CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) NO. 01-003
(GUN RANGE REMEDIATION AND REUSE)
AUGUST 27, 2013

SUMMARY

- **Location:** Huntington Central Park (between Goldenwest St. and Gothard St., south of Talbert Ave.)

- **Proposed Project:** EIR No. 01-003 is a request to analyze the potential environmental impacts associated with a proposal by the City to remediate the lead contamination that resulted from the prior use of the ±4.9 acre site as a gun range and reuse it as a park element within Central Park.

  Development of the site first occurred in the 1950s when the County began utilizing the site as a portion of the 51-acre Huntington Beach landfill. Subsequent to the landfill's closure in 1962, the County deeded the property to the City. A gun range facility was constructed on the site in approximately 1968 and was used by various law enforcement agencies and the general public. In the early 1990s, unstable soil conditions caused by the decomposing landfill materials became evident and the public side of the facility was closed. In 1997, the entire gun range was closed due to safety concerns.

  The Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) has been identified as the lead agency for the remediation of the gun range site. A Remedial Action Plan (RAP) which examined a range of remedial alternatives for the gun range was approved by the OCHCA in 2011. It identifies a requirement to clean up the site to the residential standard of 80 parts per million (PPM) lead. This is considered a conservative approach to the remediation since no residential use would be implemented as part of the reuse of the site. The preferred remedial alternative involves removing all lead-impacted soil exceeding 80 parts per million lead and removal of all telephone poles used within the gun range.

  Upon completion of the remediation, the City proposes to reuse the site as a park, which would require future Conditional Use Permit approval by the Planning Commission. While no park development plan has been formally submitted at this time, for purposes of the EIR, a range of recreational uses that could be implemented was identified as follows: park area (tot lot, picnic area, snack bar/restaurant, and passive open space); dog park; outdoor basketball courts; outdoor tennis courts; parking; and restrooms. In lieu of the outdoor basketball and tennis courts, a skate park facility was also analyzed. The site would continue to be accessed from Gothard Street. A summary of potential long-term recreational uses and associated acreages is provided in the following table.

Table 1 - Potential On-Site Recreational Uses

Recreational Use	Acreage
Park Area	0.84
Dog Park	2.00
Outdoor Basketball Courts (4) and Tennis Courts (4) or Skate Park	1.07
Parking (80 spaces)	1.00
Total	**4.9**

- **Scope of EIR Analysis:** The following determinations were made for the issue areas listed:

  Less than significant or no impacts and no further analysis required in EIR: Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Cultural Resources, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation

  Less than significant with mitigation incorporated from Huntington Central Park Master Plan EIR and no further analysis required in EIR: Hydrology and Water Quality

  Analyzed in EIR with less than significant or no impacts: Greenhouse Gas, Noise, Utilities

  Analyzed in EIR with less than significant impacts with mitigation incorporated: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Traffic and Circulation

  Analyzed in EIR with significant and unavoidable impacts: Air Quality - Short-term construction emissions are significant and unavoidable. Adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations is required to allow proposed remedial alternative.

- **Alternatives:** The following alternatives were analyzed in the EIR:

  Alternative 1: No Project – This alternative assumes no remediation or reuse of the gun range site.

  Alternative 2: Limited Excavation – This alternative involves a remedial option with limited excavation to a depth of only five feet and clean fill capping to protect underlying lead contamination resulting in a decrease in materials exported from the site.

  Environmentally Superior Alternative – The EIR concludes that Alternative 2 is the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative may result in long-term risks to human health and safety and would not accomplish the project objective to fully remediate all the lead contamination from the former gun range site.

- **EIR Public Participation**
  1. 30-day EIR Notice of Preparation (NOP) public review period (2009) – 12 letters were received in response to the NOP.
  2. 45-day Draft EIR public review period (ended June 24, 2013) – 11 letters were received and Response to Comments is being prepared.
  3. Planning Commission Public Hearing tentatively scheduled for September 10, 2013.

- **Attachment:**
  1. Executive Summary of Draft EIR No. 01-003
  2. Draft EIR No. 01-003 (Not attached but available at http://www.surfcity-hb.org/Government/Departments/Planning/Environmentalreports.cfm)

2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is approximately 4.91 acres in size and is located in the central portion of the City of Huntington Beach. The City of Huntington Beach is a coastal city along the Pacific Ocean in northwestern Orange County. It is surrounded by Westminster to the north, Fountain Valley to the northeast, Costa Mesa and Newport Beach to the east, and Seal Beach to the west. Los Angeles is located approximately 35 miles to the northwest while San Diego is 95 miles to the southeast.

