APPENDIX A
CEQA Environmental Checklist Form

The CEQA checklist identifies the impacts of the alternatives for the proposed Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project. In most cases, technical studies determined the impacts of each environmental resource for each alternative of the proposed project. Further supporting documentation is provided in Chapter 3.0 of this Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, where impacts, plus feasible avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are discussed for each environmental resource addressed. The indicated impact determination is based upon the worst-case alternative.

1. Project title:
   Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project

2. Lead agency name and address:
   California Department of Transportation, District 7
   100 South Main Street
   Los Angeles, CA 90012

3. Contact person and phone number:
   Karl Price (213) 897-1839

4. Project location:
   Terminal Island and Commodore Schuyler Heim Bridge within the Ports of Long Beach and
   Los Angeles; SR-47 and SR-03 from Terminal Island generally to I-405

5. Project sponsor’s name and address:
   Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority
   One Civic Plaza, Suite 6
   Carson, CA 90745


8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
   The lead agency and project sponsor propose to replace the seismically deficient Schuyler Heim Bridge, construct an elevated four-lane expressway between Ocean Boulevard and Alameda Street just south of Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1), and construct a flyover from eastbound Ocean Boulevard to SR-47 at the Schuyler Heim Bridge.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project’s surroundings:
   The study area is highly developed, with heavy industrial, commercial, transportation, and some recreational uses. Some residential uses occur to the west of Alternative 1 and east of Alternative 2.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
    USDOT, USFWS, California Coastal Commission, CDFG, RWQCB, City of Los Angeles, City of Long Beach, County of Los Angeles.
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” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities / Service Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology / Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology / Soils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use / Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population / Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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 “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 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**

**Signature**

**Date**

Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project
Draft EIS/EIR
ES012007010SCO/ba6227.doc/06262009
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 projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including 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) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” 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 from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” 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). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance
ISSUE CHECKLIST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? □ □ □ X

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? □ □ □ X

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? □ □ X □

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? □ □ X □

II. 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? □ □ □ X

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? □ □ □ 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? □ □ □ X

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? □ □ □ X

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? X □ □ □

c) 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)? X □ □ □
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. 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:

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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

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?

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?

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 waste water?

VII. 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?

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?

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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?
### APPENDIX A. CEQA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>e)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g)</strong> Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a)</strong> Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b)</strong> 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)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>d)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>e)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>f)</strong> Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>g)</strong> 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>h)</strong> Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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?

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING** – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

b) 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?

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

**X. 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?

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?

**XI. 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?

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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?

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?
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for 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:

- Fire protection?
- Police protection?
- Schools?
- Parks?
- Other public facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

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?

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? □ □ □ □

e) Result in inadequate emergency access? □ □ □ □

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? □ □ □ □

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? □ □ □ □

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? □ □ □ □

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? □ □ □ □

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? □ □ □ □

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? □ □ □ □
**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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?

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)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
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1.0 Section 4(f) Evaluation

1.1 Application of Section 4(f)

1.1.1 Introduction

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, codified at 49 USC Section 303, declares that “[i]t is the policy of the United States Government that special effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside and public park and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites.”

Section 4(f) specifies that

[t]he Secretary [of Transportation] may approve a transportation program or project requiring the use of publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or land of an historic site of national, state, or local significance (as determined by the federal, state, or local officials having jurisdiction over the park, area, refuge or site) only if

(1) there is no prudent and feasible alternative to using that land; and
(2) the program or project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the park, recreation area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or historic site resulting from the use.

Section 4(f) further requires consultation with the Department of Interior and, as appropriate, the involved offices of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and relevant state and local officials, in developing transportation projects and programs that use lands protected by Section 4(f).

The proposed Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and State Route (SR)-47 Expressway Project (proposed project) alternatives, as described in Chapter 2, are a transportation project that may receive federal funding and/or discretionary approvals through the U.S. Department of Transportation (i.e., FHWA [Federal Highway Administration]); therefore, documentation of compliance with Section 4(f) is required.

This Section 4(f) evaluation has been prepared in accordance with the joint FHWA/Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations for Section 4(f) compliance codified at 23 CFR Section 771.135. Additional guidance has been obtained from the FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8A (1987) and the revised FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper (2005).

1.1.2 Section 4(f) “Use”

As defined in 23 CFR Section 771.135(p), the “use” of a protected Section 4(f) resource occurs when any of the following conditions are met:

- Land is permanently incorporated into a transportation facility through partial or full acquisition (i.e., “direct use”).
There is a temporary occupancy of land that is adverse in terms of the preservationist purposes of Section 4(f).

There is no permanent incorporation of land, but the proximity of a transportation facility results in impacts so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify a resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired (i.e., “constructive use”).

Direct Use
A direct use of a Section 4(f) resource takes place when property is permanently incorporated into a proposed transportation project (23 CFR Section 771.135[p][1]). This may occur as a result of partial or full acquisition of a fee simple interest, permanent easements, or temporary easements that exceed regulatory limits noted below (23 CFR Section 771.135[p][7]).

Temporary Occupancy
A temporary occupancy of a Section 4(f) resource occurs when the temporary occupancy is considered adverse in terms of the preservationist purposes of the Section 4(f) statute. Under the FTA/FHWA regulations (23 CFR Section 771.135[p][7]), a temporary occupancy of property does not constitute a use of a Section 4(f) resource when the following conditions are satisfied:

- The occupancy is of temporary duration (i.e., shorter than the period of construction) and not involve a change in ownership of the property.
- The scope of work is minor, with only minimal changes to the protected resource.
- There are no permanent adverse physical effects on the protected resource, and there will be no temporary or permanent interference with the activities or purpose of the resource.
- The property being used will be fully restored to a condition that is at least as good as that which existed prior to the proposed project.
- There is documented agreement of the appropriate officials having jurisdiction over the resource regarding the foregoing requirements.

Constructive Use
A constructive use of a Section 4(f) resource happens when a transportation project does not permanently incorporate land from the resource, but the proximity of the project results in impacts (e.g., noise, vibration, visual, access, and/or ecological impacts) so severe that the protected activities, features, or attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f) are substantially impaired (23 CFR Section 771.135[p][2]). Substantial impairment occurs only if the protected activities, features, or attributes of the resource are substantially diminished.

This determination is made through the following practices:

- Identification of the current activities, features, or attributes of the resource that may be sensitive to proximity impacts.
- Analysis of the potential proximity impacts on the resource.
Consultation with the appropriate officials having jurisdiction over the resource (23 CFR Section 771.135(p)(6)).

1.2 Purpose and Need

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans identified the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge as not conforming to the current seismic criteria. Concurrently, the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority confirmed the existing SR-47/SR-103 facilities do not comply with the State’s Seismic Design Criteria or adequately serve as a high-capacity alternative route to SR-110 and SR-710 due to numerous at-grade railroad crossings and traffic signals.

The purpose of the proposed project is to: 1) provide a structurally and seismically safe vehicular connection between Terminal Island and the mainland that could remain in service following a major earthquake; and 2) provide a high-capacity alternative route between Terminal Island and I-405. The project includes replacement of the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge (lift-bridge) with a fixed-span bridge. The project is needed to provide for uninterrupted transport of people, freight, and goods between Terminal Island and the mainland after a major earthquake, and to improve safety and relieve congestion on the local street network.

1.3 Proposed Action

1.3.1 Description

The proposed project is to improve traffic conditions between Terminal Island, which is located within the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, and major traffic arterials on the mainland to the north, primarily within the Cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles. The Commodore Schuyler F. Heim Bridge (Schuyler Heim Bridge) (Bridge No. 53-2618) is a major traffic route that connects Terminal Island within the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles to the mainland cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles. The bridge is owned by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and is located within the City of Los Angeles and through property owned by the Port of Long Beach. The bridge spans the Cerritos Channel, through which ships serving both the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach pass. Six alternatives have been proposed for analysis in an Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the proposed project. There are four build alternatives, one Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative, and one No-Build alternative. These alternatives are described below. The four build alternatives are shown in Figure 1.

Alternative 1: Bridge Replacement and Expressway

Alternative 1 would replace the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge (lift bridge) (built in 1946-1948) in order to meet current seismic criteria. The bridge would provide a route linking Terminal Island to the mainland and would be designed to remain in service and ensure ground and vessel transportation is possible immediately following a major earthquake. Alternative 1 would include a new SR-47 Expressway to provide a high-capacity alternative route along the Alameda Corridor for traffic between Terminal Island and Alameda Street,
at Pacific Coast Highway, as well as improvements to the Alameda Street/Wardlow Road connector ramp. In addition, Alternative 1 would provide the Ocean Boulevard/SR-47 Flyover (flyover) on Terminal Island. The flyover will be a two-lane, elevated structure to divert traffic bound for northbound SR-47 directly onto the new bridge from eastbound Ocean Boulevard. This traffic then would be able to avoid the signalized Ocean Boulevard/SR-47 intersection.

With this alternative, the new fixed-span bridge would be constructed, primarily within the existing bridge right-of-way (ROW) (Caltrans Highway Easement [HE(C)]), but toward the east to avoid impacts to the railroad on the Badger Avenue Bridge, which is immediately west of the existing bridge.

The replacement bridge would be slightly wider (13 m [43 ft]) than the existing bridge due to the addition of standard shoulders, which are not present on the existing bridge. The replacement bridge would include three 3.6-m (12-ft) traffic lanes (two through-lanes and one auxiliary lane), and 3-m (10-ft) shoulders in the northbound direction, and four 3.6-m (12-ft) lanes (three through-lanes and one auxiliary lane), and 3-m (10-ft) shoulders in the southbound direction. Construction of the replacement bridge would include a southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp at New Dock Street on Terminal Island, as well as a northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp at Henry Ford Avenue on the mainland side of the bridge. With this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by four piers in the channel, with a minimum vertical clearance of 14.3 m (47 ft) over the mean high water level (MHWL). The existing navigable width of the channel is 54.9 m (180 ft), and would not change under this alternative. The navigable width is directly tied to the navigable width (54.9 m [180 ft]) of the Badger Avenue Bridge (rail) located immediately west of the Schuyler Heim Bridge.

The southern end of the new SR-47 Expressway would begin on Terminal Island, at the intersection of SR-47 and Ocean Boulevard, and extend north over New Dock Street and onto the replacement bridge. The expressway would extend northward to Alameda Street, at the intersection with Pacific Coast Highway, a distance of approximately 2.7 kilometers (km) (1.7 miles [mi]). The expressway would be a four-lane, limited access roadway. It would provide grade-separation at five at-grade railroad crossings and three signalized intersections along its length. A segment of the expressway would be constructed as an elevated roadway (viaduct) over Henry Ford Avenue and Alameda Street and return to grade at Alameda Street, just south of Pacific Coast Highway. Under this alternative, the current connectivity to SR-103 would be maintained. This alternative includes improvements to the Alameda Street/Wardlow Road connector and to Alameda Street north and south of the connector.
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Alternative 1A: Haunch Bridge Design

Alternative 1A is a structural variation of Alternative 1. The main purpose of this alternative is to improve the aesthetic appearance of the replacement bridge over the Cerritos Channel and to span a greater horizontal distance across the channel between columns. This is accomplished by increasing the span lengths over the channel and arching the superstructure soffits (the bottom of the bridge structure). Under this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by two piers (four columns) in the Cerritos Channel, compared to four piers (eight columns) under Alternative 1; and the minimum vertical clearance between the piers would be of 14.3 m (47 ft).

With this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by two piers in the channel, with a minimum vertical clearance of 14.3 m (47 ft) over the MHWL. The existing navigable width of the channel is 54.9 m (180 ft), and would not change under this alternative. The navigable width is directly tied to the navigable width (54.9 m [180 ft]) of the Badger Avenue Bridge (rail) located immediately west of the Schuyler Heim Bridge.

Other aspects of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 1.

Alternative 2: SR-103 Extension to Alameda Street

With this alternative, just as in Alternative 1, a new fixed-span bridge would be constructed, and the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge would be subsequently demolished. Additionally, modifications to the northbound and southbound approaches to the bridge would be constructed. Similar to Alternative 1, a new southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp at New Dock Street on Terminal Island would be constructed. This alternative would include the flyover and also would extend SR-103 from south of West Hill Street to the northwest on a four-lane viaduct to join Alameda Street between Sepulveda Boulevard and I-405. Improvements to SR-103 would begin approximately 3.2 km (2 mi) north of the Schuyler Heim Bridge and extend a distance of approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi). The viaduct would cross over the Union Pacific Railroad manual yard and San Pedro Branch line, through the Southern California Edison (SCE) utility corridor, across the Los Angeles Harbor Department Warehouse 16/17 area, and over Sepulveda Boulevard, then turn parallel to the western boundary of the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) to the centerline of Alameda Street. The viaduct would return to grade south of the Wardlow Road ramps to I-405. Improvements would be made to the existing SR-103 to accommodate the southerly end connection of the viaduct and to SR-47 to accommodate the northerly end connection of the viaduct. This alternative also includes widening the Alameda Street/Wardlow Road connector and improvements to Alameda Street north and south of the connector.

Alternative 3: Bridge Avoidance

This alternative was developed specifically as a potential avoidance alternative for the purpose of Section 4(f) analysis. It was conceived to preserve the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge following construction of a new fixed-span bridge on an alignment east of the existing bridge. The Schuyler Heim Bridge would be seismically retrofitted before construction of the new bridge; however, the Schuyler Heim Bridge would no longer be used for transportation purposes once the new span goes into operation. The retrofit would be for safety purposes, to avoid demolition of a historic resource and ensure that the
existing bridge would not collapse and result in safety hazards or damage to the new bridge or to the adjacent Badger Avenue Bridge. Under this alternative, the new bridge would have the same lane configuration as the replacement bridge for Alternative 1.

Other aspects of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 1.

The existing bridge may be required to be demolished to comply with U.S. Coast Guard permit requirements. In preliminary consultations held in December 2005, the U.S. Coast Guard stated that the bridge would not be allowed to remain in place if not used for transportation purposes. They further indicated that their permit to construct a replacement bridge would include a requirement for subsequent demolition of the Schuyler Heim Bridge.

**Alternative 4: Bridge Replacement Only**

This alternative would replace the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge with a fixed-span bridge, largely along the existing bridge alignment, as described under Alternative 1. With this alternative, the flyover would not be constructed, and no roadway improvements would occur. Therefore, the SR-47 Expressway described in Alternative 1 would not be constructed, the SR-103 extension to Alameda Street described in Alternative 2 would not be constructed, and there would be no improvements to the Alameda Street/Wardlow Road connector ramp.

**Alternative 5: Transportation System Management**

This alternative is designed to identify low-cost, easily implemented improvements as an alternative to construction of more expensive improvements. For this project, the TSM alternative focuses on improvements to routes that parallel the proposed SR-47 Expressway, and that serve the same trips. These trips include trucking drayage trips to and from the ICTF, and trips destined to and from the ports via Alameda Street, Henry Ford Avenue, and SR-47. The TSM alternative would include measures to improve capacity and traffic circulation at the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles through policy changes and use of the latest technologies. With this alternative, capital investment would be minimal compared to the previous alternatives addressed.

The TSM alternative for this project includes the following key elements:

- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Systems applications in and around the Port area, with special emphasis on truck movements. These include measures to improve traffic circulation through traffic control, incident management, traffic surveillance, and traffic information dissemination with the aid of intelligent transportation system devices and systems.

