1. PROJECT TITLE:  General Plan Historic and Cultural Resources Element Update

   Concurrent Entitlements:  General Plan Amendment No. 08-009

2. LEAD AGENCY:  City of Huntington Beach
   2000 Main Street
   Huntington Beach, CA 92648

   Contact:  Ricky Ramos, Senior Planner
   Phone:  (714) 536-5271

3. PROJECT LOCATION:  Citywide

4. PROJECT PROPOSENENT:  City of Huntington Beach

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:  Various

6. ZONING:  Various

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

   Introduction:

   The Historic and Cultural Resources Element (HCRE) is one of the Elements in the Huntington Beach General Plan adopted in 1996. The HCRE is a policy document that guides the City’s decisions regarding historic and cultural resources by identifying goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs as well as providing technical information and outlining issues regarding the protection of the city’s historic resources and provision of arts/cultural services. The existing HCRE is available on the city website (www.huntingtonbeachca.gov).

   Existing Element:

   The existing HCRE is organized into four main sections: Technical Synopsis; Issues; Goals, Objectives, and Policies; and Implementation Programs.

   The Technical Synopsis of the HCRE includes separate sections on historic resources and cultural resources. The historic resources section includes a brief summary of the history of Huntington Beach and the predominant architectural styles that remain in the city today. Figure HCR-1 depicts historic resources that are described in further detail in subsequent pages in the HCRE. Table HCR-2 lists 79
local landmarks comprised of 212 properties that were generated by the Huntington Beach Historic Resources Board (HRB) and considered to be of significant importance to the local community. The significance of a structure or a place is based upon its overall contribution to the community by its historical, cultural, social, or visual function(s). It is the intention of the HRB to place these structures and places on a City listing for protection and/or preservation of the landmark’s size, scale, design and/or function.

The HCRE references the Historic Survey of 1986 which was completed to provide documentation of potential historic and cultural resources so that City policies and regulations can be established to protect and preserve these resources while allowing for new development. The Historic Survey of 1986 identified three potential historic districts within the downtown area:

a. Main Street/Downtown – This district includes the 2nd and a portion of the 3rd blocks of Main Street as well as the 2nd and 3rd blocks of 5th Street.
b. 9th Street – This district spans from approximately the north half of the 3rd block to the south half of the 5th block of 9th Street.
c. Wesley Park – This district incorporates an irregular boundary focused along Main Street from Acacia to about 10th and 11th Streets.

The cultural resources section discusses existing cultural facilities and programs as well as resources for arts education. It describes the roles of the Cultural Services Division and Allied Arts Board together with funding for the arts and culture in the community.

The Issues section identifies 20 major concerns regarding local historic and cultural resources followed by a Goals, Objectives, and Policies section which guides the City’s decisions regarding historic and cultural resources. The goals, objectives, and policies promote the preservation and restoration of historic resources as well as the provision of arts and cultural activities in the community. The Implementation Programs section outlines specific steps to be taken to implement the goals, objectives, and policies.

Reason for Project:

The City initiated an update to the HCRE because the existing local landmarks list in Table HCR-2 needs updating. Many of the properties listed in the local landmarks list have since been demolished or significantly altered while others are archaeological or not historic.

Proposed Changes:

Only the historic resources component of the HCRE is proposed to be updated at this time. The cultural resources component is not being revised. A copy of the HCRE update is provided in Attachment 1 and includes the following notable changes:

1) The history of Huntington Beach and the predominant architectural styles remaining found on pages II-HCR-1 through -5 of the existing HCRE were substantially re-written.

2) The historic resources section on pages II-HCR-6 through -16 was substantially re-written.

3) Figure HCR-1 (Historical Resources) on page II-HCR-7, Tables HCR-1 (Category Ratings for Historical Landmarks) and -2 (1991 Local Landmarks) on pages II-HCR-8 through -11, and the
photos of historic resources on pages II-HCR-12 and -13 were deleted. Instead of continuing to include a local landmarks list in the HCRE, the City will maintain a separate local landmarks list which includes all the properties in the city that have been identified as having historic significance. This will allow future updates to the list as needed without requiring an amendment to the HCRE. The updated local landmarks list is shown in Appendix B of the City of Huntington Beach Historic Context and Survey Report (updated June 2014).

Table HCR-2 lists 79 local landmarks comprised of 212 properties in 1991. The current status of these landmarks is noted in Attachment 2 and summarized as follows:

- 79 properties have been carried over into the updated landmarks list;
- 133 properties have been demolished, heavily altered, or are not historic and have been removed from the updated landmarks list.