Regional access to the site is provided via Interstate 405 (I-405) Freeway to the north, Beach Boulevard to the east, and Pacific Coast Highway to the south. Local streets surrounding the project site include Goldenwest Street to the west, Gothard Street to the east, Talbert Avenue to the north, and Ellis Avenue to the south. The proposed project site is a former gun range practice facility used by the Huntington Beach Police Officer's Association, other law enforcement agencies, and the general public. The site is within Huntington Central Park and is bordered by the Huntington Central Park Sports Complex to the north and west, Sully Miller Lake to the south, and the former Orange County Transfer Station (also known as the Orange County Gothard Street Refuse Disposal Station) to the east. The site is accessed from Gothard Street via a driveway owned by the County of Orange.

2.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed project consists of two primary components: 1) remediation of existing lead contamination at the facility due to historical gun range operations; and 2) long-term reuse of the site as a recreational component of Huntington Central Park. These two primary components of the proposed project are described in detail below.

SITE REMEDIATION

The Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA) has been identified as the lead agency for remediation of the gun range facility. The City initiated the lead remediation process in 2001 through initial soil sampling, analysis, and preparation of a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) by Hart Crowser, Inc. The soil sampling and analysis was subsequently updated in 2008 by Waterstone Environmental, Inc., who also prepared the *Revised Remedial Action Plan and Human Health Risk Assessment – Former Gun Range Site* (*Revised RAP*) in 2010. This document identifies existing conditions and primary concerns related to on-site lead contamination, a preferred method of remediation, regulatory thresholds to which the site must be remediated, and a range of safety measures to be implemented during the remedial process. The *Revised RAP* was submitted to OCHCA for review in September 2010, and approval of the *Revised RAP* was issued on February 15, 2011.

The *Revised RAP* examined a range of remedial alternatives for the gun range facility (refer to Section 5.1, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*). The *Revised RAP* includes the selection of a preferred remedial alternative that is: 1) proven, viable, and cost-effective; 2) acceptable to regulatory agencies; and 3) cost-effective on a per unit volume basis. The preferred remedial alternative identified by the *Revised*

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.1

RAP is the "Excavation of Areas Exceeding 80 PPM Lead and Removal of Telephone Poles (Segregation of Lead Impacted Portions)." OCHCA consulted with the State of California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) regarding the proposed project, which resulted in the requirement to remediate the site to the residential standard (80 PPM) per the revised DTSC standard, rather than the commercial/industrial standard. This is considered a conservative approach to the remediation since no residential uses would be implemented as part of the long-term reuse of the site.

This option entails the excavation of the soil berm along the northern boundary of the site to depths from 9 to 12 feet (1 to 2 feet deeper than known contamination) and removing other surficial impacts (estimated 1 foot to 3.5 feet) where sample results indicate greater than 80 parts per million (PPM) of lead. Based on the *Revised RAP*, approximately 14,000 tons of lead-impacted soil is estimated to be present on-site.

All wooden telephone poles would be removed and transported to a landfill under the preferred alternative. Each pole would be examined for lead fragments. It is expected that telephone poles utilized as backstops will have significant lead content while the remainder of telephone poles will generally be unimpacted. For backstop telephone poles, bullets are not expected to have penetrated deeper than approximately 12 inches. For those telephone poles with obvious lead contamination, the portion of the pole that is most heavily impacted by lead fragments would be cut out and separated from the remainder of the pole. The "front" 12-inch portion of the impacted pole would be removed and disposed of separately. The unimpacted portions of the telephone poles would be disposed of as appropriate, based on their coal tar content.

SITE REUSE

Following remediation, the project site is proposed to be developed as an open space/park element of Huntington Central Park. Huntington Central Park is located south of Slater Avenue, west of Gothard Street, north of Ellis Avenue, and east of Edwards Street. The project site is located within the southeastern portion of the 356.8-acre Huntington Central Park Master Plan. A range of recreational uses could be implemented at the site, as follows:

- Park Area (tot lot, picnic area, snack bar/restaurant, and passive open space);
- Dog park;
- Outdoor basketball courts;
- Outdoor tennis courts;
- Parking; and
- Restrooms.

