



City of Huntington Beach Planning Department
STAFF REPORT

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Scott Hess, AICP, Director of Planning
BY: Jennifer Villasenor, Associate Planner *JV*
DATE: December 11, 2007

SUBJECT: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 07-002 (HUNTINGTON BEACH SENIOR CENTER)

APPLICANT: City of Huntington Beach, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648

PROPERTY

OWNER: City of Huntington Beach, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, CA 92648

LOCATION: 18041 Goldenwest Street (Southwest of intersection of Goldenwest Street/Talbert Avenue in Central Park)

STATEMENT OF ISSUE:

- ◆ Environmental Impact Report No. 07-002 (EIR No. 07-002):
 - Analyzes the proposed construction and operation of an approximately 45,000 square foot one-story senior recreation facility on a 5-acre undeveloped site in Central Park.
 - Documents potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic and utilities and service systems.
 - Evaluates three alternatives to the proposed project.
 - Concludes that the No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed By Existing General Plan and Master Plan is the environmentally superior alternative.
 - Concludes that all potential project impacts can be mitigated to less than significant levels.
 - Concludes that there will be cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts to aesthetics.

- ◆ Staff's Recommendation:
 - Certify EIR No. 07-002 because it adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts associated with the project, identifies project alternatives and mitigation measures to lessen the project's impacts consistent with General Plan policies and has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

#B-1a

RECOMMENDATION:

Motion to: “Certify EIR No. 07-002 as adequate and complete in accordance with CEQA requirements by approving Resolution No. 1618 (Attachment No. 1).”

ALTERNATIVE ACTION(S):

The Planning Commission may take alternative actions such as:

- A. “Deny certification of EIR No. 07-002 with findings for denial.”
- B. “Continue certification of EIR No. 07-002 and direct staff accordingly.”

PROJECT PROPOSAL:

Environmental Impact Report No. 07-002 represents an analysis of potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of a 45,000 square foot senior recreation facility on a 5-acre site within Huntington Central Park. The 5-acre project site will comprise the senior center building, parking lot and open space area. The approximately 45,000 square foot building consists of a community hall/dining room, group exercise, fitness and dance rooms, multi-use classrooms, a kitchen, a social lounge and administrative offices. The outdoor open area includes a patio with a decorative trellis, an expansive lawn, a garden, a fountain, a barbecue area, benches and a natural meadow.

Ingress and egress to and from the site is proposed via a new access driveway with entry gate at the existing Goldenwest Street/ Talbert Avenue intersection. An existing traffic signal at this location will be modified for traffic to enter and exit the project site.

The EIR provides a discussion of impacts by issue area and provides mitigation measures, where appropriate. Specific issue areas discussed in the EIR include: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic and utilities and service systems. An analysis of alternatives to the proposed project and long-term implications resulting from project implementation are also provided.

The EIR consists of two volumes. Volume 1 is the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices that were circulated for a minimum 45-day public review period. Volume 2 is titled the Final EIR and includes the comments received during the public review period, responses to those comments and text changes to the Draft EIR (Volume 1) to clarify or correct information in response to comments or as identified as necessary by staff. These volumes are referenced as Attachment No. 2 to this staff report.

An analysis of the proposed development of the site is presented in a companion report that will be considered by the Planning Commission after action on the EIR. The companion report reviews the application for Conditional Use Permit No. 07-039.

Background and Site History:

The project site was developed with a farm house as early as the 1930s. Sometime in the 1960s, the house was demolished and the land was excavated so that dirt from the site could be used for construction of the 405 freeway. In 1974, the City acquired the land for Central Park and it has remained in its current undeveloped state. Although there are no developed structures or programmed uses of the site, area schools occasionally use the site as part of a larger cross country route through Central Park. In addition, one temporary disc golf hole is located on the project site. Community Services staff has indicated that they have already made provisions with the disc golf operator to relocate the hole.

ISSUES:

Subject Property And Surrounding Land Use, Zoning And General Plan Designations:

LOCATION	GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
Subject Site:	OS-P (Open Space – Parks)	OS-PR (Open Space – Parks & Recreation)	Undeveloped, vacant
North of Subject Site (across earthen berm)	OS-P	OS-PR	Undeveloped area; Shipley Nature center
East of Subject Site: (across Goldenwest St.)	OS-P	OS-PR	Sports Complex; Central Library
South of Subject Site:	OS-P	OS-PR	Disc golf course; equestrian center
West of Subject Site:	OS-P	OS-PR	Passive parkland

General Plan Conformance:

The current General Plan Land Use Map designation on the subject site is OS-P (Open Space – Parks). The EIR is consistent with the Open Space – Parks designation and the goals and objectives of the City’s General Plan as follows:

A. Air Quality Element

Policy AQ 1.8.1: Continue to enforce construction site guidelines that require truck operators to minimize particulate emission.

Policy AQ 1.8.2: Require installation of temporary construction facilities (such as wheel washers) and implementation of construction practices that minimize dirt and soil transfer onto public roadways.

Standard Code Requirements (CR) and Mitigation Measures MM-4.2-2 (a) through (e) address means by which air emission impacts will be minimized, primarily by complying with the SCAQMD Rule 403 regarding fugitive dust.

B. Circulation Element

Policy CE 2.3.1: Require development projects to mitigate off-site traffic impacts and pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular conflicts to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy CE 2.3.2: Limit driveway access points and require adequate driveway widths onto arterial roadways and require driveways be located to ensure the smooth and efficient flow of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians.

Policy CE 2.3.4: Require that new development mitigate its impact on City streets, including but not limited to, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular conflicts, to maintain adequate levels of service.

The EIR includes a detailed traffic analysis to document potential impacts associated with the project. Mitigation Measure 4.12-2 requires that the project mitigate impacts to levels of service at the intersection of Goldenwest Street and Slater Avenue by providing an additional northbound through lane on Goldenwest Street. Additionally, impacts to the existing capacity of the street system during construction of the project are considered less than significant.

Policy CE 6.1.7: Require new development to provide accessible facilities to the elderly and disabled.

MM 4.12-4 requires that design features be incorporated into the project that take into account the special needs of seniors such as slower pedestrian walk speeds and larger roadway signs.

C. Environmental Hazards Element

Policy EH 1.2.1: Require appropriate engineering and building practices for all new structures to withstand groundshaking and liquefaction such as stated in the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

Mitigation Measures 4.5-1 requires that detailed design measures identified in the Geotechnical Evaluation for the project be implemented, including those related to: earthwork, seismic design consideration, and foundations, etc.

Objective EH 3.2: Minimize methane hazards in the identified Methane Overlay District, and other areas outside the Methane Overlay Districts as may later be defined, through the regulation of construction and adherence to the City's Methane Hazard Mitigation Plan.

MM 4.6-1(c) is required to address the potential hazards of the accumulation of methane and hydrogen sulfide gas at the project site by ensuring appropriate testing and methods of gas reduction, as required by the Huntington Beach Fire Department.

D. Environmental Resources/Conservation Element

Policy ERC 2.1.10: Conduct construction activities to minimize adverse impacts on existing wildlife resources.

MM 4.3-1(a) and (b) will mitigate for the potential loss of wildlife habitat as a result of construction of the proposed project. In addition, MM 4.3-2 requires that five acres of parkland be conserved and/or enhanced for raptor foraging to mitigate the loss of five acres due to the proposed project.

E. Historic and Cultural Resources Element

Objective HCR 1.1: Ensure that all the City's historically and archaeologically significant resources are identified and protected.

The EIR documents all known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the project and recommends Mitigation Measures 4.4-1 (a) through (b) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures will ensure that, in the unlikely event that intact cultural materials are encountered during construction, these materials will be identified and scientifically removed and preserved, as appropriate.

F. Noise Element

Policy N 1.6.1: Ensure that construction activities be regulated to establish hours of operation, to prevent and/or mitigate the generation of excessive or adverse noise impacts through the implementation of the existing Noise Ordinance and/or any future revisions to the Noise Ordinance.

The EIR provides acoustical analysis to define noise levels on site. The analysis includes City code requirements and mitigation measures to ensure that noise levels in the exterior activity environments meet City standards, including limiting the hours of construction in accordance with the Huntington Beach Municipal Code.

G. Public Facilities and Services Element

Objective PF 1.3: Ensure that new developments in Huntington Beach are designed to encourage safety.

Policy PF 2.3.3: Ensure that new construction is designed with fire and emergency access and safety in mind.

The EIR documents that the proposed project does not impact safety or fire and emergency access.

