PLANNING
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-9140
FAX (213) 897-1337
www.dot.ca.gov

Serious Drought.
Serious drought.
Help save water!

September 17, 2015

Mr. Craig Chalfant
City of Long Beach
Development Services
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: **Civic Center Project**
Draft Environmental Impact Report
IGR No: 150807/EA, SCH#2015041054
Vic: LA / 710 /6.058-6.273

Dear Mr. Chalfant

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has reviewed Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the proposed Civic Center Project. The proposed project includes a new 11-story City Hall, a main library, a Port Building for Harbor Department administration, the relocating of the Main Library, the redevelopment of Lincoln Park, a 580 residential building, a 200-room hotel, and a commercial mixed use development consisting of an 8,000 square foot restaurant and 32,000 square feet of retail space. The project also involves the demolition of the existing City Hall and library buildings.

As the State agency with jurisdiction over State highway transportation facilities, Caltrans is concerned with potential increase in traffic volumes directed to them as it might exacerbate existing congestion. Regional access to the Long Beach Civic Center area is provided via I-710 and State Route 1. 1

After the existing buildings are demolished, there will be a deductions of vehicle trips, therefore the proposed project is estimated to generate a net of 10,923 average daily trips of which 671 would occur during the AM peak hour and 552 during the PM peak hour (Table 5-1). A vehicle trip deduction of 26% is also taken to account for transit usage. The 26% transit reduction seems high, please explain how the figure was arrived at. Survey data from similar uses in the vicinity project site would be justifiable information. Caltrans recommends that the City monitor transit usage within its different neighborhoods in order to justify the transit usage assumptions.

We note that 47% of the net vehicle trips are distributed to I-710, however the TIA does not evaluate potential impacts to it. The magnitude of the proposed development meets the CEQA criteria of regional significant and as such it should have evaluated potential impacts to the regional highway system including I-710 nearest intersections and interchanges. We also requested analysis of state highway facilities in our comments to the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR. I-710 currently operates over capacity during peak hours in Long Beach and additional traffic from anticipated growth with the Long Beach Downtown plan could potentially exacerbate existing conditions. 2

We acknowledge the Long Beach Downtown Plan EIR includes implementation of transit facilities and programs to encourage public transit usage and development of Transportation Demand Management Policies. Please include more specific information as to how the proposed Civic Center project will encourage transit usage and other alternate modes of transportation. Proximity to public transit may not be enough incentive to cause the desired mode switch. Caltrans also promotes utilization of alternate modes of transportation including public transit, bicycle, and walking. To the extent that more of the population shifts to transit for some of their inter-regional trips, traffic impacts to state facilities can be satisfactorily mitigated 3

In the spirit of mutual cooperation, Caltrans staff is available to work with the project's traffic engineers to perform traffic analysis of state highway facilities to identify potential impacts and mitigation measures, if any are necessary.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please feel free to contact Elmer Alvarez, Project Coordinator at (213) 897-6696 or electronically at elmer.alvarez@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Elmer Alvarez for:

DIANNA WATSON
IGR/CEQA Branch Chief
Caltrans District 7

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

Letter 2

COMMENTER: Dianna Watson, IGR/CEQA Branch Chief, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

DATE: September 17, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 2.1

The commenter requests justification for the 26 percent vehicle trip deduction for transit use assumed in the Draft SEIR. The commenter suggests that survey data from similar uses in the vicinity of the project site would be justifiable information and recommends that the City monitor transit use to justify the transit use assumptions.

The SEIR traffic analysis applies the same 26 percent vehicle trip reduction for transit use that was applied to trip generation in the Downtown Plan EIR. Justification for the transit service, pass-by, and other mode trip generation adjustment are included on pages 40 to 41 of the *Long Beach Downtown Community Plan EIR Traffic Impact Analysis* (prepared by Iteris and included in Appendix F of the Downtown Plan EIR). The 26 percent reduction is from an analysis of mode share (percent of trips via auto versus transit) based on review of actual vehicle trips into and out of Downtown Long Beach, plus data from the 2000 U.S. Census Journey to Work data. In addition, it should be noted that the reduction was only applied to home-to-work trips, which are the most common type of trips to occur on transit. This is a conservative assumption, since some of the commercial trips would also occur on transit, but are not included; thus, they are all assumed to occur via passenger auto and further analysis in the SEIR is not warranted.

Response 2.2

The commenter states that the Draft EIR should have evaluated the project's traffic impacts on the I-710 intersections and interchanges. The commenter states that the I-710 currently operates over capacity during peak hours in Long Beach and additional traffic from the proposed project could exacerbate existing conditions.

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) requires 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 traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed project (see Appendix E of the Draft SEIR) and shown in Table 6-2, Trip Generation Forecast – Downtown Plan Civic Center Area, of Section 6.0, *Alternatives*, of the Draft SEIR, buildout of the Civic Center Area as analyzed in the Downtown Plan EIR would generate more trips than the proposed project. 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. Thus, further analysis in the SEIR is not warranted.

Response 2.3

The commenter requests specific information about how the proposed project would encourage transit use and other alternate modes of transportation.

Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-2 requires the project to include a number of measures that would encourage alternate modes of transportation and a reduction in single-occupancy vehicle use. Specifically, the mitigation measure requires the project to include a secure bicycle parking area within the project site for employees and customers, requires commercial development operators to operate, maintain, and promote a ride-share program for employees, and requires all new commercial developments to include or provide access to convenient shower and locker facilities to employees to encourage bicycle, walking, and jogging options for commuting. Specific project design elements may include additional incentives for commuters and residences to use alternative modes of transportation beyond the immediate convenience of being located near transit services. The project is also expected to result in additional bus stops planned throughout the new Civic Center complex. The project would include two bicycle parking areas and locker rooms in the new underground parking garage to serve City Hall and the Port Building, and the project would also include installation of numerous electric vehicle charging stations for City and Port employees.

Letter 3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

KEN ALEX
DIRECTOR

September 18, 2015

Craig Chalfant
City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Subject: Civic Center Project
SCH#: 2015041054

Dear Craig Chalfant:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Supplemental EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on September 17, 2015, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

City of Long Beach
RECEIVED
SEP 28 2015
Planning Bureau

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044
(916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH#	**2015041054**
Project Title	Civic Center Project
Lead Agency	Long Beach, City of

Type	**SIR** Supplemental EIR
Description	The project includes a new City Hall, a new Port Building for Harbor Department administration, a new and relocated Main Library, a redeveloped Lincoln Park, a residential development, and a commercial mixed use development. The project also includes the demolition of the former Long Beach Courthouse building. In total, the proposal includes six new buildings, three new parking garages, related infrastructure and landscaping, and two new public street extensions of Chestnut Avenue and Cedar Avenue through the project site. The Lincoln Park garage and Broadway garage would be preserve and would be used by city staff and public parking as it is today. Existing buildings that would be demolished include the former Long Beach Courthouse, Long Beach City Hall, and Long Beach Main Library.