In lieu of the outdoor basketball and tennis courts, the City may implement a 1.07-acre skate park facility. The skate park would consist of approximately 25,000 to 30,000 square foot skating area including raised skate bowls (approximately 15,000 square feet), a skatable concrete plaza area with curbs and railings of varying heights (approximately 10,000 square feet). The remaining acreage would be utilized for parking, landscape areas and seating areas similar to the other park development options noted above.

The project would also include minor ancillary facilities such as irrigation, lighting, landscaping, and utilities. The facility would continue to be accessed from Gothard Street. Improvements would be

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.2

required along the existing County-owned driveway ("access driveway" as depicted on Exhibit 3-7); an Easement Deed allowing for the City's improvement and use of the driveway was approved by the County on February 9, 2010. The proposed project may require up to approximately eight additional part-time staff members to supervise the proposed uses. However, no additional maintenance staff over the current levels is anticipated.

2.3 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to Section 15124 (b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR project description must include a statement of objectives sought by the proposed project. These objectives assist the Lead Agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in the EIR, and aid decision makers in preparing findings or a statement of overriding considerations, if necessary. The statement of objectives should provide the underlying purpose of the project. The goals and objectives of the proposed project are to:

1. Remediate the former gun range facility of on-site contaminants resulting from over 20 years of firing range use, in order to protect the health and safety of those in the surrounding community.

2. Provide residents within the City of Huntington Beach with open space/recreational opportunities through the provision of long-term park facilities after site remediation is complete.

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/ MITIGATION SUMMARY

The following is a brief summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and unavoidable significant impacts identified and analyzed in Section 5.0, *Environmental Analysis*, of this EIR. Refer to the appropriate EIR Section for additional information.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.3

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Section 5.1 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Existing Hazardous Materials		
Lead contamination resulting from gun range uses on-site would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment.	HAZ-1 Prior to issuance of any grading permit for the project, the City of Huntington Beach shall ensure that the Remediation Contractor has incorporated into its work plan all remedial recommendations associated with Alternative 2 within the *Revised Remedial Action Plan and Human Health Risk Assessment*, prepared by Waterstone Environmental Inc., dated January 2011. The *Revised Remedial Action Plan and Human Health Risk Assessment* is included as Appendix 13.3 of the EIR and is incorporated by reference into this mitigation measure. HAZ-2 The Remediation Contractor shall prepare a site-specific Health and Safety Plan (HASP) pursuant to the provisions of the *Revised Remedial Action Plan and Human Health Risk Assessment* (prepared by Waterstone Environmental, Inc., dated January 2011) Section 7.11, *Health and Safety Plan*, for all remediation work activities. The purpose of the HASP is to describe the controls and procedures that shall be implemented to minimize incidents, injury, and health risks associated with the excavation activities to be conducted at the project site. The following shall be addressed in the HASP: • The HASP shall incorporate the requirements specified by Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Hazardous Waste Operations Standards (WPA 29 CFR 1910.120 and CCR Title 8). • Field personnel shall review the HASP prior to commencing field work. Prior to initiation of field activities each day, a tailgate safety meeting shall be conducted to identify potential physical and chemical hazards and outline measures to be taken in event of an emergency. All on-site personnel shall be required to document their attendance at the tailgate safety meeting by signing a form before work each day.	A less than significant impact would result from existing on-site hazardous materials.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.4

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	• During field activities, appropriate personal protective equipment shall be worn by all personnel within designated exclusion zones. The amount of dust present in the operator breathing zone shall be obtained in the field on a regular basis using a dust meter or equivalent as required by the HASP. The HASP shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of a grading permit. HAZ-3 Prior to the issuance of building permits for reuse of the project site, the City shall construct a landfill gas collection and control system (GCCS) that conveys landfill gas to the existing GCCS at the Huntington Central Sports Complex. In consultation with the SCAQMD, the City shall also implement an LFG monitoring program, which shall require that any proposed structures on-site would be monitored on at least a quarterly basis, consistent with SCAQMD Rule 1150.1. The proposed GCCS shall be coordinated with the SCAQMD, OCHCA, SARWQCB, and City of Huntington Beach Fire Department. The GCCS shall incorporate the recommendations included within the Landfill Gas Analysis for Former Gun Range Within Central Park prepared by SCS Engineers (dated February 4, 2009), and any additional recommendations identified by the City Engineer. The Landfill Gas Analysis for Former Gun Range Within Central Park is included as Appendix 13.10 of the EIR and is incorporated by reference into this Mitigation Measure.	
Long-Term Operations *Development of the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or storage of hazardous materials.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to long-term project operations.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *Development of the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable hazards and hazardous materials impacts.*	Refer to Mitigation Measures HAZ-1 through HAZ-3.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.5