Zoning Compliance: Not applicable.

Urban Design Guidelines Conformance: Not applicable.

Environmental Status:

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), EIR No. 07-002 was prepared by PBS&J, an environmental consulting firm, to analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with

implementation of the proposed project as well as identify appropriate mitigation measures. The Draft EIR was distributed to the Planning Commission for review at the start of the 45-day public comment period on September 17, 2007. The Final EIR, including the Response to Comments and all text changes as a result of the public comment period, was distributed to the Planning Commission and posted on the City's website on November 27, 2007.

The document must be adopted and certified by the Planning Commission prior to any action on Conditional Use Permit No. 07-039. The procedure that was followed during the preparation of EIR No. 07-002 is outlined below:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>
<u>March, 2007</u>	Staff conducted an initial study and determined that an EIR would be required.
<u>April 2, 2007</u>	A Notice of Preparation was filed with the State Clearinghouse to notify public of intent to prepare an EIR.
<u>April 5, 2007 to May 4, 2007</u>	Initial Study/Notice of Preparation available for 30 day public review and comment period.
<u>April 19, 2007</u>	A Public Scoping Meeting was held to solicit comments and issue areas to be studied in the EIR.
<u>September 13, 2007</u>	Notice of Completion filed with the State Clearinghouse.
<u>September 17, 2007 to October 31, 2007</u>	Draft EIR available for public review and comment for forty-five days.
<u>October 11, 2007</u>	A Public Comment Meeting was held to solicit comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR.
<u>November 13, 2007</u>	Planning Commission Study Session on proposed project.
<u>November 27, 2007</u>	Planning Commission Study Session on EIR.
<u>November 28, 2007</u>	Final EIR (including Response to Comments on Draft EIR, Text Changes to Draft EIR, Technical Appendix and Comments) made available for public information and sent to Responsible Agencies. (CEQA requires Response to Comments be sent to Responsible Agencies 10 days prior to certification hearing.)
<u>December 11, 2007</u>	Public hearing before Planning Commission to Certify EIR No. 07-002.

Through the use of appropriate mitigation measures identified in the EIR, all of the potentially adverse impacts associated with the project can be mitigated to a level of insignificance. There is, however, one significant cumulative environmental impact anticipated that cannot be completely eliminated through mitigation measures. The EIR concludes that due to the increase in development intensity of the project site, when compared with current uses, the project contributes incrementally to the visual degradation of the area in terms of reducing the amount of undeveloped open space in Central Park. This results in significant cumulative impacts to aesthetics.

Prior to certification and adoption of the EIR by resolution, the Planning Commission may amend the document. However, removal of any of the recommended mitigation measures requires findings and justification. The analysis section of this report contains further discussion regarding the EIR.

Environmental Board:

The City's Environmental Board reviewed the EIR and provided a comment letter during the public review period. The letter has been responded to in the Response to Comments. In summary, the Board commented on the following: project alternatives, the loss of open space, and green building design.

Coastal Status: Not applicable

Redevelopment Status: Not applicable.

Design Review Board: Not applicable.

Subdivision Committee: Not applicable.

Other Departments Concerns and Requirements:

The EIR was circulated to other Departments for review and comment. All Department comments and recommendations are incorporated into the EIR and its mitigation measures. No conditions of approval apply to the EIR. As development of the proposed project occurs, compliance with mitigation measures will be enforced through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Public Notification:

Legal notice was published in the Huntington Beach/Fountain Valley Independent on November 29, 2007, and notices were sent to property owners of record and occupants within a 1,000 ft. radius of the subject property, individuals/organizations requesting notification (Planning Department's Notification Matrix), and other interested parties. As of December 3, 2007, two letters commenting on the EIR have been received and are incorporated with this report (Attachment No. 4).

Application Processing Dates:

<u>DATE OF COMPLETE APPLICATION:</u>	<u>MANDATORY PROCESSING DATE(S):</u>
Draft EIR: April 5, 2007	Within 1 year of complete application (April 5, 2008)
Conditional Use Permit: November 5, 2007	Within 180 days from EIR Certification (October 2, 2008)

Funding for the proposed project will be provided by park in-lieu fees from the Pacific City development project through an Owner-Participation Agreement (OPA) between the City of Huntington Beach and the Pacific City developer. The OPA specifies a timeline for the construction of the senior center including the timing for approval of the project. Per the OPA, approval of entitlements and project plans must occur by April 1, 2008.

ANALYSIS:

The analysis section provides an overview of the EIR and its conclusions, a review of the project alternatives and a summary of the response to comments.

EIR Overview

The EIR provides a detailed analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed project. It is intended to serve as an informational document for decisions to be made by the City and responsible agencies regarding the project. The issues discussed in the EIR are those that have been identified in the course of extensive review of all potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the project. The EIR discusses potential adverse impacts in 13 issue areas. The direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the project are addressed, as are the impacts of project alternatives. A summary of key issues and mitigation measures as a result of the environmental impact report process is provided below. A complete listing of the recommended mitigation measures is provided in the Mitigation Monitoring Program provided as Attachment No. 3.

◆ Aesthetics

Implementation of the project will alter views of the area and introduce new sources of light and glare. The EIR analyzes the potential impacts associated with these changes, including an analysis of impacts to and from the existing parkland west of the project site.

The EIR concludes that impacts associated with light and glare could be potentially significant and recommends Mitigation Measure (MM) 4.1-3 (a – e), which reduces impacts associated with onsite lighting and restricts the use of reflective materials on façade treatments. The EIR documents that potential impacts related to scenic resources and views will be less than significant and do not warrant mitigation. However, the project contributes to the overall loss of open space and the cumulative impact is considered significant.

◆ Air Quality

Air quality modeling was completed by PBS&J to assess potential impacts related to construction and operation of the project. Consistent with the South Coast Air Quality Management District's (SCAQMD) recommendations, the EIR analyzed the following emissions: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), Sulfur Oxides (SO_x) and Fine Suspended Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) and (PM_{2.5}). In addition, the EIR examined if localized CO concentrations at nearby intersections would be increased beyond state and national standards as a result of increased vehicle traffic.

The EIR concludes that the project results in less than significant impacts for all emissions. The project will have to comply with standard requirements such as SCAQMD's Rule 403 related to fugitive dust during construction. The EIR discusses six standard City code requirements to improve air quality emissions and recommends five mitigation measures to further reduce air quality impacts during construction.

◆ Biological Resources

PBS&J conducted a general botanical survey and a focused blooming season survey in addition to a general wildlife survey at the project site for the EIR. A total of twelve plant species and fourteen wildlife species were recorded within the project site during the survey. Other sensitive plant and wildlife species have the potential to occur on the project site. Through incorporation of MM 4.3-1 (a) & (b) impacts to the burrowing owl, a sensitive wildlife species with moderate potential to occur on the site, and protected or sensitive avian species can be mitigated to less than significant levels. These mitigation measures require focused surveys and avoidance measures prior to any ground disturbance activities. To mitigate the loss of five acres of raptor foraging habitat as a result of project implementation, MM 4.3-2 requires that five acres of suitable area be conserved and/or enhanced for raptor foraging.

◆ Cultural Resources

The northern half of the project site lies within the recorded southern portion of prehistoric site CA-ORA-142. As such, a records search, Native American consultation, pedestrian survey of the site and subsequent test trenching was performed to assess the presence of cultural resources within the project site. The records search confirmed destruction of the site and test trench excavations were negative for evidence of CA-ORA-142. Nonetheless, it is possible that intact portions of CA-ORA-142 remain outside the project site but in the vicinity. The EIR recommends MM 4.4-1 (a – c) which would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to less than significant levels by requiring monitoring of construction activities by a qualified professional archaeologist and requiring the scientific recovery and evaluation of any resources that are encountered during construction.

◆ Geology and Soils

The EIR includes an analysis of existing geology, seismicity and soil conditions that would be conducive to geological constraints such as liquefaction or expansive soils. The analysis is based on the preliminary geotechnical study completed for the project, which determined that the project is feasible from a geotechnical perspective. The EIR concludes that implementation of the project will require MM 4.5-1 to minimize potential impacts to less than significant levels. MM 4.5-1 requires that detailed design

measures contained within the Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the project be implemented, including those related to: earthwork, seismic design consideration, foundations etc. MM 4.5-2 requires that the near surface soils of the northern slope, or earthen berm, adjacent to the project site, be compacted and covered with an appropriate erosion protection device to reduce the likelihood of impacts from landslides.