Lead Agency Contact

Name	Craig Chalfant		
Agency	City of Long Beach		
Phone	562 570 6368	*Fax*	
email			
Address	333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor		
City	Long Beach	*State* CA	*Zip* 90802

Project Location

County	Los Angeles		
City	Long Beach		
Region			
Lat / Long	33° 46' 5.59" N / 118° 11' 45.61" W		
Cross Streets	Ocean Blvd, Pacific Ave, Broadway, and Magnolia Ave. Pacific Ave, Third St and Cedar		
Parcel No.	728002-5902, -5900, -2914		
Township	*Range*	*Section*	*Base*

Proximity to:

Highways	I-710, SR-1
Airports	No
Railways	Port of Los Angeles
Waterways	Los Angeles River
Schools	
Land Use	Mixed Use (LUD 7) / Downtown Plan (PD-30)

Project Issues	Agricultural Land; Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Drainage/Absorption; Flood Plain/Flooding; Forest Land/Fire Hazard; Geologic/Seismic; Minerals; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Recreation/Parks; Schools/Universities; Septic System; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Wetland/Riparian; Landuse; Cumulative Effects
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; Department of Boating and Waterways; California Coastal Commission; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Resources, Recycling and Recovery; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 7; Air Resources Board; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission; Other Agency(ies)

Date Received	08/04/2015	*Start of Review*	08/04/2015	*End of Review*	09/17/2015

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Letter 3

COMMENTER: Scott Morgan, Director, State Clearinghouse

DATE: September 28, 2015

RESPONSE:

The commenter acknowledges that the Draft EIR complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements and that no state agencies submitted comments to the State Clearinghouse.

This comment is noted.

Letter 4

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

1320 NORTH EASTERN AVENUE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90063-3294

DARYL L. OSBY
FIRE CHIEF
FORESTER & FIRE WARDEN

City of Long Beach
RECEIVED
SEP 09 2015
Planning Bureau

September 1, 2015

Craig Chalfant, Planner
City of Long Beach
Development Services Department
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mr. Chalfant:

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF A DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, "CIVIC CENTER PROJECT", INCLUDES A NEW CITY HALL, A NEW PORT BUILDING FOR HARBOR DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION, AND A COMMERICIAL MIXED DEVELOPMENT, LONG BEACH (FFER 201500152)

The Notice of Availability of a Draft Supplement Environmental Impact Report has been reviewed by the Planning Division, Land Development Unit, Forestry Division, and Health Hazardous Materials Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department. The following are their comments:

PLANNING DIVISION: 1

1. The subject property is entirely within the City of Long Beach, which is not a part of the emergency response of the Los Angeles County Fire Department (also known as the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County). Therefore, this project does not appear to have any impact on the emergency responsibilities of this Department.

LAND DEVELOPMENT UNIT:

1. This project is located entirely in the City of Long Beach. Therefore, the City of Long Beach Fire Department has jurisdiction concerning this project and will be

setting conditions. This project is located in close proximity to the jurisdictional area of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. However, this project is unlikely to have an impact that necessitates a comment concerning general requirements from the Land Development Unit of the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

1, cont'd

2. Should any questions arise regarding subdivision, water systems, or access, please contact the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Land Development Unit's Inspector Nancy Rodeheffer at (323) 890-4243.

3. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Land Development Unit appreciates the opportunity to comment on this project.

FORESTRY DIVISION – OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:

1. The statutory responsibilities of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division include erosion control, watershed management, rare and endangered species, vegetation, fuel modification for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones or Fire Zone 4, archeological and cultural resources, and the County Oak Tree Ordinance.

2

2. The County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division has no further comments regarding this project.

HEALTH HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DIVISION:

1. The Health Hazardous Materials Division (HHMD) of the Los Angeles County Fire Department previously provided our comments regarding this project in May 2015. HHMD has no additional comments at this time. In addition, HHMD has no jurisdiction over environmental matters in the City of Long Beach, which has its own local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA).

4

If you have any additional questions, please contact this office at (323) 890-4330.

Very truly yours,

KEVIN T. JOHNSON, ACTING CHIEF, FORESTRY DIVISION
PREVENTION SERVICES BUREAU

KTJ:ad

Letter 4

COMMENTER: Kevin T. Johnson, Acting Chief, Forestry Division, County of Los Angeles Fire Department

DATE: September 1, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 4.1

The commenter states that the project site is outside of the Los Angeles County Fire Department jurisdiction and thus would not have any impact on the emergency or general responsibilities of the Department. This comment is noted.

Response 4.2

The commenter states that the County of Los Angeles Fire Department's Forestry Division has no comments on the project. This comment is noted.

Response 4.3

The commenter states that the Health Hazardous Materials Division of the County of Los Angeles Fire Department has no jurisdiction over environmental matters in the City of Long Beach, which has its own local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA), and has no comments on the project. This comment is noted.

South Coast
Air Quality Management District
21865 Copley Drive, Diamond Bar, CA 91765-4178
(909) 396-2000 • www.aqmd.gov

SENT VIA E-MAIL AND USPS: September 16, 2015

Craig.chalfant@longbeach.gov
Craig Chalfant, Planner
Planning Bureau, Development Services Department
City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Civic Center Project (SCH# 2015041054)

The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The following comments are meant as guidance for the lead agency and should be incorporated into the Final CEQA document. The lead agency plans to demolish three buildings and construct six new governmental and mixed use buildings. Demolition would either be carried out by traditional techniques or by implosion. Based on a review of the Draft EIR, the SCAQMD staff has several concerns regarding the potential air quality impacts of the Long Beach Civic Center Project.

In the Air Quality Section, the lead agency quantified the project's construction and operation air quality impacts and compared those impacts with the SCAQMD's recommended regional and localized daily significance thresholds. Based on its analyses, the lead agency has determined that operational air quality impacts will exceed the recommended regional daily threshold for ROG emissions. Even with mitigation measures, the project related impacts to regional air quality would remain significant and unavoidable. The SCAQMD staff recommends additional mitigation measures that could be used to further reduce ROG emissions. Please see the attachment for more information. 1

The SCAQMD staff is available to work with the lead agency to address these concerns and any other air quality questions that may arise. Please contact Jack Cheng, Air Quality Specialist at (909) 396-2448, if you have any questions regarding these comments. We look forward to reviewing and providing comments for the Final CEQA document associated with this project.

Sincerely,

Jillian Wong

Jillian Wong, Ph.D.
Program Supervisor
Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources

JW:JC
LAC150805-02
Control Number
Attachment

Attachment

Air Quality Analysis

1. The lead agency failed to properly quantify PM emissions from implosion. CalEEMod estimates emissions from traditional demolition methods and does not quantify fugitive PM emissions from implosion. SCAQMD staff recommends the lead agency revise the air quality analysis to include the emissions from implosion demolition. 2

   Mitigation Measure AQ-2 and the Air Quality Safety Plan do not identify how the lead agency will comply with SCAQMD Rule 401 – Visible Emissions and Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. Specifically, Mitigation Measure AQ-2 does not utilize any form of dust suppression and fugitive dust control measures outlined in SCAQMD Rule 403. Furthermore, demolition by implosion is not exempt from any of the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 401 and 403. Please provide additional detailed information on the mitigation measures for both traditional and implosion demolition in the Final EIR. 3

2. The lead agency states that construction-related daily emissions would not exceed any regional SCAQMD thresholds from criteria pollutants during any individual construction phases. However, the air quality impacts from construction are underestimated because the air quality analysis does not account for overlapping construction phases. For example, Phase One: Architectural Coating overlaps with Phase Three: Demolition, Grading, and Construction. SCAQMD staff recommends revising the air quality analysis to account for overlapping construction phases and comparing the peak impacts to SCAQMD's CEQA significance thresholds for construction. 4

3. The SCAQMD staff recommends that overlapping construction and operational air quality impacts starting in 2020 through project build out 2022 be estimated, compared with the recommended SCAQMD long-term operational thresholds of significance, and then included in the Final EIR. Based on SCAQMD staff review, Phase Four: Grading air quality impacts will overlap with the operational emissions generated from occupancy during Phase One and Two. Individually, construction and operational NOx impacts for these separate activities (Phase Four: Grading and Phases 1 & 2 Operations) were shown as less than significant. However, when the overlap phases are combined, the peak impact would exceed the SCAQMD's CEQA significance thresholds for operation. 5

Additional Mitigation Measures

During project operations, the lead agency has determined that project operation emissions are significant for ROGs. Therefore, SCAQMD staff recommends additional mitigation measures to further reduce ROG emissions.