- Lower-cost roadway and intersection improvements: Measures include restriping to provide additional turn lanes and acceleration lanes and traffic signalization improvements, primarily within existing ROWs.

- Minor roadway widening: There also could be peak-hour parking prohibitions to remove midblock bottlenecks along selected roadways.
**Alternative 6: No Build**

Under this alternative there would be no changes to the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or local roadway system. The existing Schuyler Heim Bridge would continue to be seismically inadequate and subject to damage or collapse under strong seismic conditions. Maintenance activities would continue and would include application of protective coatings; lift mechanism repairs; deck resurfacing; and other, maintenance activities. The existing SR-47 roadway would function with current and increasing levels of congestion.

### 1.4 Description of Section 4(f) Resources

As noted above, properties subject to Section 4(f) consideration include publicly owned lands of a public park/recreation area; a wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance; or a historic site of national, state, or local significance, whether publicly or privately owned. Only those resources within about 0.4 km (0.25 mi) of the proposed project alternatives have been identified as being potentially affected by project impacts and thus subject to detailed Section 4(f) evaluation. These include three parks and recreational areas: Hudson Park, Hudson Elementary School, and Cabrillo High School. One historic resource is also identified: the Schuyler Heim Bridge. Three other parks are within 0.8 km (0.5 mi) of the project alternatives, but have no potential to be affected. These are: Admiral Kidd Park, East Wilmington Park, and the East Wilmington Greenbelt. No other significant historic resources were identified within 0.5 mile of the project.

As described more fully below, the Section 4(f) resources in the vicinity of the proposed project alternatives are limited to publicly owned parks/recreation areas and one significant historic site. Figure 2 illustrates the location of these Section 4(f) resources. There are no significant wildlife or waterfowl refuges in the proposed project area.

**Public Parks and Recreation Areas with No Potential 4(f) Use**

Three parks (Admiral Kidd Park, East Wilmington Park, and East Wilmington Greenbelt) are over 0.4 km (0.25 mi) from the site and are buffered from the project alternatives by distance (i.e., about 1,000 feet) and the presence of intervening structures. There is no reasonable likelihood that any direct, temporary, or constructive use would occur.

**1.4.2 Public Parks and Recreation Areas with Potential 4(f) Use**

One public park and two public schools where playgrounds/athletic fields are used for public recreation (Hudson Park, Hudson Elementary School, Cabrillo High School) have been identified within about 0.4 km (0.25 mi) of the project alternatives. These three properties are immediately adjacent to the Alternative 2 alignment. Table 1 provides a summary listing of these resources. Detailed descriptions are provided in Section 1.5 - Effects on Section 4(f) Resources.
TABLE 1
Section 4(f) Resources – Public Parks and Recreation Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hudson Park</td>
<td>2335 Webster Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hudson Elementary School (Playground/Athletic Fields)</td>
<td>2335 Webster Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cabrillo High School (Playground/Athletic Fields)</td>
<td>2001 Santa Fe Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jones & Stokes, 2006.

1.4.3 Historic Sites

A total of 38 historic sites have been identified in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) for the proposed project alternatives. All of these sites are architectural resources. No prehistoric or historical archeological resources were identified within or adjacent to the APE. In accordance with FTA/FHWA regulations, Section 4(f) requirements are only applicable to significant historic sites (i.e., those sites on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP], or sites otherwise determined significant by the FHWA Administrator) (23 CFR Section 771.135[e]). Table 2 provides a summary of the characteristics of each historic site identified within the APE, along with a determination of which of these sites has been determined significant for Section 4(f) purposes (pending completion of Section 106 determinations of eligibility, and concurrence by State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). A detailed description of the one significant historic site in the APE (the Schuyler Heim Bridge) is provided in Section 1.5 – Effects on Section 4(f) Resources.

1.5 Effects on Section 4(f) Resources

The following sections describe how the proposed project alternatives would affect Section 4(f) resources. A summary of potential effects is provided below in Table 3; additional analysis follows for each affected resource. This includes whether any permanent or temporary occupation of a property would occur, or whether the proximity of the project would cause any access disruption, noise, vibration, or aesthetic effects that would substantially impair the features or attributes that qualify the resource for protection under Section 4(f).
### TABLE 2
Summary of Historic Sites within the Area of Potential Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Significance under Section 4(f)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Significant / Potentially Significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*** None in APE ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archaeological Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not Significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*** None in APE ***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Significant / Potentially Significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge</td>
<td>Ocean Blvd./SR-47</td>
<td>Eligible for NRHP (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge Retrofit IS/EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Architectural Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Not Significant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alameda Motel</td>
<td>1050 N. Alameda St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kar’s</td>
<td>1260 N. Alameda St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alco Truck &amp; Vans</td>
<td>1230 N. Alameda St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim’s #2 Char-Broiled</td>
<td>1601 E. Anaheim St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamburgers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fast Truck &amp; Tire Service</td>
<td>1625 E. Anaheim St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1539 E. Denni St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savage Industries, Inc.</td>
<td>1634 E. Denni St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Push &amp; Pull Express, Inc.</td>
<td>1609 E. Grant St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Mutualista De San Jose</td>
<td>1023-27 N. Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmington Recyclers</td>
<td>1120 N. Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1041 N. Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for Joaquin Fernandez</td>
<td>1563 E. L St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for Joaquin Fernandez</td>
<td>1559 E. L St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1538 E. L St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rooming House for Mrs. Inge</td>
<td>1725-31 E. M St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Coe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for D.G. Grant</td>
<td>1710 E. Mauretanía St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for Fred M. Yulk</td>
<td>1714 E. Mauretanía St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS Equipment</td>
<td>1674 E. Mauretanía St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1733 Adivari Inc.</td>
<td>1733 E. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for Frank Gonzalez</td>
<td>1621 E. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House for Frank M. Gonzalez</td>
<td>1617 E. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frank M. Gonzalez Residence</td>
<td>1619 R. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrather Construction Company</td>
<td>1702 E. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1544 E. Young St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1539-41 E. Young St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2
Summary of Historic Sites within the Area of Potential Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map #</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Significance under Section 4(f)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oil Wells</td>
<td>South side of the Cerritos Channel and east of the Schuyler Heim Bridge</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Route 47</td>
<td>North and south of Schuyler Heim Bridge</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>916 N. Henry Ford Ave.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1622 E. Robidoux St.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhist Temple</td>
<td>2100 W. Willow St., Long Beach</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concession and Restroom facility</td>
<td>Hudson Park, Long Beach</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chem and Oil Tanks</td>
<td>2365 Sepulveda Blvd., L.A.</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>22440 S. Alameda St., Carson</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor Recycling</td>
<td>22440 S. Alameda St., Carson</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carson Autowrecking</td>
<td>22606 S. Alameda St., Carson</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hertz Equipment Rental</td>
<td>22422 S. Alameda St., Carson</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIPLAS</td>
<td>2430 E. 223rd St., Carson</td>
<td>Not eligible for CRHP or NRHP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A resource is considered to be “significant” for purposes of Section 4(f) if it is on or eligible for the NRHP (or otherwise determined important by the FHWA Administrator). Resources identified as “potentially eligible” and “not eligible” are awaiting concurrence from the SHPO.

Source: Jones & Stokes (2004).

### TABLE 3
Summary of Potential Effects on Section 4(f) Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Direct Use</th>
<th>Temporary Occupancy</th>
<th>Constructive Use</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Hudson Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct Use – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Occupancy – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive Use – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Hudson Elementary School (playground/athletic fields)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct Use – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Occupancy – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive Use – None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.0 SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION

TABLE 3
Summary of Potential Effects on Section 4(f) Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Direct Use</th>
<th>Temporary Occupancy</th>
<th>Constructive Use</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Use – Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4. The bridge would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demolished under Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, and 4 to prevent future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>safety impacts to the Cerritos Channel from long-term deterioration of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bridge. Loss of bridge approaches and loss of use as a vehicular bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under Alternative 3 would result in a direct use. The bridge would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demolished under Alternative 3 to comply with requirements of the U.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coast Guard permit, also resulting in direct use of the resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>Cabrillo High School</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Direct Use – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(playground/athletic fields)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary Occupancy – None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constructive Use – None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jones & Stokes, 2005.

1.5.1 Public Parks and Recreation Areas

The discussion of Hudson Park, the Hudson Elementary School Playground/Athletic Field, and Cabrillo High School playground/athletic field is pertinent only to Alternative 2, which involves extension of SR-103. Alternatives 1, 1A, 3, 4, 5, and 6 do not propose improvements in the proximity of park/recreation areas. (Please see Figure 2 for location of alternatives and the park/recreation areas.)

1.5.1.1 Hudson Park

Description and Significance of Property

Type/Location/Size
Hudson Park occupies 13.06 acres at 2335 Webster Avenue in the City of Long Beach. The west side of the park is adjacent to SR-103.

Access/Facilities/Usage
Vehicular and pedestrian access to Hudson Park is from Webster Avenue. The facilities include two baseball fields, one soccer field, a picnic area, and play equipment. The park is used for active recreation and is popular for adult sports leagues.

Relationship to Similar Facilities in the Area
Hudson Park is located immediately south of the playground and athletic fields at Hudson Elementary School.

Ownership/Jurisdiction
Hudson Park is owned by, and subject to the jurisdiction of, the City of Long Beach.
**Significance**
Hudson Park is a City of Long Beach park and recreational resource.

**Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use**

*Direct Use*
The proposed project alternatives would not require any permanent use (property acquisition) of Hudson Park.

*Temporary Occupancy*
The proposed project alternatives would not require any temporary occupancy of Hudson Park.

*Constructive Use*
The proposed project alternatives would not impose constructive uses on Hudson Park.

*Noise*
Only Alternative 2 would affect this park. Alternative 2 would include construction of an elevated SR-103 expressway approximately 46 m (150 ft) from the west side of Hudson Park. The park is used for active sports and athletic sports activities that do not require quiet surroundings. Also, the existing park is located near a large industrial area; and a busy traffic corridor borders the western boundary of park. According to the noise study prepared for the project (Caltrans, February 2005), noise levels are expected to exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 dBA in association with Alternative 2. Abatement measures, such as noise walls, have been proposed at locations where adverse impacts were identified. No noise impacts to park users were identified as a result of Alternative 2 after abatement.

Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Noise (Section 3.14) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

*Aesthetics*
The analysis of aesthetic effects in the Draft Visual Impact Assessment prepared for the project reported that the extension of SR-103 to Alameda Street to the northwest as proposed under Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial adverse aesthetic effect at this park. Views to or from the park are not a feature or characteristic of the property.

However, under Alternative 2, the following measures would be implemented to enhance the aesthetics of the expressway along its entire length, including the portion of the expressway in the vicinity of Hudson Park.

- The surfaces of columns, roadways barriers, soundwalls, and gore points will receive surface color treatments at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.

- Elements of the design of the proposed bridge and expressways, such as color, line, texture, and style, would be aesthetically pleasing and as unobtrusive as possible. During final design, particular attention would be paid to the vertical columns and soundwalls.
• All visual design elements, including landscaping, would be designed and implemented with the concurrence of the Caltrans landscape architect and in compliance with local policies and guidelines.

• Trees and vines will be planted along soundwalls at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.

• Design of the elevated expressway would be compatible (scale and massing) with the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or future bridge and the Badger Avenue/Henry Ford Railroad bridge.

Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Visual Resources/Aesthetics (Section 3.7) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

Access
Alternative 2 would pass to the west of the park and would not affect vehicular or pedestrian access to the park. Access to the park is from the east via Webster Avenue.

Coordination/Consultation
Consultation has been initiated with the City of Long Beach. Consultation with the City of Long Beach is ongoing as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and NEPA process and is expected to continue throughout the duration of that process, as well as during the subsequent period of project design and construction. (Caltrans has sent a letter to the City of Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine to initiate Section 4[f]) consultation for Hudson Park [Appendix A] and has received a response. Hudson Park has been found to be a significant recreation area by this Department and FHWA concurs with this finding.)

1.5.1.2 Hudson Elementary School Playground/Athletic Fields

Description and Significance of Property
Type/Location/Size
The Hudson Elementary School is located at 2335 Webster Avenue in the City of Long Beach. The west side of the playground and athletic fields is adjacent to SR-103.

Access/Facilities/Usage
Vehicular and pedestrian access to the Hudson Elementary School playground and athletic fields is from Webster Avenue. Facilities include two athletic fields. In addition, the school uses the athletic facilities at nearby Cabrillo School and the adjoining Hudson Park.

Relationship to Similar Facilities in the Area
The playground and athletic fields at Hudson Elementary School are adjacent to Hudson Park.

Ownership/Jurisdiction
The Hudson Elementary School playground and athletic fields are owned by, and subject to the jurisdiction of, the Long Beach Unified School District.
**Significance**

In a letter dated September 14, 2005, the Long Beach Unified School District stated that the athletic fields at both Hudson Elementary School and Cabrillo High School are significant publicly owned recreation areas, defined as having the function of a recreational area with the Park and Recreation objectives of the community (see Appendix A). Given that the Hudson School facilities are readily accessible to the general public during non-school hours, FHWA concurs with the district’s position and has thus included the Hudson Elementary School in this Section 4(f) evaluation.

**Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use**

**Direct Use**

The proposed project alternatives would not require any permanent use (acquisition) of the Hudson Elementary School property.

**Temporary Occupancy**

The proposed project alternatives would not require any temporary occupancy of Hudson Elementary School. At present, a construction easement is not anticipated. Nonetheless, at the time of construction of Alternative 2 or construction of the associated noise wall (abatement measure), if short-term use of a very small portion of the school land were required, it would be for a short period of time, the scope of work would be minor, no temporary or permanent change in activities would occur, and the property would be returned to a condition as good as or better than at present. Therefore, it would not amount to a Temporary Occupancy (as defined under Section 4(f)) of a recreational property.

**Constructive Use**

The proposed project alternatives would not impose any constructive use of the Hudson Elementary School playgrounds or athletic fields.

**Noise**

Alternative 2 would construct an elevated expressway approximately 46 m (150 ft) from the west side of Hudson Elementary School. The types of athletic activities (baseball, softball games, etc.) that take place at the school’s athletic fields do not require quiet surroundings. Also, a large industrial area and a busy traffic corridor border the western boundary of the school property. According to the noise study prepared for the project (Caltrans, February 2005), noise levels are expected to exceed the NAC of 67 dBA in association with Alternative 2. Abatement measures, such as noise walls, have been proposed at locations where adverse impacts were identified. No noise impacts to park users were identified as a result of Alternative 2 after abatement.

Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Noise (Section 3.14) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

**Aesthetics**

The analysis of aesthetic effects in the Draft Visual Impact Assessment prepared for the project finds that the extension of SR-103 to Alameda Street to the northwest as proposed under Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial adverse aesthetic effect at this location. Alternative 2 would not have aesthetic effects that would substantially impair the protected activities, features, and attributes that qualify this resource for protection under Section 4(f).
However, under Alternative 2, the following measures would be implemented to enhance the aesthetics of the expressway along its entire length, including the portion of the expressway in the vicinity of Hudson Elementary School Playground/Athletic Fields.

- The surfaces of columns, roadway barriers, soundwalls, and gore points will receive surface color treatments at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.

- Elements of the design of the proposed bridge and expressways, such as color, line, texture, and style, would be aesthetically pleasing and as unobtrusive as possible. During final design, particular attention would be paid to the vertical columns and soundwalls.