◆ Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The EIR analyzes the potential for impacts associated with hazardous materials on existing uses, construction workers and proposed uses. The proposed project, as a senior recreation facility, will not result in the increased likelihood of hazardous materials incidents. Implementation of the proposed project does not pose any constraints to the city's existing Emergency Management Plan. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce all potentially significant effects associated with the potential exposure of unknown hazardous materials through construction activities to less than significant levels by ensuring remediation of contaminated soils containing hazardous materials prior to development and by providing supplemental procedures in the event of unanticipated discoveries of contaminants.

◆ Hydrology and Water Quality

The EIR concludes that impacts to hydrology and water quality are potentially significant but can be mitigated to less than significant levels through MM 4.7-1 which requires a Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) for the project and shall include specific stormwater BMPs for reducing potential pollutants in stormwater runoff. In addition, MM 4.7-2 reduces impacts to erosion and flooding by requiring a Hydrology and Hydraulic Report and Drainage Plan that incorporates stormwater conveyance facilities to provide adequate site drainage and minimize erosive forces.

◆ Land Use

Implementation of the proposed project will not require any General Plan or zoning map amendments. A Conditional Use Permit is required to allow development of a senior recreation facility on the site. The development and its conformance to the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance are analyzed in the companion report for this project. Although the project is consistent with the General Planning land use and zoning designations, the Central Park Master Plan EIR previously identified the site as a Low Intensity Recreation Area. Implementation of the proposed project will require an amendment to the Central Park Master Plan to change the project site from a Low Intensity Recreation Area to a High Intensity Recreation Area to accommodate the proposed development. The EIR concludes that the proposed project is consistent with adjacent developments directly across Goldenwest Street, specifically the Sports Complex and Central Library. Overall, impacts to land use are considered less than significant and no mitigation is proposed.

◆ Noise

Potential noise impacts relate to short-term construction activities and long-term changes in ambient conditions related to an increase in traffic. Ambient noise levels were measured at five locations around the project site and roadway noise levels were calculated using data from the traffic study. In terms of the short-term noise impacts from construction, the City's noise ordinance exempts noise associated with construction provided the construction takes place between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 8:00 P.M. Monday

through Saturday. Despite this exemption, to further reduce less-than-significant impacts the EIR recommends MM 4.9-1(a) to limit the hours and days during which grading and construction can occur to between the hours of 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. Monday through Friday and 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. Saturdays. The EIR also indicates that noise associated with operation of the senior center, including amplified noise from special events, will be required to comply with the City of Huntington Beach noise Ordinance and impacts are considered less than significant.

◆ Public Services

Potential impacts to fire, police, schools and libraries are analyzed in the EIR. The proposed project will not result in the need for any new public services or facilities and therefore, all impacts to public services are considered less than significant.

◆ Recreation

The EIR indicates that construction and operation of the proposed senior center would increase the overall level of recreational opportunities in the City. Because development of the project site represents the loss of only 2% of all passive parkland in Central Park, impacts to existing passive recreational opportunities are less than significant. One mitigation measure has been incorporated to require that construction signs be posted in Central Park near the project site at least thirty days prior to construction commencement to give notice to informal users of the site. The mitigation measure also requires that the temporary disc golf hole that is currently on the site be permanently relocated prior to any construction activities.

◆ Transportation/Traffic

The EIR examines the potential impacts related to traffic generation, parking demand and access. The analysis takes into consideration the access improvements that will be constructed with the project and the special issues, such as pedestrian needs, that arise with senior drivers. A project specific traffic study was completed that includes an analysis of traffic conditions in Year 2012 and Year 2030 to assess potential impacts at project buildout and the long-term effect of the project in conjunction with other growth within the City.

The EIR indicates that the proposed project has the potential to contribute to deficient traffic operation at the intersection of Goldenwest Street and Slater Avenue. To mitigate this potentially significant impact, MM 4.12-2 requires that an additional northbound through lane be provided at the intersection of Goldenwest Street and Slater Avenue. Implementation of this mitigation measure will not require any physical roadway widening but will require the removal of 12 on-street parking spaces on Goldenwest Street from Ford Drive to Betty Drive. The removal of the on-street parking is considered less than significant because each of the affected residences has access to alternate parking on adjacent streets.

Roadway hazards are mitigated through mitigation measures and code requirements that also consider the needs of the seniors using the facility. The EIR shows that the project will not result in any other significant transportation/traffic related impacts.

◆ Utilities and Service Systems

This section of the EIR analyzes potential impacts to water, wastewater, solid waste services and electricity and natural gas utilities. The EIR concludes that implementation of the project could increase the demand for electricity resulting in potentially significant impacts. MM 4.13-8 requires that additional electrical load analyses be undertaken to determine the need for additional electrical transformers. The EIR also concludes that implementation of new stormwater treatment control BMPs could result in potentially significant impacts. CR 4.13-5(a) and CR 4.13-5(b) require that the project prepare and implement a SWPPP (Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan) and that all BMPs described in the Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) are properly installed and implemented. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and city code requirements, both of these potentially significant impacts, can be reduced to a less than significant levels.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or its location that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project; rather, it must consider a range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation. An EIR should also evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.

Three alternatives were selected for detailed analysis in the Draft EIR:

- No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed By Existing General Plan and Master Plan – Analyzes development on the site as a “low intensity recreation area” with the access driveway, parking lot, restrooms, tot lot and open space.
- Reduced Project/Alternative Configuration – Analyzes a reduction in the size of the development with a 30,000 square foot building re-oriented to the southeast corner of the site.
- Alternative Site – Analyzes the alternative site location of the northwest corner of Ellis Avenue and Goldenwest Street.

The No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed By Existing General Plan and Master Plan Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative would primarily result in impacts similar to the proposed project, but would also result in some impacts that would be less than the proposed project. The Alternative Site Alternative would result in potentially greater impacts to noise and recreation, and it is possible that these impacts could be significant and unavoidable.

Although two of the alternatives would result in some impacts that would be less than the proposed project, they would not necessarily reduce the level of significance of the impacts. In addition, these alternatives would not achieve the project objectives to the extent that the proposed project would. Nonetheless, because of its reduced intensity, the No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed By Existing General Plan and Master Plan Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative.

Statement of Overriding Considerations

Environmental impacts associated with implementation of a project may not always be mitigated to a level considered less than significant. In such cases, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be

prepared prior to approval of the project, and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093. Although the project would not result in significant project-specific impacts, implementation of the proposed project could result in significant cumulative impacts to aesthetics. Therefore, a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) is required to describe the specific reasons for approving the project, based on information contained within the Final EIR, as well as any other information in the public record. The SOC is part of the companion report for this project, which analyzes the conditional use permit request.

Public Comments on the Draft EIR

During the public review period, the City of Huntington Beach received a total of 12 comment letters from two state agencies, one City board and nine individuals, as well as some verbal and written comments at the public meeting held during the comment period. Staff has responded to all comments received in the Response to Comments. The Final EIR includes revised text sections as a result of the comments or as a result of staff requests to clarify information. Any written communication received subsequent to the preparation of this staff report will be forwarded to the Planning Commission under separate cover.

SUMMARY:

Environmental Impact Report No. 07-002 serves as an informational document with the sole purpose of identifying potential environmental impacts associated with the Huntington Beach Senior Center project, alternatives that minimize those impacts, and appropriate mitigation measures.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission certify EIR No. 07-002 because:

- The EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act;
- The EIR adequately addresses the environmental impacts associated with the proposed project; and
- The EIR identifies project alternatives and mitigation measures to lessen the project's impacts consistent with General Plan policies.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Resolution No. 1618
2. Final EIR No. 07-002, includes EIR, EIR Appendices, Response To Comments and Text Changes (*previously provided under separate cover – not attached*)
3. Mitigation Monitoring Program
4. Letters received regarding the proposed EIR

SH:MBB:JV

RESOLUTION NO. 1618

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (SCH#2007041027) FOR THE HUNTINGTON BEACH SENIOR CENTER PROJECT

WHEREAS, Environmental Impact Report No. 07-002, State Clearinghouse #2007041027, (“EIR”) was prepared by the City of Huntington Beach (“City”) to address the environmental implications of the proposed Huntington Beach Senior Center Project (the “Project”).