- Provide electric vehicle (EV) Charging Stations

  It is important to make this electrical infrastructure available when the project is built so that it is ready when this technology becomes commercially available. The cost of installing electrical charging equipment onsite is significantly cheaper if completed when the project is built compared to retrofitting an existing building. Similar to the City of Los Angeles requirements for all new projects, the SCAQMD staff recommends that the Lead Agency require at least 5% of all vehicle parking spaces include EV charging stations.[1] At a minimum, electrical panels should appropriately sized to allow for future expanded use. 1, cont'd

- Provide outlets for electric and propane barbecues in residential areas.

[1] http://ladbs.org/LADBSWeb/LADBS_Forms/Publications/LAGreenBuildingCodeOrdinance.pdf

Letter 5

COMMENTER: Jillian Wong, Ph.D., Program Supervisor, Planning, Rule Development & Area Sources, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)

DATE: September 16, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 5.1

The commenter recommends additional mitigation measures to further reduce reactive organic gas (ROG) emissions. Recommendations include providing electric vehicle charging stations at five percent of all vehicle parking spaces or ensuring electrical panels are appropriately sized to allow for future expanded use of electric vehicle charging, and providing outlets for electric and propane barbecues in residential areas.

The proposed project would meet LEED Gold standards, which requires approximately three percent of all spaces to have Electric Vehicle Charging Stations. Pages 4.2-20 and 4.2-21 of the Draft SEIR have been revised to include the following:

> **AQ-3(a)** **Low-VOC Paint.** The project applicant shall require all development operator(s) to use low-VOC paint on all interior and exterior surfaces. Paint should not exceed 50 g/L for all interior surfaces and exterior surfaces.
>
> **AQ-3(b)** **Barbecue Outlets. Provide electric and propane barbecue outlets in all residential outdoor areas.**
>
> **Significance After Mitigation.** As shown in Table 4.2-9, implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3**(a)** would reduce ROG emissions to the maximum extent feasible. **Mitigation Measure AQ-3(b) would further reduce ROG emissions, however, it is not possible to quantify reductions with CalEEMod.** ~~However, p~~**P**roject-related long-term impacts to regional air quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

Response 5.2

The commenter states that the Draft SEIR fails to properly quantify particulate matter (PM) emissions from implosion because CalEEMod estimates emissions only from traditional demolition methods.

Impact AQ-2 on Page 4.2-15 of the Draft SEIR states that project emissions would not exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds, but acknowledges that if demolition occurs by implosion, the project would result in significant impacts related to localized PM emissions without implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2. If demolition occurs by implosion, Mitigation Measure AQ-2 requires the development of an Air Quality Safety Plan to be approved by the SCAQMD. The plan would include the following measures:

- *A radius around the project site in which the public is prevented from being outdoors;*
- *Advanced notification of potential particulate matter and asbestos exposure to all land uses within 1,000 feet of the project site;*
- *Notice that windows should be closed at all buildings within the safety radius during the implosion until the City has provided notice that particulate matter and asbestos concentrations have reached background concentrations;*
- *Air quality monitoring during the day of the implosion to confirm when particulate matter and asbestos concentrations have reached background concentrations.*

Page 4.2-10 of the Draft SEIR has been revised to include the following clarification:

> **[…]**However, the air quality models identified in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook are outdated; therefore, CalEEMod Version 2013.2.2 was used to estimate regional air pollutant emissions associated with project construction and operation. **Modeling assumed demolition would occur by traditional methods, as it is not possible to model demolition by implosion in CalEEMod.**

Response 5.3

The commenter states that Mitigation Measure AQ-2, which requires the development of an Air Quality Safety Plan, does not identify how the Lead Agency will comply with SCAQMD Rule 401 – Visible Emissions and Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust and requests that detailed information be included in the mitigation measures for both traditional and implosion demolition. The commenter also states that demolition by implosion is not exempt from any of the requirements of SCAQMD Rule 401 and 403.

The Draft SEIR details that the project would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 and lists the measures to reduce fugitive dust that are required to be implemented at all construction sites located within the South Coast Air Basin on page 4.2-15 of Section 4.2, *Air Quality*. The following sentence on page 4.2-16 has been revised to clarify that Rule 403 applies to all phases of construction:

> Therefore, the following conditions, which are required to reduce fugitive dust in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, were included in CalEEMod for ~~the site preparation and grading~~ **all** phases of construction.

In addition, Page 4.2-6 of the Draft SEIR has been revised to include the following information:

> ***SCAQMD Rules and Regulations.*** **All projects are subject to SCAQMD rules and regulations in effect at the time of construction. Specific rules applicable to the construction anticipated under the Plan may include the following:**
>
> > **Rule 401 – Visible Emissions. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere from any single source of emission whatsoever any air contaminant for a period or periods aggregating more than 3 minutes in any 1 hour that is as dark or darker in shade as that designated No. 1 on the Ringelmann Chart, as published by the United States Bureau of Mines.**

> **Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust. This rule is intended to reduce the amount of particulate matter entrained in the ambient air as a result of anthropogenic (human-made) fugitive dust sources by requiring actions to prevent, reduce, or mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Rule 403 applies to any activity or human-made condition capable of generating fugitive dust.**
>
> **Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings. No person shall apply or solicit the application of any architectural coating within the SCAQMD with VOC content in excess of the values specified in a table incorporated in the Rule.**

Response 5.4

The commenter states that regional air quality impacts from construction are underestimated because the air quality analysis does not account for overlapping construction phases. The commenter gives as an example, Phase One: Architectural Coating overlapping with Phase Three: Demolition, Grading, and Construction. The commenter recommends revising the air quality analysis to account for overlapping phases and comparing the peak impacts to SCAQMD regional thresholds for construction.

The air quality analysis, which is reproduced in Appendix B of the Draft SEIR, does account for overlapping phases. Page 4.2-10 of the Draft SEIR has been revised to include the following clarification:

> […] Phase 1 **would span January 2016 to November 2019 and** includes demolition of the former Courthouse, grading, construction of City Hall, the Port Building, the new Library, Civic Block parking garage and associated architectural coating and paving. Phase 1 also includes the grading and construction of the residential building and parking garage within the Third and Pacific Block. Phase 2 **would span April 2017 to December 2017 and** includes architectural coating and paving for the residential building within the Third and Pacific Block. Phase 3 **would span July 2019 to March 2020 and** includes demolition of the existing Main Library, and grading and construction of Lincoln Park. Phase 4 **would span January 2020 to July 2022 and** includes demolition of the existing City Hall and grading and construction of the Center Block components, including associated architectural coating and paving.