- All visual design elements, including landscaping, would be designed and implemented with the concurrence of the Caltrans landscape architect and in compliance with local policies and guidelines.

- Trees and vines will be planted along soundwalls at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.

- Design of the elevated expressway would be compatible (scale and massing) with the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or future bridge and the Badger Avenue/Henry Ford Railroad bridge.

Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Visual Resources/Aesthetics (Section 3.7) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

Access
The proposed project alternatives would not affect access to Hudson Elementary School. Access to the school is from the east along Webster Avenue.

Coordination/Consultation
Long Beach Unified School District provided correspondence which established that this facility is used for public recreation; therefore, it has been considered a Section 4(f) resource (see Appendix A).

1.5.1.3 Cabrillo High School Athletic Fields
Description and Significance of Property
Type/Location/Size
Cabrillo High School is located at 2001 Santa Fe Avenue in Long Beach. SR 103 traverses the western boundary of the school. The school’s athletic fields are located along this western boundary.

Access/Facilities/Usage
Access to the Cabrillo High School athletic fields is provided from Monitor Avenue, Santa Fe Avenue, and Willard Street. Facilities include a baseball field, football field and play areas.
**Relationship to Similar Facilities in the Area**
The athletic fields at Cabrillo High School are part of the Long Beach Unified School District and are adjacent to Hudson Park. The Long Beach Unified School district has a Joint Use Agreement with the City of Long Beach Park and Recreation Department for use of the playground and its athletic fields. The Small Gym at Cabrillo High School is in Joint Use with the City of Long Beach and may be used after school hours and on weekends.

**Ownership/Jurisdiction**
The Cabrillo School athletic fields are owned by, and subject to the jurisdiction of, the Long Beach Unified School District.

**Significance**
In a letter dated September 14, 2005, Long Beach Unified School District determined that the fields at both Hudson School and Cabrillo High School are significant publicly owned recreation areas as defined having the function of the recreational area with the Park and Recreation objectives of the community (see Appendix A). Given that the Cabrillo High School facilities are readily accessible to the general public during non-school hours, FHWA concurs with the district’s position and has thus included the Cabrillo High School in this Section 4(f) evaluation.

**Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use**

**Direct Use**
The proposed project alternatives would not require any permanent use of Cabrillo High School. All construction for the proposed project alternatives, including construction of noise abatement walls, would occur within the existing ROW.

**Temporary Occupancy**
The proposed project alternatives would not require any temporary occupancy of Cabrillo High School. At present, a construction easement is not anticipated. Nonetheless, at the time of construction of Alternative 2 or construction of the associated noise wall (abatement measure), if short-term use of a very small portion of the school land were required, it would be for a short period of time, the scope of work would be minor, no temporary or permanent change in activities would occur, and the property would be returned to a condition as good as or better than at present. Therefore, it would not amount to a Temporary Occupancy (as defined under Section 4(f)) of a recreational property.

**Constructive Use**
The proposed project alternatives would not require any constructive use of Cabrillo High School, as explained below.

**Noise**
Alternative 2 would construct an elevated expressway adjacent to the west of the Cabrillo High School athletic fields. The types of athletic activities (baseball, softball games, etc.) that take place at the school’s athletic fields do not require quiet surroundings. Also, a large industrial area and a busy traffic corridor border the western boundary of the school property. According to the noise study prepared for the project (Caltrans, February 2005), noise levels are expected to exceed the NAC of 67 dBA in association with Alternative 2. At-grade noise walls are proposed along the western extent of the Cabrillo High School athletic fields to abate any adverse noise impacts. No noise impacts to users of playground/athletic fields were identified as a result of Alternative 2 after abatement.
Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Noise (Section 3.14) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

**Aesthetics**

The analysis of aesthetic effects in the Draft Visual Impact Assessment prepared for the project finds that the extension of SR-103 to Alameda Street to the northwest as proposed under Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial adverse aesthetic effect at this location. Alternative 2 would not have aesthetic effects that would substantially impair the protected activities, features, and attributes that qualify this resource for protection under Section 4(f).

However, under Alternative 2, the following measures would be implemented to enhance the aesthetics of the expressway along its entire length, including the portion of the expressway in the vicinity of Cabrillo High School Athletic Fields.

- The surfaces of columns, roadway barriers, soundwalls, and gore points will receive surface color treatments at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.
- Elements of the design of the proposed bridge and expressways, such as color, line, texture, and style, would be aesthetically pleasing and as unobtrusive as possible. During final design, particular attention would be paid to the vertical columns and soundwalls.
- All visual design elements, including landscaping, would be designed and implemented with the concurrence of the Caltrans landscape architect and in compliance with local policies and guidelines.
- Trees and vines will be planted along soundwalls at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.
- Design of the elevated expressway would be compatible (scale and massing) with the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or future bridge and the Badger Avenue/Henry Ford Railroad bridge.

Additional analysis is provided in the discussion of Visual Resources/Aesthetics (Section 3.7) of the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed project.

**Access**

The proposed project alternatives would not affect access to Cabrillo High School.

**Coordination/Consultation**

Long Beach Unified School District provided correspondence which established that this facility is used for public recreation; therefore, it has been considered a Section 4(f) resource (see Appendix A).

### 1.5.2 Historic Sites with Potential Section 4(f) Use

#### 1.5.2.1 Commodore Schuyler Heim Bridge

**Description and Significance of Property**

Through the Section 106 process, the Schuyler Heim Bridge has been determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C, as the
highest vertical lift bridge in the Western United States and one of the most significant vertical bridges in the state of California. The bridge was also found to meet the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the *California Register of Historical Resources* (California Register).

**Application of Section 4(f) Criteria for Use**

**Direct Use**

Four build alternatives have been proposed: Alternatives 1 (and 1A), 2, 3, and 4. Under Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 4, the Commodore Schuyler F. Heim Bridge would be demolished following construction of a replacement bridge. Demolition would be a direct use of the Section 4(f) resource.

Alternative 3, Bridge Avoidance, was developed for the purpose of this Section 4(f) evaluation. It was conceived to include seismic retrofit to preserve the historic span, but would discontinue use of the Schuyler Heim Bridge as a vehicular bridge. The loss of historic material (i.e., loss of bridge approaches) would result in a direct use. However, the U.S. Coast Guard stated during consultation meetings in December 2005 that the bridge would not be allowed to remain in place if not used for transportation purposes. They further indicated that their permit to construct a replacement bridge would include a requirement for subsequent demolition of the Schuyler Heim Bridge. Accordingly, in light of the U.S. Coast Guard position and permit requirement, Alternative 3 could also result in demolition of the bridge.

Alternative 5, the TSM Alternative, would leave the bridge in place and continue its use for vehicular traffic. The TSM Alternative provides only for minimal maintenance. Similarly, Alternative 6, No Build, would leave the bridge at its original location and continue its use for vehicular traffic. Under the No Build Alternative, the bridge would continue to require regular and routine maintenance.

Under Alternative 5 and Alternative 6, the bridge would retain its eligibility for the National Register and, accordingly, could be exempt from Section 4(f) in accordance with 23 CFR section 117.135 (f), which states:

> The Administration may determine that Section 4(f) requirements do not apply to restoration, rehabilitation, or maintenance of transportation facilities that are on or eligible for the National Register when:

1. Such work will not adversely affect the historic qualities of the facility that caused it to be on or eligible for the National Register, and

2. The SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) have been consulted and have not objected to the Administration finding in paragraph (f)(1) of this section.

**Coordination/Consultation**

Consultation with the SHPO and other cultural resources stakeholders has been initiated, and is described in the Section 106 documentation (Historic Properties Survey Report [HPSR], Supplemental HPSR, and Draft Findings of Effect [FOE]). Caltrans and FHWA will consult with SHPO regarding the Section 106 FOE for this resource during circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR.
FHWA will also seek consult with the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation that Alternative 5 and Alternative 6 would be exempt from Section 4(f) per the conditions established under 23 CFR Section 117.135(f).

**Avoidance Alternatives**

Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, and 4 would each result in demolition of the Schuyler Heim Bridge and, hence, loss of a Section 4(f) resource. Although Alternative 3 is a bridge avoidance alternative, it does not avoid “use” of a Section 4(f) resource; Alternative 3 would result in a direct use due to loss of approaches and historic material of the Schuyler Heim Bridge. Additionally, in the event the bridge is demolished under Alternative 3, as indicated by the Coast Guard position and permit conditions discussed above, loss of a Section 4(f) resource would occur. Both the No Build and TSM Alternatives would allow the bridge to continue its transportation function and are thus avoidance alternatives.

**No-Build and Transportation System Management Alternatives**

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would be no physical change to the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge. The existing bridge would continue to be seismically inadequate and subject to damage or collapse under strong seismic conditions. Maintenance activities would continue and would include application of protective coatings; lift mechanism repair; deck resurfacing; and other maintenance activities. The bridge is expected to continue to deteriorate over time as its useful life is eroded further and as various magnitude earthquakes are experienced. At some point in the future, the bridge may need to be demolished and replaced solely to avoid safety hazards. Under the No-Build Alternative, the use of the Section 4(f) resource would be avoided. However, it is not considered to be a feasible and prudent alternative, as it would not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient and deteriorated, and it does not meet the Purpose and Need established for the project (see Section 1.2, Purpose and Need).

The TSM Alternative does not include seismic improvements to the Schuyler Heim Bridge. Accordingly, it would not result in the increased ability of the bridge to withstand a major earthquake. In the event of a major earthquake that would render the bridge unusable, the TSM Alternative would not be effective in reducing roadway demand or in redirecting Terminal Island traffic to other routes. Under the TSM Alternative, the use of the Section 4(f) resource would be avoided. However, it is not considered to be a feasible and prudent alternative, as it would not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient and deteriorated, and it does not meet the Purpose and Need established for the project (see Table 4).
### TABLE 4
Evaluation of TSM and No-Build Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People, Freight, and Goods Movement</th>
<th>TSM Alternative</th>
<th>No Build Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With no capacity improvements to the SR-47 Expressway, the movement of people, freight, and goods would remain constrained.</td>
<td>With no improvement to north–south connectivity, the transportation system within and adjacent to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach would continue to remain constrained. There would be no improvement in the movement of people, freight, or goods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vital Service Route | Without the construction of the SR-47 Expressway and improvements to Schuyler Heim Bridge, there would be no vital service route that would enable emergency service vehicles to access Terminal Island in the event of an emergency that disrupts service on both the Gerald Desmond Bridge and the Vincent Thomas Bridge. | Without construction of the SR-47 Expressway and with no safety improvements to the bridge, this alternative would not provide a vital service route between the mainland and Terminal Island following an emergency that disrupts service on both the Gerald Desmond Bridge and the Vincent Thomas Bridge. |

| Immediate Service Connection | The TSM Alternative would not provide a link from the mainland to Terminal Island that would ensure ground and vessel transportation immediately following a major earthquake. | Without improvements to the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge to address seismic deficiencies, the bridge crossing would not be usable immediately or soon after a major earthquake. |

| Emergency Service Structure | The TSM Alternative would be unable to assure access to emergency service vehicles trying to reach Terminal Island in the event of an emergency. | The No Build Alternative would be unable to assure access to emergency service vehicles trying to reach Terminal Island in the event of an emergency. |

| Maximize the Bridge Life Span | With no substantial capacity improvements to the existing bridge, the life span of the access bridges to the ports, including the Schuyler Heim Bridge, would not be improved. | Under the No Build Alternative, the bridge would continue to structurally deteriorate and would eventually be closed to traffic. |

| Operational and Safety Design Features | The TSM Alternative does not propose an increase in lane width on the bridge or provide a shoulder on the bridge for safe operations; therefore, the bridge would continue to operate with unsafe operating conditions. | The No Build Alternative would not result in design changes (i.e., increase lane width to accommodate heavy trucks and provide a shoulder in each direction) to the bridge that are necessary for safe operation. |

**Alternatives on a New Location**

As noted earlier, Alternative 3 was conceived to provide a new fixed-span bridge on an alignment east of the existing bridge, along with seismic retrofit of the existing bridge, which would remain standing but unused.
Alternative 3 would be cost prohibitive. The $153,000,000 cost of a retrofit (Caltrans, 1999) for a structure that would provide no transportation function is unreasonable. In addition, there is a probability that Alternative 3 may become infeasible if permit requirements of the U.S. Coast Guard require demolition of the existing bridge.

**Alternatives on the Same Location**
There are no alternatives available that would result in avoidance of bridge demolition.

**Measures to Minimize Harm**
The following measures to minimize harm are presented in the “Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Federal Highway Administration and the California State Historic Preservation Officer, regarding the State Route 47 (SR-47) Expressway and the Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement Project.” The recommendations of this MOA are presented below.

For Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, 4, and 3 (as the United States Coast Guard [USCG] would require demolition of the Schuyler Heim Bridge following implementation of Alternative 3), FHWA shall ensure the following stipulations are carried out and completed.

1. The Schuyler Heim Bridge (Bridge) shall be offered for sale for reuse in an alternate location to interested public agencies and non-profits. A marketing plan shall be prepared for the sale of the bridge, including: a notification letter, fact sheet, list of intended recipients, as well as provisions for the salvage of smaller components in the case that there is no interest in re-use of the bridge.

   Advertisements shall be placed in appropriate newspapers of record. The offer shall run for 6 months. If no acceptable bids are received after 6 months, this stipulation shall be deeded to have been met. The above shall be done in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation Historic Bridge Program 23 USC 144(o)(4)(A) and (B).

2. Informative permanent metal plaques shall be installed at both ends of the new bridge at public locations that provide a brief history of the original Bridge, its engineering features and characteristics, the reasons for its demolition, and a statement of the characteristics of the replacement structure.

3. Pursuant to Section 110(b) of the NHPA, before the Bridge is demolished, the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) shall be contacted to determine what level and kind of recordation is required for the property. All documentation shall be completed and accepted by HABS/HAER before the Bridge is demolished.

4. Copies of the HABS/HAER report shall be disseminated to the City of Los Angeles Public Library and the City of Long Beach Public Library.

5. Information from the HABS/HAER report shall be available to the public for 10 years on an appropriate internet website.
6. A documentary (motion picture or video) shall be produced and shall address the history of the Bridge, its importance and use within the history of the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles, and demonstrate its operation and function. The motion picture or video will be of broadcast quality, of sufficient length for a standard 30-minute time period and will be made available to local broadcast stations for public access channels in local cable systems and to schools/libraries.

7. Traveling museum exhibits shall be prepared and shall address the history of the Bridge, its importance and use within the history of the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles, and demonstrate its operation and function, appropriate for display in small museums, or for use in schools.

8. Artifacts removed from the Bridge during preliminary stages of the demolition process shall be offered to local museums, and provide for their delivery to accepting institutions. Examples of such artifacts may include, but not be limited to, control panels, instruments, structural members, railings, signage, plaques or other identifying ornamentation, street lights, navigation lights, etc.

1.6 Section 4(f) Consultation and Coordination

Information regarding potential Section 4(f) properties was sought from:

- SHPO
- City of Long Beach
- Long Beach Unified School District

Copies of correspondence are included in Appendix A.

Formal consultation will be initiated with the following agencies during circulation of the Draft EIS/EIR:

- SHPO and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regarding the Section 117.135(f) exemption.

Native American consultation was conducted through letters sent to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and to individual Native American contacts.