- On April 2, 2007, a Notice of Preparation/Initial Study for the Project was prepared and distributed to the State Clearinghouse, other responsible agencies, trustee agencies and interested parties.
- After obtaining comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation, and comments received at the public scoping meeting held on April 19, 2007, the City completed preparation of the Draft EIR and filed a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse on September 13, 2007.
- The Draft EIR was circulated for public review and comment from September 17, 2007 to October 31, 2007 and was available for review at several locations including City Hall, the Huntington Beach Public Library, and the City’s website; and

WHEREAS, public comments have been received on the Draft EIR, and responses to those comments have been prepared and provided to the Planning Commission as a section within a separately bound document entitled “Final Environmental Impact Report Huntington Beach Senior Center” (the “Responses to Comments”), dated November 2007; and

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code 21092.5(a) requires that the City of Huntington Beach provide a written proposed response to any public agency that commented on the Environmental Impact Report, and the Response to Comments included in the Final Environmental Impact Report satisfies this provision; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public meeting on the EIR on December 11, 2007, and received and considered public testimony.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Planning Commission of the City of Huntington Beach, California, **DOES HEREBY RESOLVE**, as follows:

SECTION 1. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the Final EIR for the Project is comprised of the Draft EIR and Appendices, the comments received on the Draft EIR, the Responses to Comments (including a list of persons, organizations, and

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.1

public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR), the Text Changes to the Draft EIR (bound together with the Responses to Comments) and all Planning Department Staff Reports to the Planning Commission, including all minutes, transcripts, attachments and references. All of the above information has been and will be on file with the City of Huntington Beach Department of Planning, 2000 Main Street, Huntington Beach, California 92648.

SECTION 2. The Planning Commission finds and certifies that the Final EIR is complete and adequate in that it has identified all significant environmental effects of the Project and that there are no known potential environmental impacts not addressed in the Final EIR.

SECTION 3. The Planning Commission finds that although the Final EIR identifies certain significant environmental effects that will result if the Project is approved, all significant effects which can feasibly be mitigated or avoided have been mitigated or avoided by the incorporation of Project design features, standard conditions and requirements, and by the imposition of mitigation measures on the approved Project.

SECTION 4. The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR has described reasonable alternatives to the Project that could feasibly obtain the basic objectives of the Project (including the “No Project” Alternative), even when these alternatives might impede the attainment of Project objectives and might be more costly. Further, the Planning Commission finds that a good faith effort was made to incorporate alternatives in the preparation of the Draft EIR and that a reasonable range of alternatives was considered in the review process of the Final EIR and ultimate decisions on the Project.

SECTION 5. The Planning Commission finds that no “substantial evidence” (as that term is defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15384) has been presented which would call into question the facts and conclusions in the EIR.

SECTION 6. The Planning Commission finds that no “significant new information” (as that term is defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5) has been added to the EIR after circulation of the Draft EIR. The Planning Commission finds that the minor refinements that have been made in the Project as a result of clarifications in the mitigation measures and additional air quality modeling do not amount to significant new information concerning the Project, nor has any significant new information concerning the Project become known to the Planning Commission through the public hearings held on the Project, or through the comments on the Draft EIR and Responses to Comments.

SECTION 7. The Planning Commission finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Program establishes a mechanism and procedures for implementing and verifying the mitigations pursuant to Public Resources Code 21081.6 and hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program. The mitigation measures shall be incorporated into the Project prior to or concurrent with Project implementation as defined in each mitigation measure.

SECTION 8. The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent review and judgment of the City of Huntington Beach Planning Commission, that the Final EIR was presented to the Planning Commission, and that the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR prior to approving Conditional Use Permit No. 07-039.

SECTION 9. The Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR serves as adequate and appropriate environmental documentation for the Project. The Planning Commission certifies that the Final EIR prepared for the Project is complete, and that it has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act and CEQA Guidelines.

PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED, this 11th day of December 2007 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

ATTEST:

Scott Hess, Secretary

Chairperson, Planning Commission

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

**EIR, FINAL EIR including RESPONSE TO COMMENTS &
TEXT CHANGES CAN BE REVIEWED AT:**

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
2000 MAIN STREET, HUNTINGTON BEACH
CITY HALL – 3RD FLOOR**

&

ON THE CITY'S WEBSITE:

**[http://www.surfcity-
hb.org/Government/Departments/Planning/major/senior_center.cfm](http://www.surfcity-hb.org/Government/Departments/Planning/major/senior_center.cfm)**

ATTACHMENT NO. 2.1

HUNTINGTON BEACH SENIOR CENTER

Final Environmental Impact Report
SCH No. 2007041027

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Prepared for
City of Huntington Beach
Planning Department
2000 Main Street, Third Floor
Huntington Beach, California 92648

Prepared by
PBS&J
12301 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 430
Los Angeles, California 90025

November 30, 2007

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.1

Mitigation Monitoring Program

A. INTRODUCTION

The Final Environmental Impact Report for the Huntington Beach Senior Center project (State Clearinghouse #2007041027) identified mitigation measures to reduce the adverse effects of the project in the areas of: aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities & service systems.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that agencies adopting environmental impact reports ascertain that feasible mitigation measures are implemented, subsequent to project approval. Specifically, the lead or responsible agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures incorporated into a project or imposed as conditions of approval. The program must be designed to ensure compliance during applicable project timing, e.g. design, construction, or operation (Public Resource Code §21081.6).

The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) shall be used by the City of Huntington Beach staff responsible for ensuring compliance with mitigation measures associated with the Huntington Beach Senior Center project. Monitoring shall consist of review of appropriate documentation, such as plans or reports prepared by the party responsible for implementation or by field observation of the mitigation measure during implementation.

The following table identifies the mitigation measures by resource area. The table also provides the specific mitigation monitoring requirements, including implementation documentation, monitoring activity, timing and responsible monitoring party. Verification of compliance with each measure is to be indicated by signature of the mitigation monitor, together with date of verification.

The Project Applicant and the Applicant's Contractor shall be responsible for implementation of all mitigation measures, unless otherwise noted in the table.

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
Aesthetics						
MM 4.1-3(a) All exterior nighttime lighting shall be angled down and away from the adjacent open space areas. Prismatic glass coverings and cutoff shields shall be used to further prevent spillover off site.	Project building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	_____
MM 4.1-3(b) The minimum number of foot-candles deemed necessary by the City to promote effective security while controlling glare and minimizing light spillover onto adjacent areas shall be utilized in all lighting fixtures.	Project building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	_____
MM 4.1-3(c) Motion-sensitive security lighting shall be used on site.	Project building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	_____
MM 4.1-3(d) To the extent feasible, the Developer shall use non-reflective façade treatments, such as matte paint or glass coatings.	Project building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion of features	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	_____
MM 4.1-3(e) Trees and barrier-type vegetation should be placed throughout the site, including along the entire perimeter, to help shield vehicle headlights from adjacent uses.	Project landscaping and building plans	Review and approve landscaping and building plans for inclusion of features	Plan check prior to issuance of building permit	Planning	_____	_____
Air Quality						
MM-4.2-2(a) (This MM incorporates Measure Air-9 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) The project developer(s) shall require by contract specifications that construction equipment engines will be maintained in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specification for the duration of construction.	Contract language and notes on grading and building plans	Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit	Planning	_____	_____

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.3

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM-4.2-2(b) (This MM incorporates Measure Air-12 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) The project developer(s) shall require by contract specifications that construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than five minutes. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>MM-4.2-2(c) (This MM incorporates Measures Air-10 and Air-11 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) The project developer(s) shall encourage contractors to utilize alternative fuel construction equipment (i.e., compressed natural gas, liquid petroleum gas, electric, and unleaded gasoline) and low-emission diesel construction equipment to the extent that the equipment is readily available and cost effective. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>MM-4.2-2(d) The project developer(s) shall require by contract specifications that construction operations rely on the electricity infrastructure surrounding the construction sites rather than electrical generators powered by internal combustion engines to the extent feasible. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.</p>	<p>Contract language and notes on grading and building plans</p>	<p>Review and approve contract specifications, grading and building plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>MM4.2-2(e) The project developer(s) shall require by contract specifications that the architectural coating (paint and primer) products used would have a VOC rating of 125 grams per liter or less. Contract specifications shall be included in the proposed project construction documents, which shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a building permit.</p>	<p>Project building plans</p>	<p>Review and building plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a building permit</p>	<p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.4