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Section 5.2 GEOLOGY AND SOILS		
Seismicity *Development of the proposed project would not expose people/structures to significant impacts associated with seismic shaking.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to seismicity.
Liquefaction *The proposed project would not expose people or structures to significant adverse impacts from liquefaction with recommended mitigation and compliance with the California Building Code.*	GEO-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit, the Chief Building Official shall verify that any new structures are supported by a deep foundation system, such as driven piles or caissons. The foundation system shall be designated to withstand negative dragdown due to existing fill and to mitigate for liquefaction and lateral spreading. These foundation requirements shall be denoted on project plans for review and approval by the Chief Building Official.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to liquefaction.
Soil Erosion *Development of the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion and loss of topsoil.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to soil erosion.
Expansive Soils *Development of the proposed project would not expose people or property to significant effects associated with expansive soils.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to soil expansive soils.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *The proposed project along with other related future development would not result in increased geology, soils, and seismicity impacts in the area.*	Refer to Mitigation Measure GEO-1.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to cumulative geology and soils impacts.
Section 5.3 AIR QUALITY		
Short-Term (Construction) Emissions *Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air pollutant emission impacts.*	AQ-1 Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan and specifications stipulate that, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering or other dust prevention measures, as specified in the SCAQMD's Rules and Regulations. In addition, SCAQMD Rule 402 requires implementation of dust suppression techniques to prevent	**A significant and unavoidable impact would result with regard to short-term (construction) emissions.**

ATTACHMENT NO. 6

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off-site. Implementation of the following measures would reduce short-term fugitive dust impacts on nearby sensitive receptors: • All active portions of the construction site shall be watered every three hours during daily construction activities and when dust is observed migrating from the project site to prevent excessive amounts of dust; • Pave or apply water every three hours during daily construction activities or apply non-toxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas. More frequent watering shall occur if dust is observed migrating from the site during site disturbance; • Any on-site stockpiles of debris, dirt, or other dusty material shall be enclosed, covered, or watered twice daily, or non-toxic soil binders shall be applied; • All grading and excavation operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 miles per hour; • Disturbed areas shall be replaced with ground cover or paved immediately after construction is completed in the affected area; • Track-out devices such as gravel bed track-out aprons (3 inches deep, 25 feet long, 12 feet wide per lane and edged by rock berm or row of stakes) shall be installed to reduce mud/dirt trackout from unpaved truck exit routes. Alternatively a wheel washer shall be used at truck exit routes; • On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 miles per hour; • All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust prior to departing the job site; and • Reroute construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas. AQ-2 All trucks that are to haul excavated or graded material on-site shall comply with State Vehicle Code Section 23114 (*Spilling Loads on Highways*), with special attention to Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(4) as amended, regarding the prevention of	

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.7

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	such material spilling onto public streets and roads. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Applicant shall demonstrate to the City of Huntington Beach City Engineer how the project operations subject to that specification during hauling activities shall comply with the provisions set forth in Sections 23114(b)(F), (e)(4).	
	AQ-3 Prior to issuance of any Grading Permit, the City Engineer shall confirm that the Grading Plan and specifications stipulate that, in compliance with SCAQMD Rule 403, O_3 precursor emissions from construction equipment vehicles shall be controlled by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and in proper tune per manufacturer's specifications, to the satisfaction of the City. Maintenance records shall be provided to the City by the construction contractor on a monthly basis. The City shall be responsible for ensuring that contractors comply with this measure during construction. Contract specifications shall be included in the project construction documents which shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit.	
	AQ-4 The following measures shall be implemented during remediation to substantially reduce NO_X related emissions. They shall be included in the Grading Plan and contract specifications. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. • Off-road diesel equipment operators shall be required to shut down their engines rather than idle for more than five minutes, and shall ensure that all off-road equipment is compliant with the CARB in-use off-road diesel vehicle regulation and SCAQMD Rule 2449. • Require the use of 2010 and newer diesel haul trucks (e.g., material delivery trucks and soil import/export) and if the lead agency determines that 2010 model year or newer diesel trucks cannot be obtained the lead agency shall use trucks that meet EPA 2007 model year NO_X emissions requirements	