As described on page 18 of SCAQMD's CalEEMod User's Guide, Appendix A, Calculation Details for CalEEMod, "Since construction phases may or may not overlap in time, the maximum daily construction emissions will not necessarily be the sum of all possible daily emissions. CalEEMod therefore calculates the maximum daily emissions for each construction phase. The program will then add together the maximum daily emissions for each construction phase that overlaps in time. Finally the program will report the highest of these combined overlapping phases as a daily maximum." The maximum daily emissions reported in Table 4.2-6, Estimated Construction Maximum Daily Air Pollutant Emissions (lbs/day), on page 4.2-17 of the Draft SEIR account for the overlapping phases of construction described in the revision above and are "peak" emissions associated with construction of the project. As shown in Table 4.2-6, the project's maximum emissions are below SCAQMD's regional thresholds.

Response 5.5

The commenter recommends overlapping construction and operational air quality emissions starting in 2020 through project buildout in 2022 and comparing the combined emissions with recommended SCAQMD long-term operational thresholds of significance. The commenter states that overlapping construction and operational emissions would exceed SCAQMD's operational threshold.

SCAQMD's construction and operational thresholds are detailed on page 4.2-11 of the Draft SEIR. The construction emissions threshold applies to construction-related activities, such as architectural coating (i.e., interior and exterior painting), grading, and building construction; whereas, the operational emissions threshold applies to operational emissions associated with waste generation, vehicle trips, and water use of the proposed project's long term use. Construction emissions are temporary in nature and would not contribution to long-term operational emissions. Use of the approach suggested by the commenter could apply to any project, but the City has never received a similar request on any other project, nor has such an approach been used in the past. To maintain consistency with past City practice and SCAQMD recommendations, the approach used in the Draft SEIR (analyzing temporary construction emissions and long-term operational emissions separately and comparing emissions to the applicable thresholds) has not been revised.

Letter 6

COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
Telephone: (562) 699-7411, FAX: (562) 699-5422
www.lacsd.org

GRACE ROBINSON HYDE
Chief Engineer and General Manager

September 16, 2015

Ref File No.: 3408681

Mr. Craig Chalfant, Planner
Development Services Department
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mr. Chalfant:

Civic Center Project

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on August 5, 2015. The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 3. We offer the following comments:

1. Previous comments submitted by the Districts in correspondence dated May 14, 2015 (copy enclosed) still apply to the subject project with the following updated information.

2. The Joint Water Pollution Control Plant currently processes an average flow of 263.1 million gallons per day.

3. All other information concerning Districts' facilities and sewerage service contained in the document is current.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

AR:ar

Enclosure

cc: M. Sullivan
J. Ganz

DOC: #3448741.D03

Recycled Paper

COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICTS
OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY

1955 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90601-1400
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 4998, Whittier, CA 90607-4998
Telephone: (562) 699-7411, FAX: (562) 699-5422
www.lacsd.org

GRACE ROBINSON HYDE
Chief Engineer and General Manager

May 14, 2015

Ref File No.: 3290765

Mr. Craig Chalfant, Planner
Development Services Department
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dear Mr. Chalfant:

Civic Center Project

The County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County (Districts) received a Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the subject project on April 17, 2015. The proposed development is located within the jurisdictional boundaries of District No. 3. We offer the following comments regarding sewerage service:

1. The wastewater flow originating from the proposed project will discharge to a local sewer line, which is not maintained by the Districts, for conveyance to the Districts' De Forest Avenue Trunk Sewer, located in Broadway at the Long Beach Freeway. This 36–inch diameter trunk sewer has a design capacity of 39.4 million gallons per day (mgd) and conveyed a peak flow of 5.6 mgd when last measured in 2012.

2. The wastewater generated by the proposed project will be treated at the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant located in the City of Carson, which has a design capacity of 400 mgd and currently processes an average flow of 263.4 mgd.

3. The expected increase in average wastewater flow from the proposed project consisting of a 270,000-square-foot city hall building, a 240,000-square-foot port building, a 92,000-square-foot library, 40,000 square feet of retail structure, a total of 780 apartment units, and a 200-room hotel, is 113,690 gallons per day, after all structures on the project site are demolished. For a copy of the Districts' average wastewater generation factors, go to www.lacsd.org, Wastewater & Sewer Systems, click on Will Serve Program, and click on the Table 1, Loadings for Each Class of Land Use link.

4. The Districts are empowered by the California Health and Safety Code to charge a fee for the privilege of connecting (directly or indirectly) to the Districts' Sewerage System for increasing the strength or quantity of wastewater attributable to a particular parcel or operation already connected. This connection fee is a capital facilities fee that is imposed in an amount sufficient to construct an incremental expansion of the Sewerage System to accommodate the proposed project. Payment of a connection fee will be required before a permit to connect to the sewer is

DOC: #3316480.D03

Recycled Paper

issued. For more information and a copy of the Connection Fee Information Sheet, go to www.lacsd.org, Wastewater & Sewer Systems, click on Will Serve Program, and search for the appropriate link. For more specific information regarding the connection fee application procedure and fees, please contact the Connection Fee Counter at extension 2727.

5. In order for the Districts to conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the design capacities of the Districts' wastewater treatment facilities are based on the regional growth forecast adopted by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Specific policies included in the development of the SCAG regional growth forecast are incorporated into clean air plans, which are prepared by the South Coast and Antelope Valley Air Quality Management Districts in order to improve air quality in the South Coast and Mojave Desert Air Basins as mandated by the CCA. All expansions of Districts' facilities must be sized and service phased in a manner that will be consistent with the SCAG regional growth forecast for the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, and Imperial. The available capacity of the Districts' treatment facilities will, therefore, be limited to levels associated with the approved growth identified by SCAG. As such, this letter does not constitute a guarantee of wastewater service, but is to advise you that the Districts intend to provide this service up to the levels that are legally permitted and to inform you of the currently existing capacity and any proposed expansion of the Districts' facilities.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned at (562) 908-4288, extension 2717.

Very truly yours,

Grace Robinson Hyde

Adriana R

Adriana Raza
Customer Service Specialist
Facilities Planning Department

AR:ar

cc: M. Sullivan
J. Ganz

DOC: #3316480.D03

Letter 6

COMMENTER: Adriana Raza, Customer Service Specialist, Facilities Planning Department, County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County

DATE: September 23, 2015

RESPONSE:

The commenter refers to its letter submitted during the scoping period. The commenter states that all information contained in the Draft SEIR concerning the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County's facilities and services is current, except that the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant currently processes an average flow of 263.1 million gallons per day.

The average flow of the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant has been updated from 263.4 million gallons per day, which was based on the Districts' May 14, 2015 comment letter, to 263.1 million gallons per day throughout the Draft SEIR.