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>Biological Resources</p> <p>MM 4.3-1(a) Nesting habitat for protected or sensitive avian species:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Vegetation removal and construction shall occur between September 1 and January 31 whenever feasible. 2) Prior to any construction or vegetation removal between February 15 and August 31, a nesting survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist of all habitats within 500 feet of the construction area. Surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities and surveys will be conducted in accordance with CDFG protocol as applicable. If no active nests are identified on or within 500 feet of the construction site, no further mitigation is necessary. This survey can be carried out concurrently with surveys for other species provided it does not conflict with any established survey protocols. A copy of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the City of Huntington Beach. If an active nest of a sensitive species is identified onsite (per established thresholds) a 250-foot no-work buffer shall be maintained between the nest and construction activity until CDFG and/or USFWS approves of any other mitigation measures. 3) Completion of the nesting cycle shall be determined by qualified ornithologist or biologist. 	<p>Developer shall submit construction schedule (including grading activities) as evidence of construction overlap with breeding season. If construction occurs during relevant breeding, developer shall present a survey report (prepared by a consultant approved by the City) to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. If nests are found, developer shall submit plans identifying nest locations and limits of construction activities.</p>	<p>Review schedule and field survey report, and as necessary, review and approve plans indicating construction limits</p> <p>Perform periodic field check to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>During construction</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.3-1(b) Burrowing Owl:</p> <p>1) Prior to construction activity, focused pre-construction surveys shall be conducted for burrowing owls where suitable habitat is present within the construction areas. Surveys shall be conducted no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to commencement of construction activities and surveys shall be conducted in accordance with CDFG burrowing owl survey protocol.</p> <p>2) If unoccupied burrows are found during the non-breeding season, the City may collapse the unoccupied burrows, or otherwise obstruct their entrances to prevent owls from entering and nesting in the burrows. This measure would prevent inadvertent impacts during construction activities.</p> <p>3) If no occupied burrows are found in the survey area, a letter report documenting survey methods and findings shall be submitted to the City and CDFG for review and approval, and no further mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>If occupied burrows are found, impacts on the burrows shall be avoided by providing a buffer of 165 feet during the non-breeding season (September 1 through January 31) or 250 feet during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31). The size of the buffer area may be adjusted if a qualified biologist and CDFG determine it would not be likely to have adverse effects on the owls. No project activity shall commence within the buffer area until a qualified biologist confirms that the burrow is no longer occupied. If the burrow is occupied by a nesting pair, a minimum of 7.5 acres of foraging habitat contiguous to the burrow shall be maintained until the breeding season is over.</p> <p>4) If impacts on occupied burrows are unavoidable, onsite passive relocation techniques approved by CDFG shall be used to encourage owls to move to alternative burrows outside of the impact area. However, no occupied burrows shall be disturbed during the nesting season unless a qualified biologist verifies through non-invasive methods that</p>	<p>Developer shall submit construction schedule (including grading activities) as evidence of construction overlap with breeding season. If construction occurs during relevant breeding, developer shall present a survey report (prepared by a consultant approved by the City) to the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. If nests are found, developer shall submit plans identifying nest locations and limits of construction activities.</p>	<p>Review schedule and field survey report, and as necessary, review and approve plans indicating construction limits</p> <p>Perform periodic field check to ensure compliance</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>During construction</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>juveniles from the occupied burrows are foraging independently and are capable of independent survival. Mitigation for foraging habitat for relocated pairs shall follow guidelines provided in the California Burrowing Owl Consortium's April 1995 Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines, which ranges from 7.5 to 19.5 acres per pair.</p> <p>MM 4.3-2 (This MM is Measure Biological Resources-4 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The City shall mitigate for impacts to raptor foraging habitat through dedication as open space, conservation and/or enhancing areas of raptor foraging habitat at a ratio of 1:1 for acres of impact on raptor foraging habitat to provide suitable habitat values and functions for raptors. Mitigation for impacts on raptor foraging habitat will be accomplished within suitable areas that are City-owned and preferably nearby, such as the areas in association with the Sully Miller Lake Group Facility, Low Intensity Recreation Area, Semi-Active Recreation Area, and/or Midden Area/Urban Forest/Trailhead. Enhancement would include, but not be limited to, the planting of native trees within and adjacent to conserved areas of raptor foraging habitat. Prior to ground disturbance, the City shall identify the particular site or area to be enhanced and shall formulate a plan to accomplish the raptor foraging habitat enhancement activities. This plan shall be reviewed for approval by a qualified biologist.</p>	<p>The City shall determine the location of 5 acres of suitable raptor foraging habitat to be conserved and/or enhanced.</p> <p>The City shall formulate a plan to accomplish the raptor foraging habitat enhancement activities, including the planting of native trees within and adjacent to the dedicated area.</p> <p>Proof of retention of biologist.</p>	<p>Prepare plans indicating enhancement area, and verify retention of a qualified biologist</p> <p>Review and approval of raptor foraging habitat enhancement plan by qualified biologist</p> <p>Implementation and completion of enhancement activities</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a grading permit</p> <p>Review plan throughout construction activities</p> <p>Prior to Certificate of Occupancy</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p> <p>Qualified Biologist</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>Cultural Resources</p> <p>MM 4.4-1(a) (This MM incorporates Measures Archaeology-3, Archaeology-4, Historical-1, and Paleontology-1 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The City shall arrange for a qualified professional archaeological and paleontological monitor to be present during all project-related ground-disturbing activities, including the potential disturbance of soils on adjacent slopes. In addition, all construction personnel shall be informed of the need to stop work on the project site in the event of a potential find, until a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist has been provided the opportunity to assess the significance of the find and implement appropriate measures to protect or scientifically remove the find. Construction personnel will also be informed that unauthorized collection of cultural resources is prohibited.</p>	<p>Proof of retention of archaeological and paleontological monitor</p>	<p>Verify retention of qualified monitors</p> <p>Periodic field check to ensure monitors are present</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit</p> <p>Throughout ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.4-1(b) (This MM incorporates Measures Archaeology-6,7 and 8, Historical-2 and 3, Paleontology-2,3 and 4, from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>If archaeological or paleontological resources are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction activities within 50 feet of the find shall cease until the archaeologist/paleontologist evaluates the significance of the resource. In the absence of a determination, all archaeological and paleontological resources shall be considered significant. If the resource is determined to be significant, the archaeologist or paleontologist, as appropriate, shall prepare a research design for recovery of the resources in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation that satisfies the requirements of Section 21083.2 of CEQA. The archaeologist or paleontologist shall complete a report of the excavations and findings, and shall submit the report for peer review by three County-certified archaeologists or paleontologists, as appropriate. Upon approval of the report, the City shall submit the report to the South Central Coastal Information Center at California State University, Fullerton, and keep the report on file at the City of Huntington Beach.</p>	<p>Notes on grading plans</p> <p>Research design and recovery plan, if required</p>	<p>Review and approve grading plans for inclusion</p> <p>Review and approve research design and recovery plan</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit</p> <p>Throughout ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Peer review by three County-certified professionals</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>
<p>MM 4.4-1(c) (This MM incorporates Measure Archaeology-5 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The City shall arrange for a qualified Native American monitor or a rotation of monitors from the interested bands to be present during all project-related ground-disturbing construction activities, including the recompaction of soils on the adjacent hillside. Should project personnel discover any previously unknown cultural resources in the absence of an archaeological monitor, a qualified archaeologist should be notified immediately to evaluate the significance of the find and make recommendations for treatment.</p>	<p>Proof of retention of Native American monitor</p>	<p>Verify retention of qualified monitor</p> <p>Periodic field check to ensure monitor is present</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit</p> <p>Throughout ground-disturbing activities</p>	<p>Planning</p> <p>Planning</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.4-3 In the event of the discovery of a burial, human bone, or suspected human bone, all excavation or grading in the vicinity of the find shall halt immediately, the area of the find shall be protected, and the Developer shall immediately notify the City and the Orange County Coroner of the find and comply with the provisions of P.R.C. Section 5097. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the Coroner will notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendent (MLD). The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 24 hours of notification, and may recommend scientific removal and non-destructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.</p>	Notes on grading plans	Review and approve grading plans for inclusion	Plan check prior to issuance of grading permit Throughout ground-disturbing activities	Orange County Coroner & Planning	_____	_____
Geology and Soils						
<p>MM 4.5-1 Detailed design measures contained within the Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the project shall be implemented, including those related to: earthwork, seismic design consideration, foundations, building floor slabs, retaining wall, exterior flatwork, shoring, corrosion; concrete, site drainage, storm drain infiltration system, and preliminary pavement design.</p>	Notes on rough/mass grading plan and building plans	Review and approve grading and building plans for inclusion of soils and geotechnical recommendations	Plan check prior to issuance of a rough/mass grading permit	Public Works Building and Safety	_____	_____
<p>MM 4.5-2 In order to mitigate the erosion potential of the slopes adjacent to the site, the near surface soils shall be compacted along the northern slope face (earthen berm) where the site improvements encroach upon the existing slopes. The slope shall then be covered with an appropriate erosion protection device and drought tolerant plants. Surface water runoff must be diverted away from the top of the slope to reduce the likelihood of surficial sliding and erosion.</p>	Notes on rough/mass grading plan and building plans	Review and approve grading and landscaping plans for inclusion of soils and geotechnical recommendations and plant material	Plan check prior to issuance of a rough/mass grading permit and prior to approval of landscape plan	Public Works	_____	_____
<p>MM 4.5-4(a) Oversize materials, more than approximately four inches in size, such as concrete rubble shall be disposed of off site. Trash and other debris shall be selectively removed and disposed off site.</p>	Notes on grading and building plans	Review and approve notes on grading building plans	Prior to issuance of grading and building permit	Public Works Planning	_____	_____