The updated list in Appendix B includes 260 local landmarks and is included as Attachment 3.

4) The issues relating to historic resources on pages II-HCR-20 through -23 have been updated and added to.

5) Several goals, objectives, policies and implementation programs relating to historic resources found on pages II-HCR-23 through -30 have been updated.

**Historical Context and Survey Report:**

As part of the HCRE update, Galvin Preservation Associates (GPA) conducted a citywide survey to identify and evaluate potential historic resources in the city. The purpose of the survey is to update and expand the City’s existing 1986 Historic Resources Survey Report and to update the HCRE. The survey included a reconnaissance level survey of all buildings in the city constructed prior to 1959 (i.e. structures that are at least 50 years old when the survey was commenced in 2009), focusing on the historic core areas as well as select buildings located outside the historic core and other outlying areas identified by the Huntington Beach Historic Resources Board. The results of the survey are outlined in the Historic Context and Survey Report (updated June 2014) by GPA which is referred to in the HCRE.

The updated local landmarks list, included in Appendix B of the Historic Context and Survey Report, would serve as a list of historic resources for purposes of evaluating future projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Historic resources on the updated list that are proposed to be demolished would require environmental review under CEQA. Furthermore, any construction work on a historic resource must comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties in order to be exempt from CEQA environmental review.

In addition, GPA reviewed the three previously proposed potential historic districts in the 1986 survey and determined that they no longer maintain enough integrity to be considered historic districts according to national, state, and local register criteria. GPA identified two smaller concentrations of buildings in the 2014 Historic Context and Survey Report that would constitute a local historic district as follows:

a. Main Street-Crest Avenue – This district is located on Main Street and Crest Avenue between 11th Street and Palm Avenue.
b. 9th Street – This district includes most of the west side of 9th Street between Walnut Avenue and Olive Avenue.

The HCRE update does not propose or require any new land use, development projects, or physical changes and would not result in changes in zoning or allowable uses for any property.

8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING: Not applicable

9. OTHER PREVIOUS RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: None

10. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED) (i.e. permits, financing approval, or participating agreement): None
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Land Use / Planning
- Transportation / Traffic
- Public Services
- Population / Housing
- Biological Resources
- Utilities / Service Systems
- Geology / Soils
- Mineral Resources
- Aesthetics
- Hydrology / Water Quality
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Cultural Resources
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Recreation
- Agriculture Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION
(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **CANNOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or a “potentially significant unless mitigated impact” on the environment, but at least one impact (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, **nothing further is required.**

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
Ricky Ramos ___________________________ Senior Planner ___________________________
Printed Name ___________________________ Title ___________________________
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EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XIX at the end of the checklist.

6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XIX. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.

7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix G of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the City of Huntington Beach’s requirements.

---

SAMPLE QUESTION:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides? (Sources: 1, 6)

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Huntington Beach General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).
I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Sources: 1, 3, 4) ☒

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1 and 3) ☒

c) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1 and 3) ☒

Discussion a-c: The HCRE update is not in conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of the City. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. The update is consistent with the other General Plan elements including the policies and objective listed below and any applicable regulations:

Policy LU 4.2.2 – Permit historically significant buildings to vary from standard City codes; providing that the variations do not endanger human life and buildings comply with the State Historical Code.

Objective LU 15.3 – Facilitate the preservation of historically and architecturally significant points, structures, sites and districts.

Policy LU 15.3.1 – Encourage that structures designated with a “Historic Preservation Overlay” be retained, unless infeasible due to structural conditions or costs that prohibit a reasonable economic use of the property.

Several properties that are in the 1991 Local Landmarks list in the existing HCRE are proposed to be eliminated from the list (see Attachment No. 2 for current disposition/status) primarily because they have either been demolished, significantly altered, are archaeological in nature, or are not historic due to age. An updated landmarks list has been prepared with the Historic Context and Survey Report to include only qualified historic resources.

The HCRE update focuses on policies and technical information regarding historic resources and will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. It does not involve any physical changes that would divide an established community. No impacts are anticipated.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extensions of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 3 and 10) ☒

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing ☒
elsewhere? (Sources: 3 and 10)

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 3 and 10)

**Discussion a-c:** The HCRE update does not propose any new homes, businesses, or extensions of roads or infrastructure. It does not involve the displacement of existing housing or residents. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. No impacts are anticipated.