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.8

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	• The following note shall be included on all grading plans: During remediation, all internal combustion engines/construction, equipment operating on the project site shall meet EPA-Certified Tier 3 emissions standards, or higher according to the following: - January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. - Post-January 1, 2015: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall meet the Tier 4 emission standards, where available. In addition, all construction equipment shall be outfitted with BACT devices certified by CARB. Any emissions control device used by the contractor shall achieve emissions reductions that are no less than what could be achieved by a Level 3 diesel emissions control strategy for a similarly sized engine as defined by CARB regulations. - A copy of each unit's certified tier specification, BACT documentation, and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. • The remediation and construction contractors shall maintain construction equipment engines by keeping them tuned and regularly serviced to minimize exhaust emissions. • Use low sulfur fuel for stationary construction equipment. This is required by SCAQMD Rules 431.1 and 431.2. • Utilize existing power sources (i.e., power poles) when available. This measure would minimize the use of higher polluting gas or diesel generators.	

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-9

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	• Configure construction parking to minimize traffic interference. • Minimize obstruction of through-traffic lanes and provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person during all phases of construction when needed to maintain smooth traffic flow. Construction shall be planned so that lane closures on existing streets are kept to a minimum. • Schedule construction operations affecting traffic for off-peak hours to the best extent when possible. • Develop a traffic plan to minimize traffic flow interference from construction activities (the plan may include advance public notice of routing, use of public transportation and satellite parking areas with a shuttle service.) • 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.	
	AQ-5 The following SCAQMD recommended measures shall be implemented for hauling activities related to soil remediation and demolition to substantially reduce NO_X related emissions. They shall be included in the Grading Plan and contract specifications. Contract specification language shall be reviewed by the City prior to issuance of a grading permit. • All heavy duty trucks utilized for hauling shall meet or exceed EPA 2007 engine emission standards. • Beginning in 2015, all heavy duty trucks utilized for hauling shall meet or exceed EPA 2010 engine emission standards. • If the above clean truck requirements are infeasible, a phase-in schedule shall be put forth that shall feasibly achieve emission reductions as soon as possible. • The contractor shall maintain a log of all hauling trucks entering the project site to ensure that on average, the daily truck fleet meets the selected EPA emission standards. This log shall be available for inspection by City staff at any time.	

ATTACHMENT NO. 10

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	• Prohibit all vehicles and trucks from idling in excess of five minutes, both on- and off-site.	
Long-Term (Operational) Air Emissions *Long-term operation of the proposed project would not result in significant air pollutant emissions impacts.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to long-term (operational) air emissions.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS **Short-Term Cumulative Impacts** *Short-term construction activities associated with the proposed project and related cumulative projects would result in significant and unavoidable short-term air quality impacts.*	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5.	**A significant and unavoidable cumulative impact would result with regard to short-term (construction) emissions.**
Long-Term Cumulative Impacts *Long-term operations associated with the proposed project and related cumulative projects would not result in significant long-term air quality impacts.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to long-term (operational) air emissions.
Section 5.4 GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
Greenhouse Gas Emissions *Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would not have a significant impact on the environment.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to greenhouse gas emissions.
Consistency With Applicable GHG Plans, Policies or Regulations *Implementation of the proposed project could conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to consistency with applicable GHG plans, policies, or regulations.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *Greenhouse gas emissions generated by the project would not have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable greenhouse gas reduction plan, policy, or regulation.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to greenhouse gas emissions.
Section 5.5 NOISE		
Short-Term Construction Noise Impacts *Grading and construction within the area would not result in significant temporary noise impacts to nearby noise sensitive receivers.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to short-term construction noise impacts.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-11