Letter 7

LONG BEACH HERITAGE

September 10, 2015

LONG BEACH HERITAGE RESPONSE TO THE CIVIC CENTER PROJECT SEIR, SECTION 4.3

The mid-twentieth century Civic Center is a significant element in the built environment of our city and its demolition should be mitigated by a substantial contribution to future historic preservation in Long Beach. Merely documenting the destroyed buildings in photographs and saving a few artifacts for tourists to view does not make up for the loss of such notable structures by important local architects. The former Los Angeles County Courthouse of 1958-60 on Ocean Boulevard, designed by Francis Heusel and Kenneth Wing, is deemed eligible for local and state landmark status, according to CEQA guidelines. It is a prime and intact example of Mid-Century Modern curtain wall architecture. Although the City Hall and Main Library buildings are only 38 years old, they are the product of the Allied Architects, who included the internationally esteemed Edward Killingsworth; Wing & Wing; Gibbs & Gibbs; and Frank Homolka. The structures embody the Late Modern style current in America in the 1970s, with their striking combination of concrete and tinted glass, as well as the use of a rooftop garden on the Library, an innovative concept at the time. This unique complex is eligible for listing in the State Register of Historic Resources as well. Many years of planning went into the final concept for our Civic Center buildings and landscaping. 1

Long Beach Heritage agrees with the State Historic Preservation Office that mitigation for the loss of the Civic Center should include depositing a substantial sum of money into the Long Beach Navy Memorial Heritage Association trust fund to be used for future preservation grants in the city. This fund originated with mitigation money for the destruction of the architecturally noteworthy Roosevelt Navy Base designed by Adrian Wilson and Paul Revere Williams. Demolition of our Civic Center, which is considered aesthetically significant by architects and preservationists, should be assuaged by a meaningful contribution from the developer to preservation efforts in Long Beach. 2

Cheryl Perry

Cheryl Perry

President, Long Beach Heritage

Letter 7

COMMENTER: Cheryl Perry, President, Long Beach Heritage

DATE: September 10, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 7.1

The commenter states that building documentation and preserving "a few articles for tourists to view" does not make up for the loss of the former Los Angeles County Courthouse, City Hall, or Main Library. The commenter states that the complex is eligible for listing in the State Register of Historic Resources.

The Draft SEIR acknowledges that the former Los Angeles County Courthouse and City Hall-Library Complex both appear eligible for listing in the CRHR (see page 4.3-8 of Section 4.3, *Cultural Resources*). The Draft SEIR also acknowledges that Mitigation Measures CR-1(a), Historic Artifact Collection Program, and CR-1(b), Building Documentation, would reduce significant impacts to cultural resources to the degree feasible, but not to below a level of significance. Therefore, the Draft SEIR found that impacts to cultural resources would contribute to the Downtown Plan EIR finding that impacts to cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable.

Response 7.2

The commenter states agreement with the OHP that cultural resource mitigation should include funding for historic preservation and suggests depositing a "substantial sum of money" into the Long Beach Navy Memorial Heritage Association trust fund to be used for future preservation grants in the City. The commenter notes that this fund originated with mitigation money for the destruction of the architecturally noteworthy Roosevelt Navy Base.

OHP's recommendation that the City establish a historic preservation mitigation fund does not directly address the identified impact related to demolition of the Old Courthouse and the Long Beach City Hall-Library Complex. Nonetheless, this comment has been forwarded to City decision makers, who may consider including the suggestion as conditions of project approval.

Letter 8

LOS ANGELES CONSERVANCY

523 West Sixth Street, Suite 826
Los Angeles, CA 90014

213 623 2489 OFFICE
213 623 3909 FAX
laconservancy.org

Submitted electronically
September 17, 2015

Craig Chalfant, Planner
Long Beach Development Services
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802
Email: craig.chalfant@longbeach.gov

Re: Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report, Long Beach Civic Center Project

Dear Mr. Chalfant,

On behalf of the Los Angeles Conservancy, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

The Conservancy has previously raised concerns over the environmental review process for the proposed demolition of the Long Beach Courthouse, and we appreciate the completion of a Draft SEIR that examines the Long Beach Civic Center as a whole. Nonetheless, the current analysis for the proposed Civic Center Project contains significant flaws with respect to cultural resources in several key areas and fails to adequately evaluate a range of meaningful preservation alternatives. **Most concerning is that no single preservation alternative is offered (only partial-preservation alternatives) within the Draft SEIR that assesses the reuse and continued eligibility of all of the affected cultural resources, despite being required by CEQA. This is in violation of CEQA and further demonstrates that the City is not seriously looking at preservation solutions and options in a good faith manner.** 1

We strongly believe that there are viable opportunities to retain and adaptively reuse the historic Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library buildings as part of the proposed redevelopment of the site, and we urge the City to further analyze and select a true preservation alternative as the environmentally superior alternative.

I. Historic significance of the Long Beach Civic Center.

The proposed project seeks to demolish the Long Beach Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library, three known historic resources that are eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources and as Long Beach Historic Landmarks. 2

The Courthouse was determined eligible for the California Register in 2008 as part of the the City of Long Beach's citywide survey of historic resources. The assessment identified the building as an excellent example of the Corporate International Style that retains most of its character-defining features. Completed in 1960, the steel-framed building was designed by master architect Kenneth S. Wing in conjunction with Francis J. Heusel. The rectangular-plan courthouse has curtain walls set with panels of glass and blue porcelain enamel corresponding to each floor and floor plate, while the west and east elevations have a contrasting treatment with precast aggregate concrete panels. Other distinguishing features of the building's design include the recessed first floor set behind the columns of the structural framing, the transparant quality of the glass-enclosed staircase of the building's southwest section, and terrazzo paving and raised concrete planters.

Completed in 1977, City Hall and the Main Library represented the realization of the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, which envisioned a modern centralized hub for civic engagement and municipal services. The complex was designed by Allied Architects, which included Hugh and Donald Gibbs; Homolka & Associates; Killingsworth, Brady & Associates; Kenneth S. Wing and Associates; and Peter Walker as landscape architect. As built, City Hall and the Main Library are excellent examples of the Late Modern Style with integrated landscaping and reveal the collective efforts of this consortium of local master architects. The two buildings are connected by an open plaza, constructed primarily of brick and concrete with a designed modern landscape and amphitheater. 2, cont'd

The fifteen-story glass, concrete, and aluminum City Hall building is the centerpiece of the Civic Center, designed to accommodate all City departments within the central tower. Distinctive features include monumental precast concrete corner piers, sleek glass curtain walls, and the plaza-facing glass door entrance. The council chambers are located on the plaza level and visible through a glass viewing area, which Docomomo Southern California has recognized as "a forward-thinking nod to transparency in local government."

The two-story, rectangular-plan Main Library building was designed to be an integral part of the surrounding Lincoln Park and features a flat roof with planters and grass berms above reinforced concrete walls. In juxtaposition to the solid concrete massing, large clerestory windows allow natural light to filter into the public spaces.

II. Cultural Resources evaluation in Draft SEIR contains significant flaws.

The Conservancy believes that the Cultural Resources evaluation prepared for the Draft SEIR is flawed in several key areas and is inadequate for purposes of conducting a thorough environmental review. While the study acknowledges the eligibility of the Courthouse, City Hall, and the Main Library for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources and as City of Long Beach Historic Landmarks, we disagree with the methodology applied in the evaluation of a potential Civic Center historic district. 3

First, the Draft SEIR erroneously treats City Hall and the Main Library as a single historic resource as opposed to two separate resources. Though they are inextricably linked as part of the fulfillment of the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan under the direction of Allied Architects, they are distinct buildings in 4

design and execution. As such, they should have been evaluated separately for individual eligibility, as well as for eligibility as contributors to the potential historic district. 4, cont'd

Second, the Conservancy disputes the proposed boundaries for and assessment of the potential Civic Center historic district and believes that the project site does indeed contain an eligible historic district. The Cultural Resources Study in the Draft SEIR states: "[w]hile the buildings and structures within the Civic Center are all functionally related and were each designed for municipal purposes, the alterations to the Public Safety Building and Lincoln Park and construction of the Broadway Parking Garage have reduced the integrity of the site and weakened its cohesive overall identity, making it ineligible for consideration as a CRHR or locally eligible historic district."[1] We recognize that the 1960 Public Safety Building, though one of the first buildings to be constructed as part of the postwar redevelopment of the Civic Center, has been altered significantly over the years and no longer retains integrity. Similarly, Lincoln Park has been modified from its 1964 redesign and does not appear to be an eligible historic resource either. We question, however, the decision to evaluate the 1980s Broadway Parking Garage within the boundaries of the potential district, since it does not represent the realization of the Civic Center Master Plan and was constructed outside of the potential period of significance. 5

Despite alterations to the Public Safety Building and Lincoln Park, Conservancy strongly believes that the Civic Center superblock, its associated buildings (including the Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library), and its designed plaza and landscapes do compose an eligible and intact historic district. The period of significance for the potential district is 1960 to 1977. Together, the contributing buildings and integrated landscapes express the vision of the 1950s Civic Center Master Plan, namely the creation of a modern, transparent, and consolidated governmental complex within the core of the city.