### III. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving (Sources: 1, 3, 10, 13)

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Sources: 3 and 10)

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

iv) Landslides? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Sources: 1, 3, 10, 13)

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of
septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

Discussion a-e: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any new construction or physical changes. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. Therefore, it would not expose people or structures to earthquake faults, seismic ground shaking/ground failure, or landslides. It will not result in soil erosion or any other geologic impacts. No impacts are anticipated.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Sources: 1, 3, 8, 10)

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1, 3, 8, 10)

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1, 3, 8, 10)

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

k) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from construction activities? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

l) Potentially impact stormwater runoff from post-construction activities? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

m) Result in a potential for discharge of stormwater pollutants from areas of material storage, vehicle or equipment fueling, vehicle or equipment maintenance (including washing), waste handling, hazardous materials handling or storage, delivery areas, loading docks or other outdoor work areas? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

n) Result in the potential for discharge of stormwater to affect the beneficial uses of the receiving waters? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

o) Create or contribute significant increases in the flow velocity or volume of stormwater runoff to cause environmental harm? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

p) Create or contribute significant increases in erosion of the project site or surrounding areas? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
**Discussion a-p:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any new construction or physical changes. Therefore, it would not affect water quality standards or groundwater supplies, create or contribute to runoff or erosion, or alter existing drainage patterns. It would not expose people or structures to the flood hazard areas or inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflows. No impacts are anticipated.

**V. AIR QUALITY.** The city has identified the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district as appropriate to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

**Discussion a-e:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any land use, new construction, or physical changes and will not result in any emissions. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. Therefore, it would not affect any air quality standards or plans, cause substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors. No impacts are anticipated.

**VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways,
pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?  
(Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management 
program, including, but not limited to level of service 
standards and travel demand measures, or other 
standards established by the county congestion 
management agency for designated roads or highways?  
(Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either 
an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that 
results in substantial safety risks?  (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature 
(e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or 
incompatible uses?  (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?  (Sources: 1, 3, 
10)

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs 
regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, 
or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such 
facilities?  (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

Discussion a-g:  The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation 
programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the 
city.  The HCRE update is consistent with the General Plan including the Circulation Element.  It does not 
propose any land use, new construction, or physical changes.  It does not change the General Plan land use or 
zoning designation on any property.  Therefore, it will not result in any additional traffic or congestion, change 
in air traffic patterns, increase hazards due to a design feature, or affect emergency access, parking, or any 
component of the circulation system.  No impacts are anticipated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.  Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or 
through habitat modifications, on any species identified 
as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in 
local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the 
California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish 
and Wildlife Service?  (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

Discussion a-f: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any new construction or physical changes. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. In addition, existing policies for historic tree preservation are not proposed to be deleted or revised as part of the HCRE update. Therefore, it will not result in any habitat or wetland modifications, interference with the movement of any fish or wildlife, tree removal, or conflict with any HCP or NCCP. No impacts are anticipated.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ □ ❇
**Discussion a-b:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any new construction, physical changes, or policies that would affect any mineral resource recovery in the city. No impacts are anticipated.

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.**

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous material, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ ☒

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including □ □ □ ☒
where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
(Sources: 1, 3, 10)

**Discussion a-h:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any land use, new construction, or physical changes and does not involve the transport, handling, use or emission of hazardous materials. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. It does not include any policies that relate to emergency response or exposure to wildland fires. No impacts are anticipated.

**X. NOISE.** Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

**Discussion a-f:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, new construction, or physical changes, or the establishment of a land use that would generate or expose people to any noise in the short- or long-term. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. No impacts are anticipated.

**XI. PUBLIC SERVICES.** Would the project result in
substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

d) Parks? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

e) Other public facilities or governmental services?
   (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

Discussion a-e: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, new construction, or physical changes that would result in an increase in the demand for public services or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. No impacts are anticipated.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
   □ □ □ X

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the
project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

h) Include a new or retrofitted storm water treatment control Best Management Practice (BMP), (e.g. water quality treatment basin, constructed treatment wetlands?) (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

**Discussion a-g:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, land use, new construction, or physical changes that would result in an increase in demand for utilities and service systems or the construction of new facilities. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. No impacts are anticipated.

