

CHAPTER 9 Text Changes to the Draft Subsequent EIR

9.1 FORMAT OF TEXT CHANGES

Text changes are intended to clarify or correct information in the DEIR in response to comments received on the document, or as initiated by Lead Agency staff. Revisions are shown in Section 9.2 (Text Changes) below as excerpts from the DSEIR text, with a ~~line through~~ deleted text and a double underline beneath inserted text. In order to indicate the location in the DSEIR where text has been changed, the reader is referred to the page number of the DSEIR.

9.2 TEXT CHANGES

This section includes revisions to DSEIR text that were initiated either by Lead Agency staff or in response to public comments. All changes appear in order of their location in the DSEIR.

Page 1-2, first partial paragraph

passed in the November 2006 election, which proposed the new senior center on a 5-acre site in Central Park. Measure T was passed by a margin of 51.1 percent (Yes) and 48.9 percent (No) with a total of 59,375 residents voting.

Page 3-18, last paragraph

When recreational and social programs are not using the rooms in the senior center, they could be used for public meetings, ~~or receptions~~ and special events such as banquets and weddings. An outdoor patio would adjoin the multi-purpose rooms onto which programs could be extended.

Page 4.1-25, second paragraph

Interior building lighting would be expected to escape the confines of the structure through windows, and outdoor security lighting would also be visible. Sensitive receptors that could be affected by building lighting include the residences located approximately ~~0.2~~0.215 mile to the west of the project site beyond the passive recreation area, and wildlife in the open areas and parkland to the north and south. During evening hours, there is minimal use of the passive recreation area directly west of the site. As such, it is not anticipated that an increase in lighting from the proposed project would result in any substantial effects to park patrons within this area.

Page 4.1-25, last paragraph

The nearest residences are located to the west of the project site more than ~~0.2~~0.215 mile away. Recognized normal sleeping hours are from 10:00 PM to 6:00 AM. On weekdays, most of the lighting from the senior

center would be turned off at closing (10:00 PM), and the security lighting that would remain on would not be considered significant and would not substantially increase ambient lighting in the vicinity after closing. Any increased lighting as a result of the proposed project would not be substantial at adjacent residences during normal periods of sleep because the development would be more than 0.215 mile from the nearest sensitive receptors. On weekends, when the senior center could be open until 12:00 AM, facility lighting would increase the ambient light in the project vicinity, but, again, as the nearest residences are more than 0.215 mile away from the project site, this increase would not be considered significant.

Page 4.9-4, first full paragraph and Table 4.9-2

Per the request of a commenter, noise measurements were retaken at the locations originally visited in 2007. As such, Table 4.9-2 (Existing Noise Levels Around the Proposed Project Site) was updated, as shown below. In updating the table, it was discovered that the L_{min} and L_{max} values for the 2007 reading at Location #4 had been transposed. As such, the changes in noise levels at this location are not as substantial as they appear to be, and all values are correct.

Existing daytime noise levels were monitored at five locations around the project site, which are depicted in Figure 4.9-1 (Noise Monitoring Locations), in order to identify representative noise levels at various areas. The noise levels were measured using a Larson-Davis Model 814 precision sound level meter, which satisfies the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) for general environmental noise measurement instrumentation. The average noise levels and sources of noise measured at each location are identified in Table 4.9-2 (Existing Noise Levels around the Proposed Project Site). These daytime noise levels are characteristic of a typical urban area. ~~As substantial changes in land uses have not occurred in close proximity to the project site and traffic volumes in the area are assumed to have remained reasonably constant, ambient noise levels in the project site vicinity are assumed to be similar to those at the time of preparation of the Draft EIR.~~

Table 4.9-2 Existing Noise Levels Around the Proposed Project Site

	Location	Primary Noise Sources	Noise Level Statistics		
			L_{eq} (dBA)	L_{min} (dBA)	L_{max} (dBA)
1	Southwest corner of Goldenwest Street and Talbert Avenue	Traffic	<u>71.274.2</u>	<u>48.549.1</u>	<u>83.585.6</u>
2	Southwest edge of project site, above berm	Traffic on Goldenwest Street	<u>53.152.7</u>	<u>47.444.8</u>	<u>64.167.9</u>
3	North edge of Mobile Home Park	Traffic	<u>69.971.7</u>	<u>48.447.1</u>	<u>88.683.8</u>
4	Lakeview Drive and Shoreview Circle	Park noise, waterfowl	<u>53.656.5</u>	<u>68.644.5</u>	<u>47.277.2</u>
5	Southern edge of homes on Rio Vista Drive	Traffic	<u>71.573.8</u>	<u>50.151.3</u>	<u>81.382.7</u>

SOURCE: Atkins (20072011).