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.5-4(b) (This MM incorporates Measure Geology-2 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) Remedial grading to remove compressible soils and replace them with appropriately compacted fill shall occur in order to address potential settlements. Fill soils to be used for backfill around utilities shall be compacted to 90 percent relative compaction.</p>	Soils report documenting fill properties	Review and approve soil sampling report Notes on grading plans	Prior to fill import Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Fire Public Works	_____ _____ _____	_____ _____ _____
<p>MM 4.5-4(c) (This MM incorporates Measure Geology-6 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) Corrosivity testing of the on-site soils should be performed during the design phase. Corrosivity testing may also need to be considered for soils that are imported for use as fill during construction.</p>	Soils report with corrosion engineer recommendations	Review and approve notes on building plans	Prior to issuance of building permit	Building and Safety	_____ _____	_____ _____
<p>MM 4.5-5 (This MM incorporates Measure Geology-5 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) The soil expansion potential shall be evaluated in detail prior to issuance of grading permits. If expansive soils are present near design grades, potential for heaving or cracking of rigid structures shall be addressed through soil removal, chemical treatment, or other equivalent measures.</p>	Notes on rough/mass grading plan and building plans	Review and approve grading and building plans for inclusion of soils and geotechnical recommendations	Plan check prior to issuance of a rough/mass grading permit and building permit	Building and Safety	_____ _____	_____ _____

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.11

Mitigation Monitoring Program						
Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>Hazardous Materials</p> <p>MM 4.6-1(a) (This MM incorporates Measure Hazards-15 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>In the event that previously unknown soil contamination that could present a threat to human health or the environment is encountered during construction, construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the contamination shall cease immediately. A risk management plan shall be prepared and implemented that (1) identifies the contaminants of concern and the potential risk each contaminant would pose to human health and the environment during construction and post-development and (2) describes measures to be taken to protect workers and the public from exposure to potential site hazards. Such measures could include a range of options, including, but not limited to, physical site controls during construction, remediation, long-term monitoring, post-development maintenance or access limitations, or some combination thereof. Depending on the nature of contamination, if any, appropriate agencies shall be notified (e.g., City of Huntington Beach Fire Department). A site health and safety plan that meets OSHA requirements shall be prepared and in place prior to the commencement of work in any contaminated area. The developer shall ensure proper implementation of the health and safety plan. If required, contamination shall be remediated in accordance with mitigation measure MM 4.6-1(b).</p>	<p>Risk Management Plan & Site Health and Safety Plan</p>	<p>Review and approve any grading plans for inclusion</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of any grading permit</p>	<p>Fire</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.6-1(b) Closure reports or other reports acceptable to the HBFD that document the successful completion of required remediation activities, if any, for contaminated soils, in accordance with City Specification 431-92, shall be submitted and approved by the HBFD prior to issuance of grading permits for site development. No construction shall occur in the affected area until reports have been accepted by the City.</p>	<p>Closure reports or other reports acceptable to the HBFD that document the successful completion of required remediation activities</p>	<p>Review and approve closure reports other than the HBFD that document the successful completion of required remediation activities</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of any grading permit</p>	<p>Fire</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>MM 4.6-1(c) (This MM is Measure Hazards-9 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR) Any unrecorded or unknown wells uncovered during the excavation or grading process shall be immediately reported to and coordinated with the City and Division of Oil, Gas and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). In addition, should any known and unexpected landfills be excavated and discovered during the construction phase of the proposed project, construction work will be immediately halted and the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) will be notified. Further construction operations will resume at the discretion of LEA and upon work approval by LEA.</p>	<p>Documentation of consultation with DOGGR</p>	<p>Review and approve documentation</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a rough grading permit</p>	<p>Fire</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>
<p>MM 4.6-1(d) Prior to the issuance of grading permits and during construction, the project shall comply with all provisions of the HBMC Section 17.04.085 and HBFD City Specification 429, Methane District Building Permit Requirements. A plan for the testing of soils for the presence of methane gas shall be prepared. If necessary, measures to reduce levels of gases to within levels determined acceptable by the HBFD (such as vent systems) shall be implemented, if required by the HBFD.</p>	<p>Notes on grading and building plans Methane and Hydrogen Sulfide Testing Plan</p>	<p>Plan check prior to issuance of a rough grading permit Review and approval of testing plan</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of any grading permit and during construction</p>	<p>Fire</p>	<p>_____</p>	<p>_____</p>

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.13

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>Hydrology and Water Quality</p> <p>MM 4.7-1 (This MM incorporates Measures Water-2 and 3 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The project proponent shall prepare and implement a site-specific Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP).</p> <p>This (WQMP) shall identify specific stormwater BMPs for reducing potential pollutants in stormwater runoff. BMPs shall be designed in accordance with DAMP requirements and the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report prepared for the proposed project. The WQMP must be approved by the Public Works Department prior to the beginning of construction activities.</p> <p>The WQMP shall include the following BMPs along with selected BMPs to target pollutant removal rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Waste and materials storage and management BMPs (design and construction of outdoor materials storage areas and trash and waste storage areas, if any, to reduce pollutant introduction) ■ Spill prevention and control BMPs ■ Slope protection and stabilization BMPs ■ Water efficient irrigation practices (Municipal Code 14.52 Water Efficient Landscape; water efficient guidelines and Conceptual Landscape Plan). ■ Permanent erosion and sediment controls (e.g., hydroseeding, mulching, surface covers) <p>The Project Proponent is encouraged to consider the following BMPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Minimize directly connected impervious area, including: pervious concrete (if applicable) or other pervious pavement for parking areas (e.g., turf block), pervious pavement for paths and sidewalks, and direction of rooftop runoff to pervious areas. ■ Incorporation of rain gardens or cisterns to reuse runoff for 	Water Quality Management Plan	Review and approve WQMP and documentation	Plan check prior to issuance of precise grading permit	Public Works		

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.14

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
landscape irrigation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Alternative building materials ■ Site design and landscape planning ■ Wet vaults for subsequent landscape irrigation ■ Sand filters for parking lots and rooftop runoff ■ Frequent street and parking lot sweeping ■ Media filter devices for roof top drain spouts (including proprietary devices) ■ Biofiltration devices (swales, filter strips, and others) ■ Proprietary control measures (if supporting documentation is provided) ■ Drain inlet filters ■ Pet waste station ■ The upstream drainage area must be completely stabilized 						

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.15

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.7-2 (This MM incorporates Measure Utilities-8 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The project proponent shall prepare a Project Hydrology and Hydraulic Report and Drainage Plan that incorporates stormwater conveyance facilities to provide adequate site drainage and minimize erosive forces.</p> <p>This Hydrology and Hydraulic Report shall include analysis of stormwater runoff peak flow and total volume from the 2-year and 100-year storm events for both existing and developed conditions. Stormwater conveyance and detention features shall be designed and incorporated into the proposed project to reduce runoff forces to non-erosive rates for the 100-year storm events. To the maximum extent practicable, the Drainage Plan shall also reduce post-construction peak runoff rates and timing to existing conditions levels. Off-site road improvements shall be included in the Hydrology and Hydraulic Report and Drainage Plan.</p> <p>The Hydrology and Hydraulic Report shall include a Drainage Plan identifying any additional stormwater quantity BMPs, their locations, and design characteristics, along with the flow dissipation piping, bioswales, and vegetated buffer areas already identified on the Conceptual Grading and Utility Plan (Figure 3-7 in Section 3.0 [Project Description]). Supporting documentation shall be included to show that incorporation of these features will result in post-construction runoff erosive forces that do not exceed existing conditions erosive forces.</p> <p>The Public Works Department shall approve this Hydrology and Hydraulic Report and Site Drainage Plan prior to the issuance of a precise grading permit. It is recommended that the Site Drainage Plan be coordinated with the WCMP to maximize efficiency of stormwater runoff detention/retention and water quality treatment.</p>	Hydrology and Hydraulic Report and Drainage Plan	Review and approve plan and documentation	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Public Works		