The Civic Center Project seeks to demolish the Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library as well as the historic and cultural landscape in order to fulfill a proposed plan to redevelop the entire Civic Center site. This action would lead to the complete and significant loss of three individually eligible historic resources, which would be compounded by the loss of an eligibile historic district. To this end, the Draft SEIR should have also evaluated the overall impacts to cultural resources that would occur as a result of the proposed project, from the standpoint of indivually-eligble resources and as a historic district 6

III. Overly Narrow Project Objectives Improperly Limit the Full Consideration of Preservation Alternatives

Paradoxically, the project seeks to demolish the historic Courthouse and Civic Center in order to redevelop the site. As recognized by the DEIR, a significant adverse impact -- the loss of the Courthouse and Civic Center -- is the result of any attempt to meet these objectives. We strongly feel that the City cannot legitimately justify demolishing the Courthouse and Civic Center and obliterating significant and unique historic resources without the full consideration of viable preservation alternatives. As narrowly defined within the SEIR, it is virtually impossible to achieve a preservation outcome. We recognize that preserving and reusing the Courthouse and Civic Center may not be the City's preference, but the project 7

[1] City of Long Beach, *Civic Center Project Draft Supplemental Impact Report, Appendix C* (2).

objectives cannot simply be assumed to be superior to the value of the historic resources that is being compromised.

The underlying purpose of the project is summarized in the following objective: "Redevelop the Civic Center mega-block into a vibrant mix of public and private space, including a grand Civic Plaza, which asserts the value and importance of the public realm, and which functions as the City's center for governance, civic engagement and cultural and educational exchange." Rehabilitating and reusing the historic resources within the potential Civic Center Historic District would reinforce the area's civic and cultural identity, reinvigorate it for contemporary uses, and promote long-term sustainability.

As currently outlined, many of the proposed project objectives in the Draft SEIR are too narrowly defined and reveal the City's pre-commitment to demolition as opposed to rehabilitation and potential reuse, which could similarly address public safety concerns. These include the first two objectives: 7, cont'd

- Replace seismically deficient City Hall and Main Library in an expeditious manner; and
- Reduce public safety hazards by eliminating the risk of fire, structural collapse, personal injury to trespassers, vandalism and crime, by demolishing the structurally unsound, abandoned, and deteriorated former Long Beach Courthouse building.

It is well recognized that an overly narrow definition of project objectives undermines the purpose of CEQA by foreclosing consideration of less harmful alternatives.[2] With regard to the proposed project, two of the five objectives are so narrowly defined and subjective as to essentially eliminate any possibility of their being met by a preservation alternative. The Conservancy therefore requests that the DEIR contain a broader definition of project objectives, allowing for the full consideration of preservation alternatives.

IV. The Final SEIR should evaluate and select a bona fide preservation alternative as the environmentally superior alternative.

The Conservancy is deeply concerned over the absence of a range of meaningful preservation alternatives in the Draft SEIR. In our comments on the Draft EIR for the now-withdrawn Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project, we urged the City to mandate the study of bona fide alternatives for retaining and reusing the Courthouse as part of a thoughtful planning process for the Civic Center at large. With the Draft SEIR, the City has once more failed to demonstrate the infeasibility of incorporating the Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library into the new plan for revitalizing the Civic Center. 8

a. Deficiencies in current study of project alternatives, as no preservation alternative is offered that maintains eligibility of all of the affected cultural resources

[2] See City of Santee v. County of San Diego (1989) 214 Cal.App.3d 1438 (holding that when project objectives are defined too narrowly an EIR's treatment of analysis may also be inadequate).

In addition to the required No Project/No Build Alternative, the Draft SEIR analyzes three alternatives, of which two would slightly reduce impacts to cultural resources. Alternative 2/Downtown Plan Buildout of Civic Center Area Alternative would retain the Main Library and Lincoln Park, but demolish the Courthouse and City Hall. Though few details are provided, this alternative's impact on historic resources would remain significant. Alternative 3/Adaptive Reuse Alternative would rehabilitate the Courthouse according to the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* and reuse the building for governmental offices. While the Courthouse would retain its eligibility for the California Register under this alternative, City Hall and the Main Library would still be demolished, resulting in significant impacts. 8, cont'd

Alternative 3 references an Adaptive Reuse Study (Study) prepared by RRM Design Group in 2014, which was also included in the Draft EIR for the Long Beach Courthouse Demolition Project. The Study is intended to "understand on a conceptual level the impacts of re-furbishing existing building configuration to be used primarily as City Hall and/or municpal offices." As we pointed out in our comment letter on the proposed Courthouse Demolition Project, this analysis is minimal in scope and provides few actual details on the existing conditions of the various building systems. The Study includes inaccurate information in key areas, stating that "the original heating, cooling, and ventilation systems are well beyond the normal service life expectancy." Furthermore, it fails to acknowledge that, in 1996, the County of Los Angeles undertook a major $1.8 million energy efficiency upgrade of the building that focused on HVAC and lighting.[3]

The analysis in Alternative 3 of the proposed Civic Center Project does not address these deficiencies or offer any additional evidence to support claims that adaptive reuse would be infeasible. In assessing the impacts of Alternative 3 on Cultural Resources, the Draft SEIR states: "The adaptive reuse of the building, however, would require substantial alteration of interior and exterior features. The adaptive reuse would maintain the structure of the building, but its appearance and historic value may be diminished." While the project would adhere to the *Standards for Rehabilitation*, the City does not offer any insights into how the Courthouse's integrity could be compromised, and its discussion of this Alternative underscores the predisposition towards demolition.

A key policy under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is the lead agency's duty to "take all action necessary to provide the people of this state with historic environmental qualities and preserve for future generations examples of major periods of California history."[4] To this end, CEQA requires public

---

[3] Energy Star Labeled Building Profile: http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?fuseaction=labeled_buildings.showProfile&profile_id=1313: This 6-story, 215,880 sq. ft., air-conditioned facility (302,896 GSF including parking lot and garage) received two new chillers; two sets of chilled water and condenser water pumps, each with premium efficiency pump motors, 24 variable frequency drives and compatible premium efficiency motors for air handling units; an airside economizer cycle; and a new analog/digital energy management system with centralized and local HVAC access control of the entire facility. The building's lighting system was also retrofitted with T8/electronic ballasts (from T12/magnetic ballast fluorescent); compact fluorescent lamps (from incandescent), high pressure sodium lamps (from mercury vapor); and LED exit signs.