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Construction-Related Vibration Impacts *Grading and construction associated with the proposed project would not result in significant temporary vibration impacts to nearby sensitive receptors.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to construction-related vibration impacts.
Long-Term (Mobile) Noise Impacts *Traffic generated by the proposed project would not significantly contribute to existing traffic noise in the area or exceed the City's established standards.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to long-term (mobile) noise.
Long-Term (Stationary) Noise Impacts *The proposed project would not result in a significant increase in ambient noise levels.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to long-term (stationary) noise impacts.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS **Short-Term Cumulative Impacts** *Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable construction noise impacts.* **Long-Term Cumulative Impacts** *Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable long-term noise impacts.*	No mitigation measures are required. No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to short-term noise. A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to long-term noise.
Section 5.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Special Status Plant and Wildlife Species *Project implementation would not have an adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status.*	BIO-1 Prior to vegetation clearing activities on-site, the City of Huntington Beach shall conduct focused surveys for special status plant species during the appropriate blooming period (generally spring/summer) to determine the presence or absence of special status plant species. If a special status plant species is observed, its rarity and abundance shall be evaluated by the Project Biologist. If the finding is considered significant, then additional avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures may be required as determined appropriate by the Project Biologist.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to special status plant and wildlife species.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-12

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	BIO-2 Prior to the approval of landscape plans for the proposed project, the project Landscape Architect shall certify to the City of Huntington Beach Planning and Building Department that exotic plant species (any species listed in the California Invasive Plant Council [Cal-IPC] Invasive Plant Inventory or the Federal Noxious Weed List) are not included in the plant palette for the site. BIO-3 Prior to vegetation clearing activities on-site, the City of Huntington Beach shall conduct focused surveys for the coastal California gnatcatcher to determine the presence or absence of this species on the project site. Survey protocol requires either (1) a minimum of six surveys be conducted between March 15 and June 30 or (2) a minimum of nine surveys be conducted between July 1 and March 14. If focused surveys determine that coastal California gnatcatcher is not present on the project site, then no further measures would be necessary. If focused surveys determine that the coastal California gnatcatcher is present on the project site, then the City shall implement additional avoidance, minimization, or mitigation measures as determined by the USFWS. BIO-4 Prior to the approval of lighting plans and specifications for the proposed project, the City of Huntington Beach Planning and Building Department shall verify that night lighting shall be directed away from open space areas and shielding shall be incorporated into the final project design to minimize the increase in ambient lighting adjacent areas to the greatest extent practicable. These stipulations shall be denoted on project plans for review and approval by the Planning and Building Department.	
Sensitive Natural Communities *Project implementation would not have an adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.*	Refer to Mitigation Measure BIO-3.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to sensitive natural communities.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-13

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
Migratory Birds *Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of a native resident or migratory species.*	BIO-5 To the extent feasible, the City of Huntington Beach shall conduct all vegetation removal activities outside of the nesting season (typically February 15 to August 15) to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. However, if initial vegetation removal occurs during the nesting season, all suitable habitat shall be thoroughly surveyed for the presence of nesting birds by a qualified biologist prior to commencement of clearing. If any active nests are detected, a buffer of at least 100 feet (300 feet for raptors) shall be delineated, flagged, and avoided until the nesting cycle is complete as determined by the Project Biologist.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to migratory birds.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *Project implementation would not have a cumulative adverse effect on special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, or migratory birds.*	Refer to Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-5.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to special status species, riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, or migratory birds.
Section 5.7 UTILITIES		
Water Services *Project implementation would not significantly increase the demand for water such that new entitlements or resources are needed.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to water services.
Wastewater Services *Project implementation would result in a less than significant impact to wastewater services.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to wastewater services.
Stormwater Facilities *The project would not result in new stormwater drainage facilities that would result in significant environmental effects.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to stormwater facilities.
Solid Waste *Implementation of the proposed project would not generate solid waste that exceeds the permitted capacity of the landfill serving the City.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to generation of solid waste.
The project would be subject to State and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to solid waste statutes and regulations.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-4

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *Development associated with the proposed project and other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to water supply, wastewater generation, stormwater, or solid waste generation.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to utilities.
Section 5.8 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION		
Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions – Local Roadways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic on local roadways for existing conditions when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to local roadways under the forecast existing plus project condition.
Forecast Existing Plus Project Conditions – State Highways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic for existing plus project conditions at a Caltrans intersection.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to State Highway facilities under the forecast existing plus project condition.
Short-Range Year 2016 With Project Conditions – Local Roadways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic on local roadways under short-range year 2016 conditions when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to local roadways under the short-range year 2016 with project condition.
Short-Range Year 2016 With Project Conditions – State Highways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic under short-range year 2016 conditions at a Caltrans intersection.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to State Highway facilities under the short-range year 2016 plus project condition.
Long-Range Year 2030 With Project Conditions – Local Roadways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic on local roadways under long-range year 2030 conditions when compared to the traffic capacity of the street system.*	TRA-1 Prior to issuance of a building permit for the proposed project, the City of Huntington Beach shall contribute its fair share to the implementation of the following potential improvements (also identified in the *Huntington Beach Circulation Element Update*) for the Beach Boulevard/Talbert Avenue intersection: • Add second westbound left turn lane; • Add defacto westbound right turn lane;	A less than significant impact would result with regard to local roadways under the long-range year 2030 with project condition.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.5