1.7 Section 6(f)(3) Considerations

Section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCF Act) (16 USC Section 460l-4) contains provisions to protect federal investments in park and recreational resources and the quality of those assisted resources. The law recognizes the likelihood that changes in land use or development may make park use of some areas purchased with LWCF funds obsolete over time, particularly in rapidly changing urban areas, and provides for conversion to other uses pursuant to certain specific conditions.
Section 6(f)(3) – No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary, be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the then existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location.

This requirement applies to all parks and other sites that have been the subject of LWCF grants of any type and includes acquisition of parkland and development or rehabilitation of park facilities.

A review of the LWCF grants database indicates that no park and recreational resources in the project area were funded with LWCF grants. In addition, this project will not result in the acquisition of any parks or recreation lands. Therefore, Section 6(f)(3) does not apply to this project.
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August 23, 2005

Ms. Currie Matsumoto
Executive Director of Facilities
Long Beach Unified School District
1515 Hughes Way
Long Beach, CA 90810

RE: Hudson School and Cabrillo High School Section 4(f) Consultation

Dear Ms. Matsumoto:

Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are currently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed SR-47 Schuyler/Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project (SR-47). One of the Alternatives being considered would extend and improve the Terminal Island Freeway (SR-103) adjacent to Hudson School and Cabrillo High School. As part of the NEPA process, CALTRANS and FHWA are also preparing documentation required by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (see 49 USC §303) (hereinafter referred to as “Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation”).

An important component of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation is the coordination and consultation effort conducted by CALTRANS and FHWA with those agencies having jurisdiction over public parks and recreation areas in the vicinity of the SR-47 and SR-103. The publically owned parks and recreational areas that are considered as part of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation may include public school playgrounds and athletic fields, depending on whether the facilities in question serve only school activities and functions, or are also available for use by the general public. This correspondence serves as the formal initiation of the coordination and consultation specific to the Section 4(f) process. This formal consultation and coordination can be expected to continue throughout the duration of the NEPA process.

In order to properly characterize the District’s playgrounds and athletic fields, and document the potential effects of the proposed project on those resources, CALTRANS and FHWA respectfully request your response to the following initial items:

(1) Please identify the name and title of the District official(s) to whom future correspondence should be directed.
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(2) Is the District the agency that "has jurisdiction over" the playgrounds and athletic fields at Hudson School and Cabrillo High School, as defined in 23 CFR §771.135(a)(2)(c)? Are any after-school recreational programs at these facilities administered by any other group(s) or agency(ies)?

(3) Are the playgrounds and athletic fields at Hudson School and Cabrillo High School used only for school activities and functions, or are they also available for use by the general public?

(4) Has the District determined that the playgrounds and athletic fields at Hudson School and Cabrillo High School are "significant" publicly owned recreational areas? For purposes of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, the term "significant" means that, in comparing the availability and function of the recreational area (i.e., the playgrounds and athletic fields) with the park and recreation objectives of the community, the resource in question plays an important role in meeting those objectives.

Please feel free to forward to us any additional information that you believe CALTRANS and FHWA should consider as part of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation. Additionally, we would be happy to address any questions or concerns that you may have as this process moves forward.

On behalf of CALTRANS and FHWA, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this important matter, and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Ron Kosinski  
Deputy Director  
Division of Environmental Planning

cc: Wendy Clifton, Principal  
Hudson School  
2335 Webster Avenue  
Long Beach, CA 90810  

Mel Collins/Cynthia Terry, Principals  
Cabrillo High School  
2001 Santa Fe Avenue  
Long Beach, CA 90810

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
September 14, 2005

Department of Transportation
District 7
Attn: Ron Kosinski, Deputy Director
Division of Environmental Planning
190 Main Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3506

Subject: Hudson K-8 School and Cabrillo High School Section 4(f) Consultation - Terminal Island Freeway

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

This is in response to your letter of August 23, 2005 with reference to Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed SR-47 Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project (SR-47) Alternatives extending and improving the Terminal Island Freeway (SR-103) adjacent to Hudson K-8 School and Cabrillo High School.

(1) The name and title of the District representatives to whom future correspondence should be directed are:

Mr. Carri Matsumoto with copy to Mr. Kim Stallings
Executive Director of Facilities Chief Business and Financial Officer
Long Beach Unified School District Long Beach Unified School District
2425 Webster Avenue 1515 Hughes Way
Long Beach, CA 90810 Long Beach, CA 90810

(2) The Long Beach Unified School District has jurisdiction over the playgrounds and athletic fields at Hudson School and Cabrillo School. In addition, at Cabrillo High School, the Long Beach Unified School District currently has a Joint Use Agreement with the City of Long Beach Park and Recreation Department for use of playground and its athletic fields.

(3) The Small Gym at Cabrillo High School is in Joint Use with the City of Long Beach and may be used after school hours and on weekends. Under the Civic Center Act, California Education Code Section 38130-38139, the District is required to make available its facilities for public and/or community use to organizations that are allowed use under the Civic Center Act. Organizations are required to submit a Use of Facilities Application Request with the District for approval.

(4) Long Beach Unified School District has determined that the fields at both schools Hudson K-8 and Cabrillo High School are significant publicly owned recreational areas as defined having the function of the recreational area with the Park and Recreation objectives of the community.

The two mentioned schools border the Terminal Island Freeway (SR-103) with Hudson School having the potential for more impacts by noise, traffic and construction activities. Hudson School property is approximately 150' from the freeway and within one quarter mile of the Schuyler Heim Bridge over Willow Avenue. Due to the close proximity of the freeway and bridge to our Hudson School site, the District would like the opportunity in evaluating the potential impact to school sites for development being proposed. Please forward any environmental documents or other correspondence to my attention. Thank you for the opportunity to respond. We look forward to working with your office.

Sincerely,

Carri Matsumoto
Executive Director

cc: Kim Stallings
Principal Cabrillo High School
Principal Hudson K-8 School
February 8, 2007

Mr. Phil T. Hester
Director, Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine
333 West Ocean Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: Hudson Park Section 4(f) Consultation

Dear Mr. Hester:

Pursuant to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA) and the California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS) are currently preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project (SR-47). One of the Alternatives being considered would extend and improve the Terminal Island Freeway (SR-103) adjacent to Hudson Park. As part of the NEPA process, ACTA and CALTRANS are also preparing documentation required by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (see 49 USC §303) (hereinafter referred to as “Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation”).

An important component of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation is the coordination and consultation effort conducted by ACTA and CALTRANS with those agencies having jurisdiction over public parks and recreation areas in the vicinity of the proposed SR-47 and SR-103 alignments. The publicly owned parks and recreational areas that are considered as part of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation may include publicly owned recreation areas, depending on whether the facilities in question are available for use by the general public. This correspondence serves as ongoing coordination and consultation specific to the Section 4(f) process. This formal consultation and coordination can be expected to continue throughout the duration of the NEPA process.

Previously, on August 23, 2005, Caltrans initiated Section 4(f) consultation with the Long Beach Unified School District regarding Hudson School and Cabrillo High School. The athletic fields at Cabrillo High School are part of the Long Beach Unified School District and are adjacent to Hudson Park. The Long Beach Unified School District has a Joint Use Agreement with the City of Long Beach Parks, Recreation, and Marine for use of the playground and its athletic fields.

In order to further characterize Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine’s playgrounds and athletic fields, and document the potential effects of the proposed project on those resources, ACTA and CALTRANS respectfully request your response to the following:

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
(1) Please identify the name and title of the Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine official(s) to whom future correspondence should be directed.

(2) Is Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine the agency that “has jurisdiction over” Hudson Park, as defined in 23 CFR §771.135(a)(2)(c)?

(3) Has Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine determined that Hudson Park is a “significant” publicly owned recreational area? For purposes of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, the term “significant” means that, in comparing the availability and function of Hudson Park with the park and recreation objectives of the community, the resource in question plays an important role in meeting those objectives.

Please feel free to forward to us any additional information that you believe ACTA and CALTRANS should consider as part of the Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation. Additionally, we would be happy to address any questions or concerns that you may have as this process moves forward.

On behalf of ACTA and CALTRANS, we sincerely appreciate your assistance with this important matter, and look forward to working with you.

Yours very truly,

Ron Kosinski
Deputy Director

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
May 1, 2007

Ray Kosinski, Deputy Director
California Department of Transportation
District 7 – Division of Environmental Planning
100 Main Street, Suite 100
Los Angeles, CA 90012-3606

Subject: Hudson Park Section 4 (f) Consultation

Dear Mr. Kosinski:

In accordance with your requests for information, I have provided the following responses:

1.) Please address all future correspondence to:
   Phil T. Hester, Director of Parks, Recreation and Marine
   2760 Studebaker Road
   Long Beach, CA 90815

2.) Yes, the Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine has jurisdiction over Hudson Park.

3.) Yes, Hudson Park is a significant publicly owned recreational facility. At 13.09 acres, Hudson Park is the 17th largest park of the 104 parks in Long Beach. All parks are significant to a degree, as the city has 5.4 acres of recreational open space per 1,000 residents, while seeking to achieve a goal of 8 acres per 1,000 residents. However, as Hudson Park is located in the west park statistical area, which has only 1 acre per 1,000 residents, it is especially important.

   Additionally, as Long Beach is a fully subdivided and developed city, parcels of land large enough for sports fields are almost impossible to find and acquire. Hudson Park contains two baseball/softball fields and one soccer/football field. The Parks, Recreation and Marine Department’s Strategic Plan indicates the city needs 32 more baseball/softball fields, and 55 more soccer/football fields for youth and adult sports leagues. Thus, it provides an irreplaceable role in the organized recreational leagues in several sports.

"We create community and enhance the quality of life through people, places, programs and partnerships"
Hudson Park Section 4 (f) Consultation
May 1, 2007
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Thank you for the opportunity to provide information for your Section 4 (f) evaluation. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me, or Dennis Eschen, Manager of Planning and Development Bureau, at (562) 570-3130.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Phil T. Hester,
Director of Parks, Recreation and Marine

P/TH:de
P:07-053HudsonPark
Appendix D
Title VI Policy Statement
January 14, 2005

TITLE VI
POLICY STATEMENT

The California Department of Transportation under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, ensures that no person in the State of California shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity it administers.

WILL KEMPTON
Director
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SUMMARY OF RELOCATION IMPACT REPORT

The proposed Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project proposes full acquisition, permanent highway easements and permanent aerial easements, some of which would require the relocation of businesses. No residential property acquisitions are anticipated. All relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Relocation resources shall be available to all displacees without discrimination.

The area selected for the relocations is dependent upon the type of business to be relocated and the market availability of property (fee or leasehold). For example if the use is an auto repair shop then land zoned for this type of use is the area in which the business could be relocated. Because the market is dynamic, the area for relocation cannot be determined prior to relocation. In addition, the relocated business cannot be forced to accept the relocation as presented by the agency. In many cases, multiple potential relocation areas are proposed and rejected until the business accepts a suitable relocation.

The undersigned has reviewed this report of the above-referenced project and recommends approval of the report.

__________________________
Right of Way Agent

The undersigned has reviewed and approved this report.

__________________________
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SUMMARY AND PROJECT DATA

A. Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to provide the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), local agencies, and the public with information regarding the effect the proposed Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project would have on non-residential occupants within the alignments of the project alternatives. Specifically, this report is concerned with potential problems that may be caused by the displacement of existing non-residential structures and their occupants. No residential properties would be displaced under the project alternatives.

B. Limits and Purpose of Project

The project alternatives are located in Los Angeles County, within and north of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, as shown in Attachments 1 and 2. In general, the project alternatives are located between Ocean Boulevard on the south, Alameda Street on the west, SR-103 on the east, and Interstate 405 on the north.

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide a limited-access, high capacity and seismically safe vehicular connection along the critical north-south corridor between Terminal Island and the mainland that will facilitate the movement of people, freight, and goods and reduce congestion on local roadways. The project would include Terminal Island, located within the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, and major traffic arterials on the mainland to the north, primarily within the cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles. The existing Schuyler Heim Bridge is a vital transportation link, but does not meet current seismic criteria and poses a potential safety risk to motorists and to marine users of the Cerritos Channel. The purpose of the project is to provide an efficient, safe, and immediate service connection across the Cerritos Channel. For the purposes of discussion below, the terms “alternatives” and “alignments” are synonymous.

C. Description of Alignments Studied (2)

Alignment A (Alternative 1 – Bridge Replacement and Expressway): Alternative 1 would replace the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge (built in 1946-48) in order to meet current seismic criteria. The new bridge would provide a route linking Terminal Island to the mainland and would be designed to remain in service to ensure ground and vessel transportation immediately following a major earthquake. Alternative 1 also would construct a new SR-47 Expressway to provide a high-capacity alternative route along the Alameda Corridor for traffic between Terminal Island and Alameda Street, north of Pacific Coast Highway.

With this alternative, a new fixed-span bridge would be constructed, primarily within the existing bridge right-of-way (Caltrans Highway Easement), but toward the east to avoid impacts to the Badger Bridge, located west of the Schuyler Heim Bridge. The existing bridge would be demolished after construction of the new bridge was completed. The replacement bridge would be slightly wider (13 meters [m] [43 feet (ft)]) than the existing bridge due to the addition of standard width shoulder lanes, which are not present on the existing bridge. The replacement bridge would include three 3.6-m (12-ft) lanes (two through-lanes and one auxiliary lane), with 3-m (10-ft) shoulders in the northbound direction and three 3.6-m (12-ft) lanes, one 3.6-m (12-ft) auxiliary lane, and 3-m (10-ft) shoulders in the southbound direction. Construction of the replacement bridge would include a southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp at New Dock Street on Terminal Island, as well as a northbound off-ramp and southbound on-ramp at Henry Ford Avenue on the mainland side of the bridge. With this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by four piers in the channel, with a minimum vertical clearance of 14.3 m (47 ft) over the mean high water level (MHWL). The existing navigable width of the channel is 54.9 m (180 ft), and would not change under this alternative. The navigable width is directly tied to the navigable width (54.9 m [180 ft]) of the Badger Bridge.

The southern end of the new SR-47 Expressway would begin on Terminal Island, at the intersection of SR-47 and Ocean Boulevard, extending north over New Dock Street and onto the replacement bridge. The expressway would extend northward to Alameda Street, to the intersection with Pacific Coast Highway, a distance of approximately 2.7 kilometers (km) (1.5 miles [mi]). The expressway would be a four-lane, limited access roadway. It would provide grade-separation at five at-grade railroad crossings and three signalized intersections along its length. A segment of the expressway would be constructed as a viaduct...
over Henry Ford Avenue and Alameda Street and return to grade at Alameda Street, just south of Pacific Coast Highway. Under this alternative, the current connectivity to SR-103 would be maintained.

Alternative 1 also includes construction of the Ocean Boulevard/SR-47 Flyover (flyover), a two-lane, elevated structure to divert traffic bound for northbound SR-47 directly onto the new bridge from eastbound Ocean Boulevard. The purpose of the flyover is to enable this traffic to avoid the signalized Ocean Boulevard/SR-47 intersection. The flyover would begin on Terminal Island, about 1,200 m (3,900 ft) west of the Ocean Boulevard/SR-47 intersection, extend eastward along the south side of Ocean Boulevard, then turn north, cross over Ocean Boulevard and onto the new bridge. The west end of the flyover would be at grade, then the structure would rise to a maximum elevation of 21 m (69 ft) to cross over Ocean Boulevard, then descend to an elevation of 12.9 m (42.4 ft) to join the new bridge. The flyover would have an overall length of 1,550 m (5,084 ft), ending at the northerly end point (gore point) of the northbound New Dock Street on-ramp onto the bridge. The left lane of the flyover would converge with the SR-47 through lane to the left; the right lane of the flyover would continue as a northbound SR-47 through lane and would continue to SR-47. The flyover would be located entirely within the City and Port of Long Beach.