**XIII. AESTHETICS.** Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)
Discussion a-d: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, new construction, or physical changes that would have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista or create a new source of light or glare. It does not propose removal or alteration of scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The HCRE update includes policies that encourage rehabilitation of historic structures in accordance with state and federal design standards as well as policies that provide incentives for private property owners to maintain and enhance their structures. No negative impacts are anticipated.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 3, 4, 5, 10)

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site unique geologic feature? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

Discussion a-d: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The following policies were strengthened to provide more protection of historic resources:

HCR 1.1.1 - Continually update the existing citywide survey of historic resources.

HCR 1.1.2 - Consider the designation of any historically significant public trees, archaeological sites, parks, structures, sites or areas deemed to be of historical, archaeological, or cultural significance as a Huntington Beach City Historical Point, Site or District.

HCR 1.1.3 - Consider establishing a historic overlay for historic structures throughout the City. The overlay should be structured to allow the underlying land use to continue as well as support the reuse of the historic structure.

HCR 1.2.1 - Utilize the State of California Historic Building Code, Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, and standards and guidelines as prescribed by the State Office of Historic Preservation as the architectural and landscape design standards for rehabilitation, alteration, or additions to sites containing historic resources in order to preserve these structures in a manner consistent with the site’s architectural and historic integrity.
**HCR 1.3.1 - Encourage** owners of eligible historic income-producing properties to use the tax benefits provided by the 1981 Tax Revenue Act as well as all subsequent and future financial incentives.

The HCRE update does not propose any policies, new construction, or physical changes that would have a substantial adverse impact on a historical, archaeological, paleontological, or geological resource or disturb any human remains. The HCRE update actually promotes the preservation of historic resources in the city that have been identified based on accepted criteria during a recent historic resources survey. As a result of the recent historic resources survey, 260 local landmarks have been identified which is an increase from the original 212 in the existing HCRE. No negative impacts are anticipated.

**XV. RECREATION.** Would the project:

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood, community and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion a-c:** The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, land use, new construction, or physical changes that would increase the use of, or affect park and recreational facilities, or propose the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. Triangle Park and Lake Park have been added to the local landmarks list but it would not affect existing recreational opportunities. No impacts are anticipated.

**XVI. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES.** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ x □ □

c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ x

Discussion a-c: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, new construction, or physical changes that would convert any farmland to non-agricultural use or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. No impacts are anticipated.

XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ x

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ x

Discussion a-b: The HCRE update involves updates to the goals, policies, objectives, implementation programs, and technical information, among others, relating to the preservation of historic resources in the city. The HCRE update does not propose any policies, land use, new construction, or physical changes that will result in any emissions. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. Therefore, it would not generate greenhouse gas emissions or conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. No impacts are anticipated.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Sources: 1, 3, 10) □ □ □ x

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1, 3, 4, 5, 10) □ □ □ x
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1, 3, 10)

Discussion a-c: Based on the analysis in Section I-XVII the HCRE is an update to an existing policy document pertaining to historic resources. It does not propose any land use, new construction, or any physical changes. It does not change the General Plan land use or zoning designation on any property. It does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. It would not result in any cumulatively considerable adverse impacts or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. No impacts are anticipated.
XIX. EARLIER ANALYSIS/SOURCE LIST.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D). Earlier documents prepared and utilized in this analysis, as well as sources of information are as follows:

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Available for Review at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach General Plan</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Planning and Building Dept., 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach and at <a href="http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/gp/index.cfm">http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/Government/Departments/Planning/gp/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach City Clerk’s Office, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach and at <a href="http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/elected_officials/city_clerk/zoning_code/index.cfm">http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/elected_officials/city_clerk/zoning_code/index.cfm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft Historic and Cultural Resources Element Update (June 2014)</td>
<td>See Attachment #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1991 Local Landmarks List with Current Status</td>
<td>See Attachment #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Appendix B (Updated Landmarks List) of Historic Context and Survey Report (Updated June 2014)</td>
<td>See Attachment #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Historic Context and Survey Report (Updated June 2014)</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Planning and Building Dept., 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Geotechnical Inputs Report</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach Planning and Building Dept., 2000 Main St. Huntington Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (Dec. 2009)</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CEQA Air Quality Handbook</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Huntington Beach CEQA Procedure Handbook</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>State Seismic Hazard Zones Map</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14  Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List  www.calepa.gov/sitecleanup/cortese

15  City of Huntington Beach Municipal Code  City of Huntington Beach City Clerk’s Office, 2000 Main St., Huntington Beach and at http://www.huntingtonbeachca.gov/government/charter_codes/municipal_code.cfm