IMPACTS	MITIGATION MEASURES	SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	• Add separate northbound right turn lane; • Add second eastbound left turn lane; and/or • Stripe defacto eastbound right turn lane.	
Long-Range Year 2030 With Project Conditions – State Highways *Project implementation would not cause a significant increase in traffic under long-range year 2030 conditions at a Caltrans intersection.*	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to State Highway facilities under the long-range year 2030 plus project condition.
Hazardous Design Feature/Site Access *Implementation of the project would not result in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to hazardous design features/site access as a result of the project.
Conflict With Policies, Plans, or Programs *Implementation of the project would not result in a decrease of the performance or safety of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities as a result of a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to the project conflicting with policies, plans, or programs.
Remediation and Construction Traffic *Traffic associated with remediation of the project site and construction of the project would not result in a significant impact to the surrounding circulation network.*	No mitigation measures are required.	A less than significant impact would result with regard to remediation and construction traffic.
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS *The proposed project along with other related cumulative projects would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to traffic and circulation.*	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1.	A less than significant cumulative impact would result with regard to project-related traffic.

ATTACHMENT NO. 15

2.5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6, this section describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, which could feasibly attain most of the proposed project's basic objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen significant effects of the proposed project. The evaluation considers the comparative merits of each alternative. The analysis focuses on alternatives capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the project's significant environmental effects, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the proposed project objectives. Potential environmental impacts associated with the following alternatives are compared to impacts of the proposed project:

- "No Project" Alternative; and
- "Limited Excavation" Alternative.

However, in determining an appropriate range of alternatives to be evaluated in the EIR, three possible alternatives were considered but not carried forward for additional analysis, since they would not accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project or were considered infeasible. These three possible alternatives are as follows:

- An "Alternative Site" Alternative for this project would not be applicable as it would directly conflict with the project objective to remediate the former gun range facility of on-site contaminants resulting from over 20 years of firing range use, in order to protect the health and safety of those in the surrounding community. The selection of an alternative site would conflict with the primary purpose of the project, and therefore is not under consideration.

- An "Alternative Use" Alternative (e.g., long-term reuse of the site as a commercial, industrial, or residential use) is not being considered by the City as it would directly conflict with the project objective to provide residents within the City of Huntington Beach with open space/recreational opportunities through the provision of long-term park facilities. In addition, this alternative would still require remediation of the project site prior to implementation of a long-term reuse, and thus a significant unavoidable air quality impact would remain.

- The "Alternative Disposal Site" Alternative assumes that lead-contaminated materials exported from the site during remediation would be transported to Buttonwillow Landfill in Buttonwillow, California. Buttonwillow Landfill is located approximately 163 miles from the project site. An "Alternative Disposal Site" Alternative would consist of a disposal site that would be closer to the project site. This would reduce the length of truck haul trips, and potentially reduce the significant unavoidable air quality impact identified for the project.

  However, there are only three fully permitted Class I commercial hazardous waste landfills disposal facilities that exist in California, which include Buttonwillow Landfill, Kettleman Hills Landfill, and Westmorland Landfill.[1] The Kettleman Hills Landfill is located in Kettleman City, approximately 210 miles from the project site. The Westmorland Landfill is located in Westmorland, approximately 190 miles from the project site. As such, the

[1] Department of Toxic Substances Control website, http://dtsc.ca.gov/upload/TitleVIAnnouncement.pdf, accessed February 22, 2013.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1-17

selection of an alternative disposal site (i.e., either Kettleman Hills Landfill or Westmorland Landfill) would result in an increase in distance that haul trucks would need to travel, exacerbating the significant air quality impact identified for the project. As such, an "Alternative Disposal Site" Alternative is not under consideration by the City.

The following is a description of each of the alternatives evaluated in Section 7.0, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*.