Alignment B (Alternative 1A – Haunch Bridge Design): Alternative 1A is a structural variation of Alternative 1. The purpose of this alternative is to improve the aesthetic appearance of the replacement bridge over the Cerritos Channel and to span a greater horizontal distance across the channel between columns. This is accomplished by increasing the span lengths over the channel and arching the superstructure soffits (the bottom of the bridge structure). Under this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by two piers (four columns) in the Cerritos Channel, compared to four piers (eight columns) under Alternative 1; the minimum vertical clearance between the piers would be of 14.3 m (47 ft). With this alternative, the new bridge would be supported by two piers in the channel, with a minimum vertical clearance of 14.3 m (47 ft) over the mean high water level (MHWL), the same as Alternative 1.

Other aspects of this alternative would be the same as Alternative 1.

Alignment C (Alternative 2 – SR-103 Extension to Alameda Street): With this alternative, as with Alternative 1, the flyover would be constructed, a new fixed-span bridge would be constructed, and the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge would be demolished. Additionally, modifications to the northbound and southbound approaches to the bridge would be constructed. Similar to Alternative 1, a new southbound off-ramp and northbound on-ramp at New Dock Street on Terminal Island would be constructed.

This alternative also would extend SR-103 from south of West Hill Street to the northwest on a four-lane viaduct to join Alameda Street between Sepulveda Boulevard and I-405. Improvements to SR-103 would begin approximately 3.2 km (2 mi) north of the Schuyler Heim Bridge and extend a distance of approximately 2.6 km (1.6 mi). The viaduct would cross over the Union Pacific Railroad Manual Yard and San Pedro Branch line, through the Southern California Edison (SCE) utility corridor, across the Los Angeles Harbor Department Warehouse 16/17 area, and over Sepulveda Boulevard, then turn parallel to the western boundary of the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF) to the centerline of Alameda Street. The viaduct would return to grade south of the Wardlow Road (and E. 223rd Street) ramps to I-405. Improvements would be made to the existing SR-103 to accommodate the southerly and northerly end connections of the viaduct.

The flyover would be the same as under Alternative 1 although with this alternative, after joining with SR-47, the right lane of the flyover would continue to SR-103.

Alignment D (Alternative 3 – Bridge Avoidance): This alternative was developed specifically as a potential avoidance alternative for the purpose of the Section 4(f) analysis. It was conceived to preserve the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge following construction of a new fixed-span bridge on an alignment east of the existing bridge. Under this alternative, the new bridge would have the same lane configuration as the replacement bridge for Alternative 1. The existing Schuyler Heim Bridge would be seismically retrofitted before construction of the new bridge; however, the Schuyler Heim Bridge would no longer be used for transportation purposes once the new span goes into operation. This alternative was conceived to include seismic retrofit so that the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge could remain standing but unused. The retrofit
would be for safety purposes, to ensure that the existing bridge would not collapse and result in safety hazards or damage to the new bridge or to the adjacent Badger Avenue Bridge and thus avoid demolition of a historic resource.

The existing Schuyler Heim Bridge may be required to be demolished to comply with U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard) permit requirements. In preliminary consultations held in December 2005, the Coast Guard stated that the bridge would not be allowed to remain in place but unused. The Coast Guard further indicated that their permit to construct a replacement bridge would include a requirement for subsequent demolition of the Schuyler Heim Bridge.

**Alignment E (Alternative 4 – Bridge Replacement Only):** This alternative would replace the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge (lift bridge) with a fixed-span bridge largely along the existing bridge alignment, as described under Alternative 1. With this alternative, no roadway improvements would occur. With this alternative, therefore, the SR-47 Expressway described in Alternative 1 would not be constructed; and the SR-103 extension to Alameda Street described in Alternative 2 would not be constructed.

**Alignment F (Alternative 5 – Transportation System Management):** The Transportation System Management (TSM) alternative is designed to identify low-cost, easily implemented improvements as an alternative to construction of more expensive improvements. For this project, the TSM alternative focuses on improvements to routes that parallel the proposed SR-47 Expressway, and that serve the same trips. These trips include trucking drayage trips to and from the ICTF, and trips destined to and from the Ports via Alameda Street, Henry Ford Avenue, and SR-47. The TSM alternative would include measures to improve capacity and traffic circulation at the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles through policy changes and use of the latest technologies. With this alternative, capital investment would be minimal compared to the previous alternatives addressed.

The TSM alternative for this project includes the following key elements:

- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS): Systems applications in and around the Ports area, with special emphasis on truck movements. These include measures to improve traffic circulation through traffic control, incident management, traffic surveillance, and traffic information dissemination with the aid of intelligent transportation system devices and systems.

- Lower-cost roadway and intersection improvements: Measures include restriping to provide additional turn lanes and acceleration lanes and traffic signalization improvements, primarily within existing rights-of-way.

- Minor roadway widening: There also could be peak-hour parking prohibitions to remove midblock bottlenecks along selected roadways.

**Alignment G (Alternative 6 – No Build):** Under the No-Build alternative, there would be no changes to the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or local roadway system. The existing Schuyler Heim Bridge would continue to be seismically inadequate and subject to damage or collapse under strong seismic conditions. Maintenance activities would continue and would include application of protective coatings; lift mechanism repairs; deck resurfacing; and other, similar, maintenance activities. The existing SR-47 roadway would function with current and increasing levels of congestion.

1. Is there a “core” corridor common to all alternates? Yes ☒ No ☐

   The Schuyler Heim Bridge is common to all build alternatives.

**D. Basis of Findings**

The sources used in the preparation of this report were both primary and secondary in nature, and are identified in the References section at the end of this document. Information was gathered from the right-of-way studies conducted by Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority.
E. Describe the Displacement Area: (neighborhood, amenities, access, facilities, general occupancy characteristics)

No residential areas exist within the area of displacement; no residential properties would be displaced. Displacements of industrial/commercial businesses would occur. The majority of the businesses are machine shops, autobody shops, recycling facilities, and container storage type businesses.

The displacement area is along the project alignments within the Cities of Long Beach, Los Angeles and Carson. In general the displacement area is located along SR-47, north of Ocean Boulevard and south of Alameda Street. The area is highly developed with heavy industrial, commercial, and transportation uses associated with the nearby Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Access to the areas is primarily via SR-47.

The local amenities within the immediate area and their distances from the project site include:

- Hudson Park, approximately 0.25 mile east of Alternative 2;
- Admiral Kidd Park, approximately 0.5 mile east of Alternative 2;
- East Wilmington Park, approximately 0.3 mile east of Alternative 1;
- Banning Park, approximately 1 mile west of Alternative 1; and
- East Wilmington Park, approximately 1 mile west of Alternative 1.

The schools in the area and their distances from the project site include:

- Hudson Elementary School, adjacent and to the east of Alternative 2;
- Cabrillo High School, adjacent and to the east of Alternative 2;
- Holy Family Grammar School, approximately 0.5 mile west of Alternative 1; and
- Wilmington Park Elementary School, approximately 0.7 mile west of Alternative 1.

None of the school or park properties would be acquired as part of the project.

F. Estimated Displacement Units by Alignment

Alignment A (Alternative 1 – Bridge Replacement and Expressway): Under Alternative 1, there would be no residential displacements. There would be full acquisition of 11 Assessor-numbered parcels (6 ACTA-numbered parcels, all privately owned); 5 APN-numbered parcels are vacant, and 6 businesses would require relocation. There would also be approximately 129 partial takes (aerial/highway easements) and 82 temporary construction easements. Six slips would be acquired at the Leeward Bay Marina.

Alignment B (Alternative 1A – Haunch Bridge Design): The only difference between this alignment and Alignment A is the design of the new bridge, which would have no effect on the number or type of displacements. Therefore, as with Alternative 1, there would be no residential displacements. There would be full acquisition of 11 APN-numbered parcels (6 ACTA-numbered parcels, all privately owned); 5 APN-numbered parcels are vacant, and 6 businesses would require relocation. There would also be approximately 129 partial takes (aerial/highway easements) and 82 temporary construction easements. Six slips would be acquired at the Leeward Bay Marina.

Alignment C (Alternative 2 – SR-103 Extension to Alameda Street): Under Alternative 2, there would be no residential displacements. There are 118 partial takes (aerial/permanent highway easements) and 73 temporary construction easements. Under Alternative 2, two businesses would require relocation as a result of permanent highway easements.

Alignment D (Alternative 3 – Bridge Avoidance): There would be no residential or non-residential displacements requiring relocation. This alternative would result in approximately 61 partial takes (aerial/highway easements) and 41 temporary construction easements. Six slips would be acquired at the Leeward Bay Marina.

Alignment E (Alternative 4 – Bridge Replacement Only): Under Alternative 4, there would be no residential or non-residential displacements requiring relocation assistance. This alternative would result in 17 partial takes (aerial/highway easements) and 8 temporary construction easements.
Alignment F (Alternative 5 – Transportation System Management): Under the TSM Alternative, there would be minimal construction. Therefore, no relocations or displacements are anticipated.

Alignment G (Alternative 6 – No Build): Under the No-Build Alternative, no relocations or displacements would occur.

ALIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupants of single-family residences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant occupants of single-family residences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant occupants of multiple-unit residences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupants of mobile homes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant occupants of mobile homes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL RESIDENTIAL UNITS:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PERSONS:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(average #/household)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALIGNMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nonresidential:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial businesses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/manufacturing business:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organizations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural/farms:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NONRESIDENTIAL UNITS:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALIGNMENTS

G. Type of Displacement Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single-family residence:</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/triplex (multi-unit residences):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (multi-unit residences), 4 or more:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping rooms/shared quarters:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile homes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Adequate Relocation Resources

Exist for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential owners ........................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential tenants ........................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile homes ................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses ..................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit organizations ..................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture ..................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No residential properties, mobile homes, nonprofit organizations, or agricultural areas would be acquired in association with implementation of this project.
1. The closest replacement area identified is within Zip Codes 90744, 90810, and 90813. However, based on previous experience and current research, it is challenging to relocate the types of businesses that are being displaced as a result of this project. Given the declining percentage of land under manufacturing and industrial use in most cities, the availability of land for uses such as container storage, recycling facilities, landfill, trucking related businesses and other industrial uses is limited. Therefore, relocation sites outside the immediate vicinity would be considered.

2. The relocation area is comparable in terms of amenities, public utilities, and accessibility to public services, transportation, and shopping. Yes ☒ No ☐

   The relocation area is an urban area with all amenities and public utilities in place.

3. The relocation resources (are) ( ) affordable to residential displacees, given the use of replacement housing payments. However, there are no residential displacements as a result of the project.

4. The project would not result in any typical residential displacements. Businesses in this area have been known to have resident caretakers on their properties. If any of the businesses that are being relocated include resident caretakers, appropriate relocation could be provided for these resident caretakers.

   The 6 slips that would be acquired at the Leeward Bay Marina could result in relocation of one resident. However, these live aboard residents rent slips on a month-to-month basis. According to the rental agreements, the Port can give these tenants 30-day advance notice to vacate for any reason and the Port is not responsible to compensate its tenants. Other public projects that may require displacements (either residential or non-residential) in the area include Pier 400 Container Terminal and Transportation Corridor Project, Wilmington Parkway, Pacific Corridor Redevelopment Project, San Pedro, Southern California International Gateway, Piers D, E, F Terminal Redevelopment, Piers G & J Terminal Redevelopment Project, Pier A West Expansion Project, Pier S Marine Terminal, Pier J South Terminal, Pier T, Long Beach LNG Terminal, and Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement Project. However, it is anticipated that these projects would undertake a study of relocations and abide by the regulations governing relocations.

5. The State’s relocation program is adequate to successfully relocate all displacees.

6. The business and industries to be relocated are machine shops, autobody shops, recycling, container storage type uses. Given the nature of these businesses, they are not compatible with residential and office commercial uses. The area in the vicinity of the Ports has developed as an industrial area suitable for locating such businesses due to lack of residential uses in the vicinity. The amount of land under industrial uses has been on a decline in the Los Angeles area. Industrial uses are largely perceived as undesirable due to issues related to use of hazardous materials, contamination and noise/traffic nuisances. For this reason, the relocation of businesses would likely have to occur in close vicinity where other such and similar uses exist. If the uses cannot be relocated within the Port area, locations outside Los Angeles County would be considered. Acquisition and relocation alternatives would be evaluated once a preferred alternative is available. All efforts would be made to relocate the businesses within a suitable replacement area and/or just compensation would be provided.

7. Last Resort Housing Program payments are not anticipated, as no households would be relocated as a result of the project.

8. It is not anticipated that construction of replacement housing under the Last Resort Housing Program will be required.

9. A field office will not be required for this project.

---

1 Based on a conservative estimate, 15% of the boat slips within POLA and POLB contain live-aboard residents. To arrive at the number of live-aboards likely to be relocated as a result of Alternatives 1, 1A, and 3, calculating fifteen percent (15%) of the six (6) slips would equate to possibly taking one (1) resident at the Leeward Bay Marina. Therefore, for the calculations in this DRIR, it is assumed that one live-aboard resident would be relocated. Source: Harley Martin, CH2MHILL, in conversation with Rick Adler at POLA Property Management Division and Larry Ditchkus at POLB Property Management Division on February 16, 2006.
DETAILED ANALYSIS

I. DISPLACEMENT AREA

1. Residential Displacements

   The project would not result in any typical residential displacements. Businesses in this area have been known to have resident caretakers on their properties. If any of the businesses that are being relocated include resident caretakers, appropriate relocation could be provided for these resident caretakers. The 9 slips that would be acquired at the Leeward Bay Marina under Alternatives 1, 1A, and 3 could result in relocation of one resident.

2. Business and Nonprofit

   1. Number of businesses directly impacted by the project.
      
      Six businesses would be relocated as a result of alternatives 1, 1A, and 3; these include recycling facilities, transportation company repair shop, materials, transportation system and facilities management company. All of these businesses are on parcels zoned as commercial/industrial.

      Under Alternative 2, two buildings (not entire parcels) would be acquired as Permanent Highway Easements, thereby denying them of their existing use. One of these buildings is owned by Corridor Properties, and the other is an industrial building owned by Southern California Edison. Note that in the after condition, the permanent and aerial highway easements could allow for temporary uses, such as parking, temporary structures such as storage sheds or trailers, and storage of non-hazardous materials.

      Alternatives 4, 5, and 6 would not require relocation of any businesses and/or nonprofits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age of business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–3 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4–7 Years</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8–15 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15 Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is an estimate based on the average age of similar types of businesses in the area. Interviews with the businesses, to be conducted later in the process, would reveal the exact age of the business at its existing location.
3. Estimated number of employees:
   Note: Small business is defined as 500 or fewer employees. Over 500 = No reestablishment payment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Max5x20=100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1-20 employees for each business. Please note that this is a conservative estimate available at this time. Once a project alternative is selected, a detailed interview will take place with the business owners to obtain relevant information about their businesses.

4. There are no businesses impacted by the project that are assumed to be minority owned.

5. Number of the different type of facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small shop-center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low rent area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As shown above, only single structure buildings will be impacted.