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.16

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
<p>MM 4.7-5 The project proponent shall prepare and implement a Nutrient and Pesticide Management Program.</p> <p>A Nutrient and Pesticide Management Program (NPMP) shall be prepared and implemented to minimize the risk of pollutants associated with landscape establishment and maintenance practices in runoff waters. This NPMP shall include guidelines, application regulations, and applicator training, and shall encourage minimization of chemical use.</p>	Nutrient and Pesticide Management Program	Review and approve NPMP	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Public Works	_____	_____
Noise						
<p>MM 4.9-1(a) (This MM is Measure Noise-3 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The City of Huntington Beach shall limit grading and construction activities to daily operation hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. (Monday through Friday) and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays. Construction shall not take place on Sundays or Federal holidays.</p>	Notes on building plans	Review and approve building plans for inclusion	Prior to issuance of a building permit	Planning	_____	_____
<p>MM 4.9-1(b) (This MM is Measure Noise-5 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that noise levels from construction equipment can be lowered as much as 13 dBA by implementing noise control features that require no major redesign or extreme cost. The City of Huntington Beach shall require that all construction equipment incorporate noise reduction control features. All vehicles and compressors should utilize exhaust mufflers, and engine enclosures as designed by the manufacturer should be in place at all times.</p>	Notes on grading plans and building plans	Review and approve grading plans and building plans for inclusion	Prior to issuance of a grading permit and a building permit	Planning	_____	_____

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.17

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
Recreation						
<p>MM 4.11-1 (This MM is Measure Recreation-1 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>At least thirty days prior to construction, the City of Huntington Beach shall post signs in the vicinity of the project site indicating the proposed construction schedule of the senior center facility (including location and hours of operation) and shall complete the permanent relocation of the disc golf course hole located at the southern boundary of the site back to the official disc golf course.</p>	Final building plans and project grading plans	Ensure construction schedule signs are posted and disc golf course hole is relocated	At least 30 days prior to construction	Planning	_____	_____
Transportation/Traffic						
<p>MM 4.12-2 The project shall provide an additional northbound through lane at the intersection of Goldenwest Street and Slater Avenue. This can be provided by restriping the existing northbound right turn lane, without any physical roadway widening. In addition, approximately 300 feet of existing on-street parking from Ford Drive to Betty Drive will need to be removed in order to allow three through lanes northbound.</p>	Street Improvement Plans & Traffic Control Plan	Review and approval of Street Improvement Plans & Traffic Control Plan	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy	City Transportation Division	_____	_____
<p>MM 4.12-4 The intersection of Goldenwest Street at Talbert Avenue shall be modified to include the project driveway as the west leg, with appropriate corresponding signal modifications and intersection lane improvements. The City Transportation Manager shall determine the ultimate signal modifications that are most appropriate for the project site. Design recommendations include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Split phase operations for east-west movements ■ Adequate pedestrian green to accommodate a slower walk speed (e.g., 2.8 feet per second) ■ Address design site distance ■ Increased letter sizes on roadway signs ■ Increased signal clearance intervals 	Street Improvement Plans & Traffic Control Plan	Review and approval of Street Improvement Plans & Traffic Control Plan	Prior to Certificate of Occupancy	City Transportation Manager	_____	_____

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.18

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Monitoring Program

Mitigation Measure	Implementation Documentation	Monitoring Activity	Timing	Responsible Monitor	Compliance Verification Signature	Date
Utilities & Service Systems						
<p>MM 4.13-2 (This MM is Measure Utilities-7 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>If the Green Acres Project is not yet operational and able to supply water to the program level elements of the Master Plan prior to the development of final plans and specifications, additional studies will be undertaken to determine the extent to which one or a combination of the following measures will be necessary to reduce impacts to water supply systems for program level elements during the interim until water from the Green Acres Project is available:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reduce the required irrigable areas by 10 percent; ■ Enhance the utilization of existing groundwater systems (i.e., subpotable wells); or ■ Supplement the irrigation supply with water from the domestic water system. 	Green Acres Project	Review status of Green Acres Project and ability to supply the project If Green Acres Project cannot supply water to the project, prepare study/studies identifying measures to reduce impacts to water supply systems	Prior to issuance of a grading permit	Public Works		
<p>MM 4.13-6 The developer shall install low-flow water devices and waterless urinals as part of the project.</p>	Notes on building plans	Installation of low-flow water devices and waterless urinals	Prior to and during construction activities	Public Works		
<p>MM 4.13-8 (This MM is Measure Utilities-9 from the Central Park Master Plan EIR)</p> <p>Prior to construction of program level elements, additional electrical load analyses shall be undertaken to determine the need for additional electrical transformers.</p> <p>SOURCE: PBS&J 2007</p>	Electrical load analyses	Conduct electrical load analyses	Prior to construction activities	Public Works		

ATTACHMENT NO. 3.19

Villasenor, Jennifer

From: Murphyeile@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, December 02, 2007 1:14 PM
To: Villasenor, Jennifer
Subject: RE:EIR #07-002/CUP #07-039 Senior Center

City of Huntington Beach

DEC 03 2007

Jennifer Villasenor-Project Planner

The EIR is inadequate as I said in the Public hearing.

1. There should be no building on park land. The developer Makar mitigated not having any Parks in his Pacific City development and gave the City of HB 26 million to improve the parks in the City now. They are woefully in need of upgrading. The City gave him a contract to build a Community Center/Senior Center in Central Park. This fails in any mitigation for improving the passive Park which is what Central Park is.

2. EIR for liquefaction is inadequate.

"Groundwater depth is 10 feet they think"

Site is included in Zone NO. 4 " which is 400 feet southwest of Huntington Lake which has a potential for landslides and permanent ground displacements."

3 EIR is inadequate for mitigating raptor foraging

Chapter 2 "pg 2-8 Impact 4.3-2

"development of the proposed project would have substantial adverse impact to raptor foraging habitat"

The mitigation is" through dedication as open space, conservation and/or enhancing raptor foraging on a 1:1 for acres. Mitigation will be accomplished within suitable areas that are City owned and preferably near-by such as Sully Miller Lake, facility" (not feasible),"Low intensity Recreation Area ,Semi-active Recreation Area, and /or Midden Area,Urban Forest /Trailhead,Low intensity."(Sites not appropriate)" Enhancement would include the planting of native trees within and adjacent to conserved area of raptor foraging habitat."

The inadequacy of this is what size trees and how long does the development wait to begin until the trees are habitable for the raptors?

Raptors need large area of non-human activity. The raptors can not be moved to other areas which already have their own raptors.

Eileen Murphy

201 21st Street

HB CA 92648

Check out AOL Money & Finance's list of the hottest products and top money wasters of 2007.

ATTACHMENT NO. 4.1

December 2, 2007
City of Huntington Beach

DEC 03 2007

To: Jennifer Villasenor – Assoc. Planner
City of Huntington Beach – Planning Dept.
2000 Main St., Huntington Beach, Ca.

Re: Huntington Beach Senior Center Project – Mitigation Factor MM 4.12 – 2
Removal of on-street parking on Goldenwest St.

Ms. Villasenor,

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation for the chance to at least partially state my concerns about the above-mentioned Mitigation Measure 4.12 – 2, as well as meet you at the EIR study session held on Nov. 27. Unfortunately the allotted 4 minutes was insufficient to communicate even half of my concern. As I mentioned at that time, I believe you can probably imagine the inconvenience of having all parking removed in front of our houses (visitors, guests, delivery, service vehicles and personnel, etc.), but I will leave further discussion of this to my neighbors as well as the safety factors that would be compromised with the implementation of this measure (especially those households with small children). This letter shall deal primarily with the current and projected noise pollution that all of these residences are and would be subjected to.