[4] Public Resource Code, Sec. 21001 (b), (c).

agencies to deny approval of a project with significant adverse effects when feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures can substantially lessen such effects."[5]

Courts often refer to the EIR as "the heart" of CEQA because it provides decision makers with an in-depth review of projects with potentially significant environmental impacts and analyzes a range of alternatives that reduce those impacts.[6] Based on objective analyses found in the EIR, agencies "shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment whenever it is feasible to do so."[7] The lead agency cannot merely adopt a statement of overriding considerations and approve a project with significant impacts; it must first adopt feasible alternatives and mitigation measures.[8]

8, cont'd

While the Adaptive Reuse Study ultimately concludes that "a renovation project of this size and complexity would cost far more than demolishing and replacing the existing building with entirely new construction," **the fact that an environmentally superior alternative may be more costly or fails to meet all project objectives does not necessarily render it infeasible under CEQA.**

b. Meaningful adaptive reuse alternatives will meet most of the project objectives.

The Draft SEIR contends that the environmentally superior alternative is Alternative 1/Reduced Density Alternative, which does not include any preservation components that would reduce significant impacts to cultural resources. This determination is in error and inherently flawed and reveals the broader and problematic deficiencies with the City's analysis and this SEIR The Final SEIR should, in good faith, examine a range of additional preservation alternatives that retain and adaptively reuse the Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library buildings as part of a comprehensive approach to the Civic Center. **Further, the SEIR needs to offer at least one preservation alternative that maintains the eligibility of the affected cultural resources, including the Courthouse and overall Civic Center complex (which includes the historic City Hall, Library and associated designed landscape). This alternative is not provided at all which does not adhere to CEQA provisions. Only partial-preservation alternatives are offered in the Draft SEIR. As stated, the City simply rejected considering and studying this option.[9]**

9

The Draft SEIR states that a Courthouse Adaptive Reuse and City Hall-Library Complex Rehabilitation Alternative was considered, but ultimately rejected. Though the 2014 Adaptive Reuse Study of the Courthouse is cited as evidence of this alternative's infeasibility, no studies appear to have been conducted on City Hall and the Main Library. Without sufficient evidence, including detailed cost analyses and a thorough assessment of existing building conditions, we question how the City arrived at its determination that rehabilitation and reuse are infeasible.

---

[5] *Sierra Club v. Gilroy City Council* (1990) 222 Cal.App.3d 30, 41; also see PRC Secs. 21002, 21002.1.
[6] *County of Inyo v. Yorty* (1973) 32 Cal.App.3d 795; *Laurel Heights Improvement Association v. Regents of the University of California* (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1123.
[7] Public Resource Code, Sec. 21002.1.
[8] Public Resource Code, Sec. 21081; *Friends of Sierra Madre v. City of Sierra Madre* (2001) 25 Cal.4th 165, 185.
[9] Civic Center Project SEIR, 6-14

Furthermore, we strongly believe that greater consideration and analysis should have been given to the three alternatives suggested by the Office of Historic Preservation, including the proposed Infill Alternative. The Draft SEIR fails to demonstrate, for example, the infeasibility of integrating sensitive infill development into the underutilized portions of the site. Adaptively reusing the Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library buildings – in tandem with compatible infill construction – would meet most the central project objectives, including revitalizing the Civic Center area, enhancing connectivity between Downtown and the Civic Center, and facilitating a vibrant mix of public and private space. There are other civic center developments that have successfully been reused and upgraded to meet current government and alternative use requirements, including those involving similar Modernist structures that also required seismic and life safety solutions, not unlike those present for Long Beach. One example is the Civic Center in Richmond, California.[10] We encourage the City to look to this example and others before foreclosing options for a viable preservation alternative.

While we recognize that the proposed Civic Center project reflects many of the guiding principles of the 2012 Downtown Plan, retaining and rehabilitating these known historic resources is also consistent with the City's outlined vision, which states: "[w]e value our buildings of historic merit and seek to preserve or restore them through adaptive reuse."[11] Though the Downtown Plan EIR found that the implementation of the Downtown Plan would have a "significant and unavoidable impact resulting from the potential redevelopment of properties that are eligible [historic resources]," the City must also demonstrate a good-faith effort to examine and pursue the environmentally superior alternative that mitigates and/or avoids significant impacts. 9, cont'd

Studies have consistently shown that, when comparing buildings of equal size and function, adaptive reuse nearly always offers greater environmental savings over demolition and new construction.[12] New energy efficient buildings can take up to eighty years to overcome the climate change impacts that result from their construction, whereas building reuse and retrofits can substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Though the Draft SEIR notes that Alternative 3/Adaptive Reuse Alternative would "incrementally lessen impacts to GHG emissions," it fails to explore the full environmental benefits of preservation. 10

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft SEIR for the Long Beach Civic Center Project. We welcome the opportunity to continue working with the City on efforts to identify opportunities for rehabilitation and adaptive reuse within the potential Civic Center Historic District. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (213) 430-4203 or afine@laconservancy.org should you have any questions or concerns.

About the Los Angeles Conservancy:

---

[10] Richmond, California Civic Center, http://aiasf.org/programs/competition/design-awards/2010/richmond-civic-center/

[11] City of Long Beach, *Civic Center Project Draft Supplemental Impact Report* (2-28).

[12] Preservation Green Lab, National Trust for Historic Preservation, *The Greenest Building: Quantifying the Environmental Value of Building Reuse*, January 2012.

The Los Angeles Conservancy is the largest local historic preservation organization in the United States, with more than 6,000 members throughout the Los Angeles area. Established in 1978, the Conservancy works to preserve and revitalize the significant architectural and cultural heritage of Los Angeles County through advocacy and education. For over twenty-five years, the Conservancy and its volunteer Modern Committee have worked to raise awareness about Los Angeles' unique collection of mid-20th century modernist structures.

10, cont'd

Sincerely,

Adrian Scott Fine

Adrian Scott Fine
Director of Advocacy

cc: Long Beach Heritage
California Office of Historic Preservation
Docomomo-Southern California

Letter 8

COMMENTER: Adrian Scott Fine, Director of Advocacy, Los Angeles Conservancy

DATE: September 17, 2015

RESPONSE:

Response 8.1

The commenter states that the Draft SEIR is in violation of CEQA because it fails to include an alternative that preserves all cultural resources on the project site. The commenter opines that there are viable opportunities to retain and adaptively reuse the historic Courthouse, City Hall, and Main Library buildings.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (a) states that an EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, however an EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative to the project. The same *CEQA Guidelines* section goes on to state that the alternatives should feasibly attain most of the objectives for a project, but avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.

The Draft SEIR includes a partial preservation alternative, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative, discussed in Section 6.3. This alternative would preserve the former Courthouse building, but demolish the City Hall-Library complex. The Draft SEIR found that the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would reduce impacts to cultural resources, as well as greenhouse gas emissions/climate change.

As discussed in Section 6.5, *Alternatives Considered But Rejected*, an alternative that would adaptively reuse the Courthouse as office space (similar to that described in the Adaptive Reuse Alternative) and rehabilitate the seismic deficiencies within the City Hall-Library Complex in the Courthouse Adaptive Reuse and City Hall-Library Complex Rehabilitation Alternative was considered. However, as discussed on pages 6-14 and 6-15 of the Draft SEIR, this alternative was rejected because of the functional and physical deficiencies of the buildings and because most of the project objectives would not be feasibly attainable.

Response 8.2

The commenter states that the project would involve the demolition of three buildings eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources.

The commenter is correct. If City decision makers approve the project, they would have to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations setting forth the reasons that they believe the project's benefits outweigh this significant environmental impact.

Response 8.3

The commenter states that the Cultural Resources Study included as Appendix C of the Draft SEIR is flawed and disagrees with the finding that the Civic Center is not a historic district.