3. Agricultural Impact: Analysis of farm operations, and how impacted, especially if part take and owners or tenants working will be displaced

1. Type of agriculture: The proposed project would not result in any agricultural impacts.

II. REPLACEMENT AREA

A. Describe in Relationship to the Local Town/Community and to the Displacement Area

The EIS/EIR for the project is currently under preparation and will evaluate the environmental impacts of the various alternatives for the project. Upon completion of the environmental review process, which includes opportunity for public input, a feasible alternative will be chosen. The acquisition process would begin once a preferred alternative has been adopted by the lead agency. No residential relocations are anticipated under any alignment. However, in the event replacement is needed, the replacement area would be determined based on the adopted alternative and available replacement housing.

1. Housing stock:
   a. Number of single-family residences: N/A
   b. Number of multiple-family units: N/A
   c. Number of mobile homes and other: N/A
   d. TOTAL HOUSING UNITS (a+b+c): N/A

No residential acquisitions would occur.
2. Vacancy rate expressed as a percent: For Rent For Sale
   Single-family residences N/A N/A
   Multiple-family units N/A N/A
   Mobile homes N/A N/A
   No residential acquisitions would occur.

3. Housing characteristics:
   No residential acquisitions would occur.

4. Average prices of typical single-family homes that are DS&S for the displacement properties:
   No residential acquisitions would occur.

B. Business and Nonprofit Replacement
1. Number of business sites that will be available for rent, purchase, or development
   No business sites will be available for rent, purchase, or development as a result of the project alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  E  F  G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service - - - - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 0  0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Discuss difficulties the businesses may encounter in finding replacement property because of:
   a. Replacement site requirements: The businesses require similarly zoned commercial/industrial land that allows uses such as recycling and auto body shops. No other requirements exist.
   b. Lease rates or purchase price: No difficulties related to lease rates or purchase price are anticipated.
   c. Financial capacity of the businesses to accomplish move: No difficulties related to lease rates or purchase price are anticipated. All eligible businesses, as determined by the Uniform Relocation Act, will receive relocation assistance.
   d. Special services that may be needed to assist businesses relocate (e.g. rezoning, reduced CUP costs, advanced payments, construction of replacement site, professional services to plan the move or obtain replacement site, business loans, special consideration by the local agency): No special services have been identified. See response to 2.c., above.

3. Discuss difficulties the employees may have if the business relocated as planned: If the businesses are relocated in the vicinity of their existing location, no impacts or, at most, minor impacts to employees would occur. However, if the businesses are relocated far from the displacement site, employees may need to relocate with the business or find new employers. However, this remains undetermined at this point in the process and would be given due consideration once the relocations are finalized. Once a preferred alternative is selected, an interview process with the business owners would be initiated. As a result of the interview process, more detailed information regarding type of business and employees would become available.

4. Discuss difficulties the employees may have if the business cannot relocate as planned: See response to 3, above.
C. Residential Replacement
1. Section 8 rental limits: No Section 8 housing would be displaced.
2. Replacement neighborhood is homogeneous to displacement area. No residential displacements would occur.
3. General condition of displacement neighborhood: No residential displacements would occur.
4. Condition of units being displaced:
   N/A Very Good Good Average Fair/Poor
5. Compared to condition of units in replacement area:
   N/A Very Good Good Average Fair/Poor
6. Number of mobile home parks directly impacted by the project 0.
7. Number of mobile homes directly impacted by the project 0 within the park.
8. Number of mobile homes directly impacted by the project 0 that are not in a mobile home park.

D. Comparative Data
   Not applicable, as no residential displacements would occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISPLACEMENTS</th>
<th>PROJECT AREA</th>
<th>REPLACEMENT AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% owner occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% renter occupied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total housing units vacant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy rate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units for sale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing units for rent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per household</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median housing value</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. RELOCATION RESOURCES

A. Adequate Resources (availability, funds, staffing, time) exist for all displacees
   Adequate resources exist.

B. The Replacement Area Chosen and Used as a Basis for Relocation Resources
   The project is in an active industrial/commercial area, and suitable replacement sites are available in the market.

C. Adequacy of Market Availability
   Market availability is expected to be adequate to meet the relocation demands of the project alternatives.

IV. RELOCATION PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS

A. Relocation Problems
   No relocation problems related to the categories provided below are anticipated.

   Elderly * Yes ☐ No ☒ Minorities Yes ☐ No ☐
   Low income (30%) Yes ☐ No ☒ Overcrowded residence Yes ☐ No ☐
   Low income (poverty) Yes ☐ No ☒ Handicapped* Yes ☐ No ☐
   Last resort housing const. Yes ☐ No ☒ Minority business Yes ☐ No ☐
   Marginal business* Yes ☐ No ☒ Other Yes ☐ No ☐
   Lack of availability Yes ☐ No ☒

*All indicate special advisory assistance will be needed
B. Housing Impact
   This project will not impact the local housing stock for the community, as no residential displacements would occur.

C. Conclusion
   The right-of-way surveys have recently been completed. Once the environmental review process is completed and public input has been sought, a preferred alternative will be chosen. Acquisition and relocation alternatives would be evaluated once a preferred alternative is available. All efforts would be made to relocate the businesses within a suitable replacement area and/or just compensation would be provided.

   All relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Relocation resources shall be available to all displacees without discrimination.

FINAL CONCLUSION: The project alternatives would not result in any residential displacements. Relocation of not more than 6 businesses would occur under any alternative studied in this report. The project is in an active industrial/commercial area. Suitable replacement sites are available in the market and would be adequate to meet the replacement needs generated by the project.
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Appendix F
Public Notices
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

TO: The State Clearinghouse
1400 Tenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

FROM: California Department of Transportation, District 7
Division of Environmental Planning
120 South Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
for the Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and Alameda Corridor Truck
Expressway Project
[References: Division 13, Public Resources Code, Section 21080.4]

This is to inform you that the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will act as Lead Agencies under the California
Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA),
respectively, for the proposed project described below. These agencies will prepare a joint
Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Environmental Assessment (EA). Your participation as
a responsible/trustee/cooperating agency is requested in the preparation and review of
this document.

We need to know the applicable permit and environmental review requirements of your agency
and the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency's
statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use
the EIR/EA when considering your permit or other approval for the project.

Project Title: Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and Alameda Corridor Truck Expressway
Project (Ocean Boulevard to Pacific Coast Highway)

Project Location: Cities of Long Beach and Los Angeles, Los Angeles County, California.

Project Description: The proposed project consists of replacement of the Schuyler Heim
Bridge (Bridge Number 53-2618) over the Cerritos Channel at the Port of Long Beach and
construction of an elevated truck expressway between the Schuyler Heim Bridge and
Pacific Coast Highway (State Route [SR] 1) in the Wilmington community of Los Angeles. For
further information about the project, see the attached “Additional Project Information” and the
“Initial Study” checklist.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible
date, but no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response and the name of a contact person in your agency, as well as any
comments or questions regarding this project to Ronald Kosinski, Deputy District Director,
Division of Environmental Planning, Caltrans, 120 South Spring Street (MS 16 A), Los Angeles,
CA 90012.

DATE: 1-28-02

Signature: [Signature]
Title: [Title]
Ronald J. Kosinski
Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning
District Engineer/U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Environmental Clearance Officer/Department of Housing and Urban Development
Thomas Harrison/U.S. Coast Guard
US Coast Guard 12th District
Jim Bartel/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Robert S. Hoffman/National Marine Fisheries Service
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Office of Federal Activities (A-104)
EIS Coordinator, Region 9/Environmental Protection Agency
Federal Transit Administration Region 9
Federal Railroad Administration/Office of Policy and Plans
Director, Office of Environmental Affairs/Department of Health and Human Services
Cesar Perez/U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration
Director, Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Charles Raysbrook/California Department of Fish and Game South Coast Region
Dennis Dickerson/State Water Quality Control Board Los Angeles Region
Deborah Lee/South Central Coast District California Coastal Commission
Executive Officer/State Lands Commission
Hans Kreutzberg/Office of Historic Preservation Department of Parks and Recreation
Office of Planning and Research
Don Drachane/State of California Air Resources Board-Attn: Bob Cross, Mobil Source Control Division
Commander/California Highway Patrol South Los Angeles Office
Additional Project Information

Purpose and Need of Project

The purpose of the proposed project is to replace the seismically inadequate Schuyler Heim Bridge and improve the SR 47/Henry Ford Avenue/Alameda Street transportation corridor by constructing an elevated truck expressway from the Schuyler Heim Bridge to SR 1.

The Schuyler Heim Bridge is one of only three bridges that connects the mainland with Terminal Island in the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, which are the two largest ports in the United States, based on cargo volume. This bridge currently accommodates three 3.3- to 3.6-meter (m) (11- to 12-foot) lanes in each direction (no shoulders). The Schuyler Heim Bridge is a steel vertical lift bridge that is a popular route for truck traffic because of its relatively short and low sustained longitudinal grades; therefore, it has become a vital truck traffic link between the ports and the mainland. Because it is a vital transportation link, and due to a state mandate, the Schuyler Heim Bridge must sustain a Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE) without collapsing.

Currently, the Schuyler Heim Bridge is in need of seismic retrofitting and major maintenance work. A previous study\(^1\) evaluating the seismic retrofit and maintenance of the bridge determined that replacement of the bridge would be a more economically feasible alternative.

The Alameda Corridor Truck Expressway (SR 47) would be a four-lane facility constructed above Henry Ford Avenue and Alameda Street that would provide a link between the Terminal Island Freeway (SR 103) and Alameda Street. The purpose of the project is to provide a high capacity alternative route for truck traffic between Terminal Island and SR 91. The new expressway would cross over existing rail crossings and Anaheim Street. It would alleviate existing congestion on Interstate (I)-710, I-110, and local north-south streets by providing a desirable alternative route for truck traffic, and it would eliminate the heavy truck/rail conflicts that presently exist south of SR 1 at existing grade crossings.

Alternatives for the bridge replacement and truck expressway are discussed further in the next section.

Alternatives to be Evaluated

The project to be evaluated in the EIR/EA would be comprised of the replacement of the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge and construction of the Alameda Corridor Truck Expressway. Two build alternatives are being considered for the Schuyler Heim Bridge replacement, and two build alternatives are being considered for the Expressway. The alternative combinations will be evaluated in detail in the EIR/EA. The bridge replacement and truck expressway alternatives are described below.

Bridge Alternatives

Each of the alternatives listed, with the exception of the No Project Alternative, include the replacement of the existing steel vertical lift bridge with a concrete fixed bridge. In addition to the two build horizontal alignments, there are two vertical clearance options, as well as three channel-width options described below.

Bridge Alternative 1 – Existing Alignment Alternative. This alternative would replace the existing bridge with a fixed bridge within the existing alignment. The proposed fixed bridge would be wider than the existing bridge and would consist of three 3.6-m (12-foot) lanes with 3-m

---

(10-foot) shoulders in each direction. The footprint of the fixed bridge would be widened toward the east side to avoid impacts to the railroad located immediately to the west. This fixed bridge replacement alternative would include the following vertical clearance and channel width variations:

- **Vertical Clearance Option A.** The proposed vertical clearance of the bridge would be at 11.6 m (38 feet) over Mean High Water Level (MHWL) of 1.43 m (4.7 feet). This maintains the same clearance as when the existing lift bridge is in the lowered position.

- **Vertical Clearance Option B.** The proposed vertical clearance of the bridge would be increased to 14.3 m (47 feet) over MHWL level. This profile accommodates a 13.7-m (45-foot) fireboat.

- **Channel Width Option A.** The width of the navigable channel would remain at 54.9 m (180 feet).

- **Channel Width Option B.** The width of the navigable channel would be decreased to between 42.7 and 44.2 m (140 to 145 feet).

- **Channel Width Option C.** The width of the navigable channel would be decreased to between 24.4 and 25.9 m (80 to 85 feet).

**Bridge Alternative 2 – Realignment Alternative.** This alternative would replace the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge with a fixed bridge on an alignment east of the existing footprint. The replacement bridge would consist of three 3.6-m (12-foot) lanes with 3-m (10-foot) shoulders on each side. This fixed bridge replacement alternative would include the following vertical clearance and channel width variations.

- **Vertical Clearance Option A.** The proposed vertical clearance of the bridge would be at 11.6 m (38 feet) over MHWL of 1.43 m (4.7 feet). This maintains the same clearance as when the existing lift bridge is in the lowered position.

- **Vertical Clearance Option B.** The proposed vertical clearance of the bridge would be increased to 14.3 m (47 feet) over MHWL level. This profile accommodates a 13.7-m (45-foot) fireboat.

- **Channel Width Option A.** The width of the navigable channel would remain at 54.9 m (180 feet).

- **Channel Width Option B.** The width of the navigable channel would be decreased to 42.7 to 44.2 m (140 to 145 feet).

- **Channel Width Option C.** The width of the navigable channel would be decreased to 24.4 to 25.9 m (80 to 85 feet).

**Truck Expressway Alternatives**
A Feasibility Study evaluating the following two alternatives is currently being prepared for the Truck Expressway.

**Truck Expressway Alternative 1.** The expressway would be constructed along Henry Ford Avenue between the Schuyler Heim Bridge and SR 1. The expressway would be elevated 6 to 22.8 m (20 to 75 feet) above ground for a total of 2.7 kilometers (km) (1.7 miles) and would join Alameda Street just south of SR 1. It would be designed to Caltrans standards and have a design speed of approximately 45 miles per hour (mph). Two lanes in each direction would be provided and right-of-way would be required along the east side of Alameda Street, north and south of SR 1,
affecting approximately 25 parcels. Permanent easements would also be required at certain locations for the elevated portions of the expressway. The project would also include minor street and intersection improvements on Alameda Street between SR 1 and SR 91. This alternative would keep SR 103 as the primary route, but it would construct new on- and off-ramps that link the existing SR 103 to the new truck expressway, just north of the Schuyler Heim Bridge, to allow trucks to travel on the expressway as an alternative. Construction of the expressway is not anticipated to significantly impact existing freeway or truck traffic.

**Truck Expressway Alternative 2.** This alternative differs from the first in that the Alameda Corridor Truck Expressway would become the primary route and would extend directly from the Schuyler Heim Bridge. On- and off-ramps would be constructed linking the new truck expressway to the existing SR 103, just north of the Schuyler Heim Bridge, to allow trucks to travel on SR 103 as an alternative. All other features listed for Truck Expressway Alternative 1 are the same for this alternative.

**Environmental Setting**

The proposed project is located in an industrialized area in and near the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. The area is highly developed and includes land uses such as industrial shipyards and oil wells and refineries.

SR 47 crosses the Cerritos Channel at the Schuyler Heim Bridge. The channel is primarily used as a deep water path for the transport of goods between the Los Angeles and Long Beach harbors. It is approximately 99 m (325 feet) wide, with a depth ranging from 0.0 m/feet at the sides to about 15.2 m (50 feet) in the center. The existing vertical clearance of the bridge in its lowered position is 11.6 m (38 feet) over the MHWL, and it is 49.7 m (163 feet) over the MHWL in its raised position. The existing width of the channel beneath the bridge is 54.9 m (180 feet). There is no vegetation on the banks of the channel; therefore, it does not qualify as a federal/state wetland.