"NO PROJECT" ALTERNATIVE

Pursuant to *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e)(2), the No Project Alternative must be analyzed within the EIR. The No Project Alternative should discuss what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. In certain instances, the No Project Alternative means "no build" wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. Thus, this Alternative assumes that no remediation or reuse of the site would occur, and that the site would remain in its existing condition as a vacant former gun range facility.

"LIMITED EXCAVATION" ALTERNATIVE

As noted in Section 5.1, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the *Revised Remedial Action Plan and Human Health Risk Assessment* (*Revised RAP*) analyzed a total of three remedial options, which included the proposed project, a No Action scenario, and a remedial option involving limited excavation and clean fill capping. This final remedial scenario involving limited excavation and clean fill capping ("Limited Excavation" Alternative) is analyzed as it would result in a decrease in materials exported from the site.

The Limited Excavation Alternative would involve a reduction in the amount of contaminated soil excavated and removed from the project site in comparison to the proposed project. The Limited Excavation Alternative would involve removal of soil in the Soil Berm area of the project site to a depth of five feet (versus the maximum 12 feet associated with the proposed project). The five feet of removed soil would be replaced with five feet of compacted fill for protection of the underlying lead-containing soil. However, an engineered cap may continue to shift and would be required to be maintained over time due to the nature of the uncompacted landfill materials underlying the project site. For the purposes of this analysis, the Limited Excavation Alternative would consist of a 25 percent reduction in excavated and hauled contaminated soil as compared to the proposed project.

Under the Limited Excavation Alternative, all aspects of the long-term reuse of the project site would remain identical to the proposed project.

"ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR" ALTERNATIVE

Table 2-1, *Comparison of Alternatives*, summarizes the comparative analysis presented in Section 7.0, *Alternatives to the Proposed Project*. Review of Table 2-1 indicates the No Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, as it would eliminate the significant unavoidable air quality impacts from remediation, and would reduce impacts related to geology and soils, GHG emissions, noise, biological resources, utilities, and traffic and circulation. However, the No Project Alternative

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.18

would not reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, as the site would remain contaminated by existing lead associated with the former gun range facility.

Table 2-1
Comparison of Alternatives

Sections	No Project	Limited Excavation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	▲	▲
Geology and Soils	▼	=
Air Quality	▼	▼
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	▼	▼
Noise	▼	▼
Biological Resources	▼	=
Utilities	▼	▼
Traffic and Circulation	▼	▼

▲ Indicates an impact that is greater than the proposed project (environmentally inferior).
▼ Indicates an impact that is less than the proposed project (environmentally superior).
= Indicates an impact that is equal to the proposed project (neither environmentally superior nor inferior).

The Limited Excavation Alternative has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, since the No Project Alternative cannot be selected under *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15126.6(e). As previously discussed, the Limited Excavation Alternative would reduce the amount of soil excavated and hauled off-site as compared to the proposed project (although significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during remediation would remain). The Limited Excavation Alternative would result in similar impacts to the proposed project regarding geology and soils and biological resources. Due to the reduced amount of soil excavated and hauled, and the overall reduced amount of construction equipment and workers that would be required under the Limited Excavation Alternative, impacts regarding air quality, GHG emissions, noise, utilities, and traffic and circulation would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. However, the Limited Excavation Alternative would not reduce impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials, as this Alternative would implement an engineered cap over portions of the site that may result in increased impacts over the long-term. Because the Limited Excavation Alternative would result in a general reduction in impacts in comparison to the proposed project, the Limited Excavation Alternative has been determined to be the environmentally superior alternative.

However, as noted above, neither the No Project Alternative nor the Limited Excavation Alternative would accomplish the identified project objectives. Since the No Project Alternative would leave the site in its existing state, this Alternative would not accomplish the objectives of remediating the former gun range facility nor would it achieve the objective of expanding recreational opportunities within the City. Since the Limited Excavation Alternative may result in long-term risks to human health and safety, it would not accomplish the project objective to remediate the former gun range facility of on-site contaminants resulting from over 20 years of firing range use.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1.19

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

DRAFT EIR NO. 01-003 NOT ATTACHED

AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT:

PLANNING AND ZONING COUNTER – CITY HALL, 3RD FLOOR

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE – CITY HALL, 2ND FLOOR

CENTRAL LIBRARY

CITY WEBSITE

http://www.surfcity-hb.org/Government/Departments/Planning/Environmentalreports.cfm

ATTACHMENT NO. 2