Refer to Response 1.2 for a response to this comment.

Response 8.4

The commenter states that City Hall and Main Library should not have been evaluated as one resource.

Consideration was given to how each of the resources within the project area should be evaluated and documented as part of the study. The City Hall-Library Complex spaces share a physical connection: a narrow wing of single-story offices extends off the west elevation of the Main Library and connects to the City Hall between the western and southern piers of the tower. The rooftop landscaping elements continue these connections throughout the space. Therefore the City Hall-Library Complex buildings and the associated landscape elements were considered a single resource. Treating the two buildings separately rather than as the "City Hall-Library Complex" would not change the SEIR conclusions given that the impact associated with demolition of the complex has been identified as unavoidably significant.

Response 8.5

The commenter disputes the boundary used for assessing the Civic Center historic district and opines that the Broadway Parking Garage should not have been included in the assessment.

The Broadway Parking Garage was included in the historic assessment of the project because it is located within the physical property of the Civic Center space. Although the parking garage was constructed in the 1980s and does not meet the typical 50-year threshold for historic significance (as only the former Courthouse meets the 50-year threshold), it was evaluated because of its function as part of the Civic Center and its location within the Civic Center. Further, placement of the Broadway Parking Garage within the Civic Center is integral to evaluating the important components of the property, its spaces and overall cohesion. Even if the Broadway Parking Garage were excluded from the assessment, a historic district would still not be present due to the lack of contributing resources.

Response 8.6

The commenter re-states an opinion that the Civic Center superblock comprise an eligible and intact historic district.

Refer to Response 1.2, Response 8.4 , and Response 8.5 for a response to this comment.

Response 8.7

The commenter states that the project objectives are overly narrow making it virtually impossible to achieve a preservation outcome.

The project objectives are commensurate with the guiding principles of the adopted Long Beach Downtown Plan, described on Page 2-10 of the Draft SEIR, and include "promoting the development of a distinctive downtown skyline", "providing a vibrant, compact city core", and "demand[ing] quality in building practices in order to ultimately create historical masterpieces". In addition, Section 6.0, *Alternatives,* of the Draft SEIR analyzed three alternatives that would reduce impacts to cultural resources, the No Project Alternative, the Adaptive Reuse Alternative, and the Downtown Plan Buildout of Civic Center Area Alternative.

It is acknowledged that an alternative that preserves and rehabilitates existing structures would reduce impacts to historic resources and is physically feasible. However, such an alternative would conflict with objectives for the currently proposed project as well as those of the adopted Downtown Plan and would be prohibitively expensive, ranging from more than $124,650,000 to $138,500,000 for conversion of the former Courthouse alone, which would still suffer from functional and physical deficiencies. Therefore, a full preservation alternative is not a feasible alternative under CEQA.

Response 8.8

The commenter re-states an opinion that the Draft SEIR is in violation of CEQA because it fails to include an alternative that preserves all cultural resources on the project site. The commenter also states that an environmentally superior alternative may be more costly or fail to meet project objectives, but this does not render it "infeasible under CEQA."

Refer to Response 8.1 and Response 8.7, for a response to this comment.

Response 8.9

The commenter states that adaptive reuse would meet most of the project objectives. The commenter also believes that the OHP suggested alternatives that were considered, but rejected should have been more fully considered.

The last paragraph of Section 6.5, *Alternatives Considered But Rejected*, on pages 6-14 and 6-15 of the Draft SEIR, describes the objectives that a full adaptive reuse alternative would fail to meet project objectives because retaining the former Courthouse and the City Hall-Library Complex would restrict space available to achieve project objectives; these include:

- Redeveloping the site into a vibrant mix of public and private space with a grand Civic Plaza
- Improving connections with greater Downtown
- Reestablishing the small block grid of the historic downtown street fabric;
- Private development of housing, office, hotel, and retail; and
- Increasing affordable housing.

The other suggested alternatives included an Alternate Site Alternative, an Infill Alternative, and an Alternative-Use Alternative. These are discussed on page 6-14 of the Draft EIR. An Alternate Site Alternative and Infill Alternative would have located the entire proposed project or project components on one or more different sites within the Downtown Plan Area and an Alternative-Use Alternative would have placed different uses within the existing buildings on the project site. As discussed in the Draft SEIR, moving the project to another site, as would occur in the Alternate Site and Infill Alternatives, would not meet many of the key project objectives since it would not replace seismically deficient structures, reduce public safety hazards, or improve and revitalize the Civic Center Area. In addition, it would not be feasible to place different uses in existing buildings on the project site, as would occur in the Alternate-Use Alternative, since additional buildings would need to be constructed to house displaced civic uses. Displaced civic uses then would not be located within the Civic Center Area, as identified in the adopted Downtown Plan.

Response 8.10

The commenter states that the Adaptive Reuse Alternative fails to fully account for the greenhouse gas emission reduction benefits of preservation, stating that new energy efficient buildings can "take up to eighty years to overcome the climate change impacts that result from construction."

The proposed project's impact related to greenhouse gas emissions was found to be less than significant and the Draft SEIR acknowledges that the impact of the Adaptive Reuse Alternative would be lower than that of the proposed project. In response to this comment, page 6-10 of the Draft SEIR has been revised:

> This alternative would have ~~slightly~~ lower construction GHG emissions than the proposed project due to the adaptive reuse of the former Long Beach Courthouse, rather than demolition of the building. This alternative's climate change impacts would be ~~slightly~~ less than those of the proposed project and**, as with the proposed project,** would **be** ~~remain~~ less than significant.

Letter 9

-----Original Message-----
From: JIM COKE [mailto:jimcoke@usa.net]
Sent: Monday, September 07, 2015 4:32 PM
To: Craig Chalfant
Subject: civic center solar array on roof of new library will be in the shade during winter

Hello Craig,

April Economides suggested reaching out to you regarding the civic center design flaw mentioned in the subject line above.
I pointed this out at a meeting about 18 months ago at Los Altos library with city and developer people. Plan looked the same from latest pictures I saw at the meeting at MADE last month.

Deadline for input in Sept 17? Cambodian community leaders meeting Sept 19? Is this information correct?

thank you,
Jim

Letter 9

COMMENTER: Jim Coke, Private Citizen

DATE: September 7, 2015

RESPONSE:

The commenter states that the proposed solar array on the new library would be shaded during the winter.

Figures 4.1-7a through 4.1-7d in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, of the Draft SEIR show the results of a shadow study prepared for the proposed project. As shown on Figure 4.1-7a, the library roof would be shaded by surrounding existing buildings during the early morning hours at the height of winter. Figure 4.1-7b shows that the library would be unshaded during the late morning at the height of winter. Figures 4.1-7c and 4.1-7d indicate that the library roof would be shaded by the proposed mixed-use tower and surrounding existing buildings during the early afternoon at the height of winter. Figures 4.1-7a through 4.1-7d show that the library would be unshaded by existing or proposed buildings throughout the day during the height of summer.

While the solar array efficiency may be reduced during those limited winter solstice hours each year, the overall system would still produce sufficient solar energy to reduce the project's nonrenewable energy demands and associated greenhouse gas emissions. Downtown Plan EIR Mitigation Measure AQ-2 states that "The proposed structures shall be designed to meet current Title 24 + 20 percent energy efficiency standards and shall include photovoltaic cells on the rooftops to achieve an additional 25 percent reduction in electricity use on an average sunny day." The proposed project's design and solar array would be in compliance with this mitigation measure, as winter solstice is not indicative of an "average sunny day."