**Environmental Effects**

A preliminary Environmental Checklist has been prepared for this project and potential impacts to the following environmental factors have been identified: aesthetics, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, public services, cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, noise, air quality, geology/soils, land use/planning and transportation/traffic. The level of impact will vary depending on the alternatives selected.

**Scoping Meeting**

A scoping meeting will be held to discuss environmental and other project-related issues on February 13, 2002, at 3:00 P.M. at the Port of Long Beach Administrative Building located at 925 Harbor Plaza, Long Beach, CA 90802.
SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Small Business Size Standards: Waiver of the nonmanufacturer rule

AGENCY: Small Business Administration.

ACTION: Notice of waiver of the nonmanufacturer rule for aluminum, sheet, plate, and foil manufacturing.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA) is granting a waiver of the Nonmanufacturer Rule for Aluminum, Sheet, Plate, and Foil Manufacturing. The basis for waivers is that no small business manufacturers are supplying these classes of products to the Federal government. The effect of a waiver would be to allow otherwise qualified regular dealers to supply the products of any domestic manufacturer on a Federal contract set aside for small businesses or awarded through the SBA 8(a) Program.

DATES: This waiver is effective on June 23, 2004.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edith Butler, Program Analyst, by telephone at (202) 619–0422; by FAX at (202) 205–7280; or by e-mail at edith.butler@sba.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 8(a)(17) of the Small Business Act, 15 U.S.C. 637(A)(17), requires that recipients of Federal contracts set aside for small businesses or SBA 8(a) Business Development Program provide the product of a small business manufacturer or processor, if the recipient is other than the actual manufacturer or processor. This requirement is commonly referred to as the Nonmanufacturer Rule. The SBA regulations imposing this requirement are found at 13 CFR 121.406 (b). Section 8(a)(17)(b)(iv) of the Act authorizes SBA to waive the Nonmanufacturer Rule for any “class of products” for which there are no small business manufacturers or processors in the Federal market.

As implemented in SBA’s regulations at 13 CFR 121.1204, in order to be considered available to participate in the Federal market on these classes of products, a small business manufacturer must have submitted a proposal for a contract solicitation or received a contract from the Federal government within the last 24 months. The SBA defines “class of products” based on six digit coding systems. The first coding system is the Office of Management and Budget North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The second is the Product and Service Code established by the Federal Procurement Data System.

The SBA received a request on April 16, 2004 to waive the Nonmanufacturer Rule for Aluminum, Sheet, Plate, and Foil Manufacturing. In response, on May 4, 2004, SBA published in the Federal Register a notice of intent to grant the waiver of the Nonmanufacturer Rule for Aluminum, Sheet, Plate, and Foil Manufacturing. SBA explained in the notice that it was soliciting comments and sources of small business manufacturers of this class of products. In response to this notice, no comments were received from any interested party. SBA has determined that there are no small business manufacturers of this class of products, and is therefore granting a waiver of the Nonmanufacturer Rule for Aluminum, Sheet, Plate, and Foil Manufacturing. NAICS 331315.


Barry S. Meltz,
Acting Associate Administrator for Government Contracting.
[FR Doc. 04–12846 Filed 6–7–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 8025–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Los Angeles County, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Los Angeles County, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: César Pérez, Team Leader—South Region, Federal Highway Administration, 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4–100, Sacramento, California 95814, Telephone (916) 498–5065.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA), will reinitiate environmental studies and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve State Route 47 (SR–47) in Los Angeles County, California. The proposed improvement would involve replacing the seismically deficient Schuyler Heim bridge with a fixed-span bridge and the construction/extension of SR–47 as a new four-lane elevated expressway from the new Heim bridge along Alameda Street to Pacific Coast Highway (State Route 1). The new fixed-span bridge would change the current vertical and horizontal clearances through the Cerritos Channel. The elevated expressway would provide a direct route from Terminal Island to Alameda Street, resulting in the elimination of five at-grade railroad crossings and ultimately reduce truck traffic on Interstates 710 and 110.

During 2002, Caltrans and ACTA began formal public scoping and initiation of environmental studies for the proposed project. Notice letters were sent to federal, state and local agencies on January 28, 2002. Notices were prepared in the Federal Register and local newspapers, advertising public scoping and open house meetings, on February 13, 2002, at 2:30 p.m. and 4:30 p.m., respectively. Public comments were received until February 28, 2002. A review of subsequent environmental studies led the FHWA to conclude that an EIS would be required. Budgetary constraints then led Caltrans to temporarily suspend the project.

Major project elements to be evaluated in the EIS include:

- Replacement of the vertical-lift Schuyler Heim Bridge with a fixed-span bridge; construction of an elevated four-lane expressway to State Route 1; and, potential realignment of surface roads and ramps.

- The EIS will consider a variety of possible alignments for these improvements, as well as the “no-build” alternative.

- Letters describing the re-initiation of studies and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State and local agencies and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed, or are known to have, an interest in this proposal.

- Additional public scoping meeting(s) for the EIS will be provided, as appropriate. Comments received during the prior scoping period (January 28 through February 28, 2002) will also be considered. In addition, a public hearing will be held following completion of the draft EIS. Public notice will be given of the time and place for the hearing. The draft EIS will be available for public and agency review and comments prior to the public hearing.

- To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the FHWA at the address provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12292)
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement:
Suffolk County, NY

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of Intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Suffolk County, New York.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:
Subimal Chakraborti, P.E., Regional Director, NYSDOT Region 10; State Office Building: 250 Veterans Memorial Highway; Hauppauge, NY 11788; Telephone: (631) 952–6632.

Robert E. Arnold, Division Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, New York Division, Leo W. O’Brien Federal Building, Room 719, Clinton Avenue and North Pearl Street, Albany, New York 12207; Telephone: (518) 431–4127.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:
The FHWA, in cooperation with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) will prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) on a proposal to reconstruct NYS Route 347 (Project Identification Number 0054.05) in Suffolk County, New York. The proposed improvements will involve the reconstruction of approximately 15 miles of the existing route from Northern State Parkway to RTE 25A in the Towns of Smithtown, Islip and Brookhaven and through the incorporated Village of Lake Grove. The improvements considered are necessary to provide for the existing and projected traffic demand along Route 347 and to improve safety. Also, included in this proposal are two new ramps on Northern State Parkway and three new grade separation improvements on Route 347 at the intersections of Route 454, Route 25 and Nicolls Road.

Alternatives under consideration include: (1) Taking no action; (2) Eight lane Arterial from Northern State Parkway to Route 454 and six lane arterial east of Route 454 to Route 25A with three grade separations and two new ramps on Northern State Parkway. Letters describing the proposed action and soliciting comments will be sent to appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, and to private organizations and citizens who have previously expressed interest in this proposal. Public information meetings will be held in the Towns of Smithtown and Brookhaven between winter of 2004 and summer of 2006. In addition, a public hearing will be held. Public notice will be given of the time and place of the meetings and hearing. The draft EIS, when prepared, will be available for public and agency review and comment. Early public involvement and coordination efforts to identify the range of reasonable alternatives and social, economic and environmental issues to be addressed resulted in a Route 347 Corridor Study Report completed in December 2001. Also, public meetings were held for this project in May of 2002 as part of the scoping process. No additional NEPA scoping meetings are planned at this time.

To ensure that the full range of issues related to this proposed action are addressed and all significant issues identified, comments and suggestions are invited from all interested parties. Comments or questions concerning this proposed action and the EIS should be directed to the NYSDOT or FHWA at the addresses provided above.

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 20.205, Highway Research, Planning and Construction. The regulations implementing Executive Order 12372 regarding intergovernmental consultation on Federal programs and activities apply to this program.)

Authority: 23 U.S.C. 315; 23 CFR 771.123


Douglas P. Conlan,
District Operations Engineer, Federal Highway Administration, Albany, New York.

[FR Doc. 04–12766 Filed 6–7–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Surface Transportation Board

[STB Finance Docket No. 34505]

East Brookfield & Spencer Railroad, LLC—Lease and Operation Exemption—CSX Transportation, Inc.

East Brookfield & Spencer Railroad, LLC (EB&SR), a noncarrier, has filed a verified notice of exemption under 49 CFR 1150.31 to lease, from CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSXT), and operate approximately 4 miles of rail line. The line is a portion of CSXT’s passing track located between mileposts 60 and 64 in East Brookfield and Spencer, Worcester County, MA, together with approximately 270 feet of lead track running from the passing track at milepost 63.08 to the property line of the proposed New England Automotive Gateway Facility (Facility) in East Brookfield, MA.1

EB&SR certifies that its projected revenues as a result of this transaction will not exceed those that would qualify it as a Class III rail carrier and states that such revenues will not exceed $5 million annually. The transaction was scheduled to be consummated on May 19, 2004.

If the verified notice contains false or misleading information, the exemption is void ab initio. Petitions to revoke the exemption under 49 U.S.C. 10502(d) may be filed at any time. The filing of a petition to revoke will not automatically stay the transaction.

An original and 10 copies of all pleadings, referring to STB Finance Docket No. 34505, must be filed with the Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20423–0001. In addition, a copy of each pleading must be served on Betty Jo Christian, Steptoe & Johnson, LLP, 1330 Connecticut Ave., NW., Washington, DC 20036.

Board decisions and notices are available on our Web site at http://www.stb.dot.gov.

Decided: June 1, 2004.

By the Board, David M. Konschnik, Director, Office of Proceedings.

Vernon A. Williams,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 04–12766 Filed 6–7–04; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4910–22–M

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Office of the Comptroller of the Currency

Proposed Extension of Information Collection; Comment Request

AGENCY: Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comment.

SUMMARY: The OCC, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federa-
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Federal Highway Administration

Environmental Impact Statement: Los Angeles County, CA

AGENCY: Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), DOT.

ACTION: Notice of intent.

SUMMARY: The FHWA is issuing this notice to advise the public that an environmental impact statement will be prepared for a proposed highway project in Los Angeles County, California.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ojas Pérez, Team Leader—South Region, Federal Highway Administration, 650 Capitol Mall, Suite 4-100, Sacramento, California 95814 Telephone (916) 498-5085.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The FHWA, in cooperation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA), will reinitiate environmental studies and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on a proposal to improve State Route 47 (SR-47) in Los Angeles County, California. The proposed improvement would involve replacing the seismically deficient Schuyler Heim Bridge with a new fixed-span bridge and the construction/extension of SR-47 as a new four-lane elevated expressway from the new Heim Bridge along Alameda Street to Pacific Coast Highway (State Route 1). The new fixed-span bridge would change the current vertical and horizontal clearances through the Cerritos Channel. The elevated expressway would provide a direct route from Terminal Island to Alameda Street, resulting in the elimination of five at-grade railroad crossings and ultimately reduce truck traffic on interstates 710 and 110.

During 2002, Caltrans and ACTA began formal public scoping and initiation of environmental studies for the proposed project. Notice letters were sent to Federal, State and local agencies on January 28, 2002. Notices were prepared in the Federal Register and local newspapers, advertising public scoping and open house meetings, on
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Internal Revenue Service

[EE–43–92]

Proposed Collection: Comment Request for Regulation Project

AGENCY: Internal Revenue Service (IRS), Treasury.

ACTION: Notice and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Treasury, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to take this opportunity to comment on proposed and/or continuing information collections, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104–13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)). Currently, the IRS is soliciting comments concerning an existing final regulation, RE–43–92 (TD 8619). Direct Rollovers and 20 Percent Withholding Upon Eligible Rollover Distributions From Qualified Plans (§§ 1.601(a)(31)–1, 1.402(c)(2)–1, 1.402(f)(3), 1.403(b)(2)–2, and 31.3405(c)(1)).

DATES: Written comments should be received on or before September 24, 2004 to be assured of consideration.

ADDRESSES: Direct all written comments to Glenn Kirkland, Internal Revenue Service, room 6411, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Requests for additional information or copies of the regulations should be directed to Allan Hopkins, at (202) 622–6665, or at Internal Revenue Service, room 6407, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20224, or through the Internet, at Allian M.Johnson@irs.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title: Direct Rollovers and 20 Percent Withholding Upon Eligible Rollover Distributions From Qualified Plans.

OMB Number: 1545–1341.

Regulation Project Number: EE–43–92.

Abstract: This regulation implements the provisions of the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1992 (Pub. L. 102–318), which impose mandatory 20 percent income tax withholding upon the taxable portion of certain distributions from a qualified pension plan or a tax-sheltered annuity that can be rolled over tax-free to another eligible retirement plan unless such amounts are transferred directly to such other plan in a “direct rollover” transaction. These provisions also require qualified pension plans and tax-sheltered annuities to offer their participants the option to elect to make “direct rollovers” of their distributions and to provide distributees with a written explanation of the tax law regarding their distributions and their option to elect such a rollover.

Current Actions: There is no change to this existing regulation.

Type of Review: Extension of a currently approved collection.

Affected Public: Individuals, business or other for-profit organizations, not-for-profit institutions, and Federal, State, local or tribal governments.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 10,323,926.

Estimated Time per Respondent: 13 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 2,129,660.

The following paragraph applies to all of the collections of information covered by this notice.

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a valid OMB control number. Books or records relating to a collection of information must be retained as long as their contents may become material in the administration of any internal revenue law. Generally, tax returns and tax return information are confidential, as required by 26 U.S.C. 6103.

Request for Comments

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the collection of information is necessary to provide the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency’s estimate of the burden of the collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology; and (e) estimates of capital or start-up costs and costs of operation, maintenance, and purchase of service to provide information.


Glenn Kirkland, IRS Reports Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 04–16995 Filed 7–23–04; 8:45 am]
August 23, 2004

File: 07-LA-47
KP 4.5/8.5 (PM 2.8/5.3)
Schuyler Heim Br. Replacement and
SR-47 Expressway
EA 199900

Dear Involved Agencies and Interested Parties:

Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies

Caltrans is formally initiating studies for a proposed project in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The project involves replacing the seismically-deficient Schuyler Heim Bridge and improving the SR 47/Henry Ford Avenue/Alameda Street transportation corridor by constructing an elevated expressway from the Heim Bridge to SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway). It is proposed to replace the existing vertical lift bridge with a fixed structure; various alternative alignments, heights and clear channel widths are being considered. Alternatives are also being considered for the expressway/SR 103 interchange in the expressway portion of the project. The proposed work will require additional Right of Way. The attached map shows the general limits of the proposed study.

During 2002, Caltrans and ACTA began formal public scoping and initiation of environmental studies for the proposed project. Notice letters were sent to federal, state, and local agencies on January 28, 2002. Notices were published in local newspapers advertising the public scoping and open house meetings on February 13, 2002. Public comments were received until February 28, 2002. Budgetary constraints then led Caltrans to temporarily suspend the project.

It is anticipated that the appropriate environmental document will be an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). However, this will be determined by the results of the environmental studies that will be conducted.

It would be appreciated if you would notify us of any existing facilities or planned developments surrounding the project study area. Caltrans anticipates that working cooperatively with other agencies and their staffs in an effort to exchange ideas will assure that all pertinent factors are considered and that a mutually acceptable transportation solution will result. Any comments or suggestions you may have concerning alternatives to be studied or potential social, economic, and environmental impacts associated with this project are welcome.

An Agency Scoping Meeting will be held on September 9, 2004 at the Wilmington Senior Center located at 1371 Eubank Ave., Wilmington, CA 90744 from 2:30 PM to 4:30 PM. A brief presentation will be made and displays will be available for review; questions and comments will also be solicited.