Page 4.9-15, Analytic Method, First paragraph

This analysis of the existing and future noise environments is based on noise level monitoring, noise prediction modeling, and empirical observations. As defined in the City’s General Plan Noise Element,

noise sensitive land uses include public schools, hospitals, and institutional uses including churches, museums, and private schools. Typically, residential uses are also considered noise sensitive receptors. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, the nearest sensitive receptors to the project site would be the residential uses located approximately 800 feet west of the project site. Residential uses are also located approximately 1,4200 feet north of the site and approximately 1,400 feet south of the site.

Page 4.9-20, Impact 4.9-2 discussion, second paragraph

This analysis uses the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) vibration impact thresholds for sensitive buildings, residences, and institutional land uses. These thresholds are 85 VdB, which is the vibration level that is considered by the FTA to be acceptable only if there are an infrequent number of events per day (as described in Table 4.9-25 [Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration]). In terms of groundborne vibration impacts on nearby structures, this analysis will use the FTA's vibration damage threshold of approximately 100 VdB for fragile buildings (HMMH 2006).

Page 4.9-21, first full paragraph

Construction activities would have the potential to impact the surrounding sensitive receptors to the project site, which include the existing single-family residential homes located approximately 800 feet west of the project site. Based on the information presented in Table 4.9-10, vibration levels could reach approximately 81 VdB within 50 feet of the project site. As vibration level would attenuate at a rate of approximately 6 VdB per doubling of distance, vibration levels at the closest sensitive receptors (800 feet west of the project site) are anticipated to be 57 VdB. As such, these residential uses would not experience vibration levels during construction of the proposed project that would exceed the FTA's vibration impact threshold of 85 VdB for human annoyance. Therefore, this impact would be considered *less than significant*.

Page 6-44, first full paragraph

In order to accommodate parking demand created by this alternative, the existing 28-space parking lot, located in front of the existing buildings and between Dorsett Drive and the existing buildings, would be modified and paved areas located south of and directly adjacent to the existing buildings would be converted to parking to provide a total of approximately 192 parking spaces. If additional parking is required, visitors to the senior center could park along local residential streets (such as Stilwell Drive or Dorsett Drive), but this would be considered undesirable by the residents of these streets. Access to the new and modified parking areas could be provided from the identified Stillwell Drive extension or from Dorsett Drive, consistent with existing conditions. Therefore, based on the location, adjacent uses, local access, and parking, the ~~Park View Kettler School~~ Alternative site would have a greater impact on traffic than the proposed project site.¹⁵⁴

Page 6-57, second full paragraph

During operation traffic would be similar to the proposed project since a similar number of people would be accommodated at the senior center. However, with the athletic fields adjacent to this alternative site, parking would be needed to accommodate the demands of both uses. Although there are

a number of paved areas (including parking lots and playground areas) that could be utilized and converted for parking purposes, it is likely that some patrons of the senior center would park on the street along Tunstall Lane and/or Maddox Drive, which front this alternative project site. This would potentially impact residents of the neighborhood that are also adjacent to these streets, and that use on-street spaces. Therefore, based on the location, adjacent uses, local access, and parking, the Park View School ~~a~~Alternative site would have a greater impact on traffic than the proposed project site.¹⁵⁷

9.3 FIGURE CHANGES

There were no changes to DSEIR figures.

9.4 APPENDIX CHANGES

The following appendix has been added to the DSEIR; it is included at the end of this Volume II:

- Appendix 12 (Huntington Beach Senior Center Feasibility Study [New])