Prior to this occasion, I can remember at least two other instances where the removal of the on-street parking between Betty and Ford Sts. was proposed. During the first time, an EIR report showed that the noise pollution already exceeded Federal guidelines for exterior noise. At the Nov. 27 meeting, I also referred to an HB Staff Report from the Community Development Dept. to the Planning Commission dated Dec. 13, 1988 (please find copy of report cover page enclosed – report much too bulky to copy). Among the many aspects and recommendations contained in this report were the following:

- ✚ Currently (1988) vehicles using Goldenwest St. numbered 30,000/day; projected to be 36,000/day by year 2006, if no widening project. – pg. 3
- ✚ Recommendation on pg. 4 states “On-site parking will continue to be allowed only along the east side of the street, between Warner Ave. and Slater Ave.”. This statement is reaffirmed in a later section in the report virtually verbatim.
- ✚ Under NOISE, Sensitive Receptor Analysis, pg. 28, paragraph 1, it is stated “A field review of the sensitive noise receptors located adjacent to the Goldenwest St. within the project area **indicates exceedances of Federal exterior noise criteria** for: 1) 13 residences...” among which our residences are included.
- ✚ Table 18 on page 30 of this section shows that our properties are represented by receptor #4, and the subsequent analysis of the findings and possible mitigation action to correct can be found on pg. 31, and is as follows:
“The noise level measured at site #4 is typical of dwellings with front yard noise impacts shown on Fig. 13 on the east side of Goldenwest St. (between Warner and Slater Aves.). The noise measurement was taken in front of the house (east of

ATTACHMENT NO. 4.2

Goldenwest St. and north of Ford Dr.) at the edge of the driveway, 26 feet from the Goldenwest St. right-of-way. The noise measurements show exceedances of the Federal exterior noise criteria under existing and future no-mitigation conditions. Effective noise barriers can be constructed along the right-of-way of these corner lots (north and south of Betty Dr. and Ford Dr.) without creating access or aesthetic problems. Although the four lots facing Goldenwest St. between Betty Dr. and Ford Dr. have rear alley access for vehicles, a 6-foot block wall across the front yard may be undesirable in view of access restrictions and aesthetic considerations.”

- ✦ Same Section; pg. 33, #3 – “A noise barrier is feasible in the case of the four houses fronting Goldenwest St. between Warner Ave. and Talbert because the driveways would not interfere with the integrity of the barrier, but it may be undesirable in view of access restrictions and aesthetic considerations.”

The first point above shows how many cars were using Goldenwest back in 1988 and projections if not widened. Goldenwest St. was widened, of course, and current estimate of vehicle usage is around 50,000/day.

The report on “noise analysis” using receptor #4 for our properties showed a noise impact of 70 dba (Leq) back in 1988. Projected noise level for 2006 was 72 dba (Leq), without considering what the impact of the, as then unplanned, Home Depot center at Goldenwest and Warner; or the subsequent construction of HB Central Park Sports Complex!! I am willing to bet that if noise analysis receptors were placed in front of our residences today, the result would be at least 72 dba(Leq) or probably higher. According to an EIR report for the current Senior Center Project, the nearest noise analysis monitor was several hundred feet south of Slater Ave. Our homes are several hundred feet north of Slater; the traffic in front of our houses is slightly more concentrated; and our locations is such that vehicles are winding up their rpms and shifting in front of us, after stopping at or turning onto Goldenwest from Slater. Naturally, the noise levels would be greater where our properties are, then where recent monitor was employed.

Again referring to the same recent EIR report re: pg.8; figure 4.9 – 2 entitled “Land Use Compatibility with Community Noise Environments” -- Using the guidelines in this table in your own report, noting our properties would fall into the first category, a noise level of 72 dba (Leq) or more would put us right on the border of “**normally unacceptable**” and “**clearly unacceptable**”. This is the level we are subjected to currently; think about how much worse it would be by moving this **traffic noise even 6 or 7 feet closer** to our bedroom windows. The layout of our homes puts a bedroom (in my case, master bedroom) in the front of the house facing the street. To move the traffic closer to us is like saying “his open wound is so painful already, he will barely notice if we rub salt in it”.

As indicated in the 1988 report, there were several mitigation ideas that were brought up, such as the 6 foot block wall. I ask you to think about that one...not only would we lose the parking, but we would essentially wind up with two backyards, a back/back yard and a front/backyard. Except the front/back yard would have a public sidewalk running through it!! How would anyone (new guest, delivery and service personnel, etc.) find us if never been here before!! How much should I tip the Pizza guy when he has to deliver us from ½ a block away?? How much would such a lovely visage devalue the market price of our

properties (not to mention loss of parking and/or increased noise)?? Please find enclosed, a copy of another mitigation option that was proposed to us by the city. See the official letter dated November 16, 1990. To save you time, the city was offering to discuss installing/retrofitting all front and side windows of our homes with double-pane sound abating windows, in order to cut down on the noise pollution from Goldenwest St.

Lastly, I ask you to consider what removing the parking, increasing the traffic noise, compromising safety factors, etc. would do to the fair market value of our properties. We all knew when we bought our homes where they were located. Based on purchase price and subsequent appraisals (we have lived here since 1978), I believe the "discount" of our properties is 5 – 6% of the fair market price, as things are currently. If we lose the parking, etc. or have a wall put up, then what would the "Goldenwest discount" be?...10%? 12%?? For many homeowners, their property (or equity therein) represents a form of savings plan, whether to use the future equity to move up housewise, collateral for the kids college expenses, as a safety net for approaching retirement, etc. We do not believe that it would be fair for the city to devalue our properties in this manner, especially without offering due compensation.

We thank you for your consideration regarding the above concerns. We look forward to seeing you at the December 11th meeting.

Michael & Geri Ames
17332 Goldenwest St.
Huntington Beach Ca.
714.336.1832 cell
ajmames@verizon.net

CC: John Scandura
Tom Livengood
Blair Farley
Fred Speaker
Joe Shaw
Devin Dwyer
Elizabeth Shier-Burnett
Scott Hess
Leonie Mulvihill
Herb Fauland

ATTACHMENT NO. 4.4

PLI
SIA
↓

STAFF

REPORT

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Community Development
DATE: December 13, 1988

SUBJECT: COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT NO. 88-29 IN CONJUNCTION WITH NEGATIVE DECLARATION NO. 88-34

APPLICANT: City of Huntington Beach

DATE ACCEPTED:
November 10, 1988

REQUEST: To permit the Goldenwest Street improvement and widening project.

MANDATORY PROCESSING DATE:
January 9, 1988

LOCATION: The 3.5 mile segment of Goldenwest Street from Warner Avenue to Pacific Coast Highway (Route 1).

GENERAL PLAN: Various General Plan land use designations occur along the 3.5 mile segment of Goldenwest Street from Warner Avenue to Pacific Coast Highway (Route 1).

ZONE: Various zoning designations occur along the 3.5 mile segment of Goldenwest Street from Warner Avenue to Pacific Coast Highway (Route 1).

EXISTING USE: Goldenwest Street is a fully or partially improved, four-lane roadway except for the segment between Warner Avenue and Rio Vista Drive where it exists as a six-lane roadway.

1.0 SUGGESTED ACTION:

Approve Coastal Development Permit No. 88-29 and Negative Declaration No. 88-34 with findings and conditions of approval.

2.0 GENERAL INFORMATION:

Coastal Development Permit No. 88-29 in conjunction with Negative Declaration No. 88-34 is a request to permit the proposed Goldenwest Street improvement and widening project. The proposed project is to make various improvements to the 3.5 mile segment of Goldenwest Street to achieve a fully improved, six lane traffic corridor with striped bike lanes in both directions, painted and raised center medians, left-turn pockets, and concrete curbs and gutters as



C-3

A-FM-23C



CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH

2000 MAIN STREET

CALIFORNIA 92648

REAL ESTATE SERVICES

November 16, 1990

Michael A. Ames
17332 Golden West Street
Huntington Beach, California 92647

Reference: Golden West Street Right-of-Way Widening CC-575
AP #165-203-14 Sound Attenuation

Dear Michael A. Ames:

The City of Huntington Beach is in the process of improving the Golden West Street right-of-way from Pacific Coast Highway to Warner Avenue with three lanes each way, including curbs, gutters, raised center dividers, turn lanes and bike paths. A study was made as to sound impact of the added third lane to certain residences within the project. Conclusions were that the increased traffic over the next few years and the traffic being closer to the residences may cause a slight sound increase for certain properties. Your property was found to be in this area.

We should note that there will be no widening acquisition or construction effecting your property other than restriping the existing street to create the three lanes each way and increased traffic flow.

We would like to set up a meeting, at your convenience, to discuss a mitigation approach to a possible increase in traffic sound where the windows have street frontage. Enclosed is a plat map showing the location of the homes where remediation is suggested.

For an appointment to discuss this issue please call Paul Larkin at 714/536-5445.

Respectfully,

DAN M. BRENNAN
Director Real Estate Services

DMB/rf
0080U

ATTACHMENT NO. 4.6