We will be pleased to have your ongoing participation on this project. Please send any written comments by September 30, 2004 to:

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning (LA 47 KP 4.5/8.5 (PM 2.8/5.3))
Caltrans
120 S. Spring Street (MS 16A)
Los Angeles, CA 90012

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
If you have any questions please contact Karl Price at (213) 897-1839 (e-mail: Karl_Price @dot.ca.gov). Caltrans would like to thank you for your participation and interest in this transportation project study.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning

State Route 47 from Ocean Blvd to Pacific Coast Highway

Project Location Map
August 23, 2004

File: 07-LA-47
KP 4.5/8.5 (PM 2.8/5.3)
Schuyler Heim Br. Replacement and
SR-47 Expressway
EA 199900

Dear Concerned Individuals and Interested Parties:

Notice of Scoping/Initiation of Studies

Caltrans is formally initiating studies for a proposed project in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor area. The project involves replacing the seismically-deficient Schuyler Heim Bridge and improving the SR 47/Henry Ford Avenue/Alameda Street transportation corridor by constructing an elevated expressway from the Heim Bridge to SR 1 (Pacific Coast Highway). It is proposed to replace the existing vertical lift bridge with a fixed structure; various alternative alignments, heights and clear channel widths are being considered. Alternatives are also being considered for the expressway/SR 103 interchange in the expressway portion of the project. The proposed work will require additional Right of Way. The attached map shows the general limits of the proposed study.

During 2002, Caltrans and ACTA began formal public scoping and initiation of environmental studies for the proposed project. Notice letters were sent to federal, state, and local agencies on January 28, 2002. Notices were published in local newspapers advertising the public scoping and open house meetings on February 13, 2002. Public comments were received until February 28, 2002. Budgetary constraints then led Caltrans to temporarily suspend the project.

It is anticipated that the appropriate environmental document will be an Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS). However, this will be determined by the results of the environmental studies that will be conducted.

It would be appreciated if you would notify us of any existing facilities or planned developments surrounding the project study area. Caltrans anticipates that working cooperatively with the public in an effort to exchange ideas will assure that all pertinent factors are considered and that a mutually acceptable transportation solution will result. Any comments or suggestions you may have concerning alternatives to be studied or potential social, economic, and environmental impacts associated with this project are welcome.

A Public Scoping Meeting will be held on September 9, 2004 at the Wilmington Senior Center located at 1371 Eubank Ave., Wilmington, CA 90744 from 5:30pm to 7:30pm. This will be an informal meeting with displays available for review; questions and comments will also be solicited.

We will be pleased to have your ongoing participation on this project. Please send any written comments by September 30, 2004 to:

Mr. Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning (LA 47 KP 4.5/8.5 (PM 2.8/5.3))
Caltrans
120 S. Spring Street (MS 16A)
Los Angeles, CA 90012

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
If you have any questions please contact Karl Price at (213) 897-1839 (e-mail: Karl_Price@dot.ca.gov). Caltrans would like to thank you for your participation and interest in this transportation project study.

Sincerely,

Ronald J. Kosinski, Deputy District Director
Division of Environmental Planning

State Route 47 from Ocean Blvd to Pacific Coast Highway

Project Location Map
Appendix G

Project Scope Summary Report (Seismic Retrofit)
PROJECT SCOPE SUMMARY REPORT
(SEISMIC RETROFIT)
PROJECT NO. 627

ON ROUTE 47
AT SCHUYLER HEIM BRIDGE

I have reviewed the right of way information contained in this Project Scope Summary Report-Seismic Retrofit and the R/W Data Sheet attached hereto, the data to be complete, current, and accurate:

LAWRENCE J. STALEY
Deputy District Director – Right of Way

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

ESSAM H. ALAMEDINE
Project Manager

APPROVED:

DOUGLAS R. FAILING
District Division Chief / Design

APPROVAL RECOMMENDED:

DEBORAH MAH
District Seismic Retrofit Coordinator and Program Manager

7/23/88
Date
This Project Scope Summary Report-Seismic Retrofit has been prepared under the direction of the following registered civil engineer. The registered civil engineer attests to the technical information contained herein and the engineering data upon which recommendations, conclusions, and decisions are based.

[Signature]
REGISTERED CIVIL ENGINEER

[Stamp]
C 50170
Exp. 6-30-01
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL

07-15-98
Date
INTRODUCTION

The Commodore Schuyler Heim Bridge (Bridge No. 53-2618) on Route 47, is one of the three bridges that connect the mainland and Terminal Island in the Ports of Long Beach/Los Angeles area. The Department of Transportation, District 7 is proposing to retrofit this bridge as a part of a statewide program to improve the seismic safety of those bridges under the responsibility of the Department. The seismic retrofit of this structure will provide a much higher level of security against the loss of this transportation vital link. Because of its original design with a lift span in the center, this bridge presents the advantage over the other two bridges (Vincent Thomas and Gerald Desmond) of having shorter and lower sustained longitudinal grades which makes it more attractive especially for the predominant truck traffic in the area.

The criteria for establishing the scope and extent of the Schuyler Heim Bridge retrofit was the “No Collapse” under the Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE). This implies that the operation of the lift span is not required following the design seismic event; therefore, all structural evaluations were performed assuming that the lift span was in the down position.

Designed in 1946, the Schuyler Heim Bridge carries three lanes each of northbound and southbound traffic across the Cerritos Channel into and out of Terminal Island. The structure portion design was developed through a service contract by the Engineering Consulting Firm, DeLeuw Cather & Co. under the supervision of Caltrans Office of Structures.

In addition to the seismic retrofit solution proposed, four other alternatives were considered, as follows:

1) a fixed (non-lift) bridge parallel to and offset from the existing bridge alignment,
2) a fixed bridge following the same general alignment as the existing bridge,
3) a vertical lift moveable bridge parallel to and offset from the existing alignment, and
4) a vertical lift moveable bridge following the same general alignment as the existing bridge.

The fixed bridge alternatives were not pursued due to objections from the US Coast Guard and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach due to vertical clearance and right of way constraints.

The offset vertical lift bridge alternative required significant permanent right of way acquisitions and was also abandoned.

The vertical lift moveable bridge alternative was developed by keeping the original bridge alignment as much as possible. This alternative although considered by the Ports, required a temporary detour, fixed bridge, parallel to the existing one, interim retrofit of the approach spans, and additional right of way at a prohibitive cost.
This alternative had a cost estimate of $180,000,000 which included interim retrofit of the approach spans. This Project Scope Summary Report (PSSR) is being prepared to program, fund, and schedule a seismic retrofit project of one structure on Route LA-47. This project is in the legislatively mandated seismic retrofit program.

II. RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the seismic retrofit proposals described below be approved.

III. LOCATION AND PROBLEM

This seismic retrofit project proposes work on the following structure which does not meet present standards for seismic resistance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Bridge No.</th>
<th>Bridge Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-LA-47</td>
<td>3.6/4.3</td>
<td>53-2618</td>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. PROPOSALS

This project proposes to provide the following:

A. Truss Bridge

- Tower pier foundation retrofit
- Truss pier foundation retrofit
- Reconstruct timber fenders
- Reconstruct steel sheet pile bulkhead
- Driving of 3’ diameter CIDH piles for slope stabilization
- Tower retrofit
- Top laterals retrofit
- Bottom laterals retrofit
- Tower anchorage retrofit
- Truss bearing retrofit
- Lateral restraint retrofit

B. Approach Structures

- Class “F” column retrofit
- Column strengthening
- Longitudinal and transverse footing retrofit
- Bearing retrofit
- Steel cap and deck connection strengthening
- Footing cap strengthening
- Abutment retrofit
- Bearing retrofit
- Lateral bracing
V. COST ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53-2618</td>
<td>43,819,000</td>
<td>840,000</td>
<td>1,350,300</td>
<td>623,000</td>
<td>$46,632,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. PROJECT SCHEDULES

- Strategy Meeting: 12/4/96
- Project Scope Summary Report Approval: 08/98
- Structure PS&E to District: 08/98
- District PS&E to Office Engineer: 08/98
- Ready to List: 08/98
- Advertisement: 08/98
- Construction Complete: 10/00

VI. PROJECT FACTORS

A. Environmental

The project Environmental Document to clear this project is ND/FONSI. The soils at the north and south approaches are contaminated at some of the bent locations with lead and petroleum hydrocarbons. Quality of the groundwater was also evaluated for discharge/disposal purposes. Mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance to findings and recommendations of Site Investigation Report and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDS) permit requirements.

The superstructure is painted with lead based paint. Containment and monitoring will be necessary.

B. Right of Way

Permanent and temporary easements will be required. There is railroad facilities involvement. The railroad is owned and controlled by the Port of Long Beach.

C. Utilities

The following utilities are in the vicinity of the retrofit work, but have no conflict with this project as cleared by the Utility Engineer:

- 6" So Cal gas line west of the existing piers
- Submarine cables for Southern California Edison
- Submarine cables for W.U. & U.P.R.R.
- 2-35KV Department of Water and Power submarine cables
- Submarine cables for W.U. & U.P.R.R.
- Submarine communication cables between Schuyler Heim and Henry Ford
Bridges. These cables are abandoned.
- 2-6" DU electrical cable

D. Permits

The following permits will be required:
- Port of Long Beach Harbor Development Permit
- Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- California Department of Fish and Game
- Regional Water Quality Control Board

E. Traffic Control

The retrofit work will require:
- Partial lane closure and/or lane re-striping
- Temporary lane re-striping of roadways crossing the bridge during work on the underside of the deck
- Coordination with the railroad companies during work at the rail lines
- Full closure of bridge for 8 hour periods to reconstruct the lift span bearings
- 8-48 hour, 48-4 hour and 1-8day periods of lift span closures for shipping traffic in the channel

F. Concurrent Work

There is an ongoing construction project for Bridge Deck Replacement (Contract No. 07-4C51040) and a Minor B Project is currently programmed for the 97/98 FY to modify traffic signals and overhead signs at this bridge (Contract No. 4M2501). Other contracts north and south of the project under the administration of the Port of Long Beach, and the Vincent Thomas Bridge retrofit project.

G. Landscaping

No landscaping will be required for this project.

VIII. PROJECT FUNDING

This project will be funded from the Structure Seismic Retrofit (HA4S) Fund Reservations by SHOPP Amendment following approval of this PSSR. Construction cost will be programmed in the 98/99 fiscal year at a total project cost of $46,700,000.
IX. PROJECT PERSONEL

A. District 7

MARIO A. GUTIERREZ
Project Engineer
Calnet 647-4644
(213) 897-4644

ESSAM H. ALAMEDDINE
Project Manager
Calnet 647-0141
(213) 897-0141

DEBORAH MAH
District Program Manager
Calnet 647-4593
(213) 897-4593

LAWRENCE J. STALEY
District 7 R/W Management Branch
Calnet 647-1823
(213) 897-1823

ELATTAR AZIZ
Environmental Planning Branch
Calnet 647-0686
(213) 897-0686

B. Office of Structure

RAND HELDE
Project Engineer
Calnet 498-8052
(916) 227-8052

RON JESPERSEN
Contract Manager
Calnet 498-8047
(916) 227-8047

X. PROJECT REVIEWS

A. FHWA

Although this project is exempt from FHWA review, due to its complexity, a review of the PS&E documents has been scheduled. The project is eligible for Federal participation.

B. Headquarters

There are no non-standard features proposed for this project. Review by Project Development Coordinator is not required.

XI. ATTACHMENTS

A. Location Map
B. FONSI/CEQA Documents
C. Right of Way Data Sheet
D. General Plan
E. General Plan Structure for Structure Portion
Finding of No Significant Impact

for

Route 47 - Schuyler Heim Bridge Seismic Retrofit Project

Los Angeles County, California

The proposed project involves the Seismic retrofit of the Commodore Schuyler Heim Bridge. The structure is one of the three bridges that connect Terminal Island to the mainland in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor complex.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has determined that this project will not have any significant impact on the human environment. This finding of no significant impact is based on the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) and the information provided by Caltrans, which has been evaluated by the FHWA and determined to adequately discuss the environmental issues and impacts of the proposed project. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an environmental impact statement is not required.

The FHWA takes responsibility for the scope and content of the attached environmental assessment.

May 20, 1998

Date

For Jeffrey A. Limley
Division Administrator, FHWA

SS# P17889
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

(CEQA)

Pursuant: Division 13, Public Resources Code

Description: The proposed project involves the seismic retrofit of the Commodore Schuyler Heim Bridge. This structure is one of three bridges that connect Terminal Island to the mainland in the Los Angeles/Long Beach Harbor complex. The retrofit, which will be carried out as part of the statewide seismic retrofit program, will enhance the ability of this bridge to withstand a major earthquake.

Determination: An Initial Study has been prepared by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). On the basis of this study it is determined that the proposed action will not have a significant effect upon the environment for the following reasons:

1. There will be no significant effects on businesses, residences, schools, or public facilities, neighborhoods, employment, or the area economy.

2. Potential significant effects on unique or significant natural features, including but not limited to, threatened or endangered species, their habitat or movement, can be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

3. Potential significant effects on architectural, cultural or historic properties, park lands, recreation or scenic areas can be mitigated to a level of insignificance.

4. There will be no significant effect on noise, air quality or water quality.

5. There will be no effect on growth or require public services beyond those proposed for the near future.

6. There will be no significant effect on prime agricultural land or floodplains.

Raja Mitwasi
Deputy District Director
California Department of Transportation

Date: 5-19-98
IF THIS PROJECT IS SUBSEQUENTLY DIVIDED OR CHANGED INTO ANOTHER E.A. AND/OR THE PROJECT COPE CHANGES, THEN THIS DATA SHEET BECOMES INVALID FOR STIP, BUDGET, AND PYS CAN PURPOSES. NEW DATA SHEET(S) WILL NEED TO BE REQUESTED IMMEDIATELY BY YOUR SECTION.

TRANSMITTED HEREWITH IS A COST ESTIMATE PURSUANT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITION(S)

X 1. COST ESTIMATE IS VALID FOR THE ABOVE SCOPING REPORT ONLY AND NEED TO BE UPDATED WITHIN TWO YEARS. THIS IS AN ESTIMATE ONLY AND NOT AN APPRAISAL. IT MAY BE BASED ON A WORSE CASE SCENARIOS. THE ESTIMATE IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE AND REVISION

X 2. NOTIFY THE ABOVE COORDINATORS IF THIS IS THE PREFERRED PROJECT

3. RESIDENTIAL DISPLACEMENT IS INVOLVED AND ENVIRONMENTAL DEPT. NEEDS TO BE ADVISED BY YOUR DEPT.

X 4. MAPS WERE: PROVIDED  X  NOT PROVIDED

DATE  6/17/98

X 5. THE MAPPING DID NOT PROVIDE SUFFICIENT OR ADEQUATE DETAIL TO DETERMINE THE LIMITS OF THE RIGHT OF WAY REQUIRED AND EFFECTS ON THE IMPROVEMENTS.

X 6. THE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES HAVE NOT BEEN SUFICIENTLY DESIGNED SO OUR ESTIMATOR COULD DETERMINE THE DAMAGES TO ANY OF THE REMAINDER PARCELS AFFECTED BY THE PROJECT.

X 7. ADDITIONAL RIGHT OF WAY REQUIREMENTS ARE ANTICIPATED BUT ARE NOT DEFINED DUE TO THE PRELIMINARY NATURE OF EARLY DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.

X 8. TIME CONSTRAINTS PRECEDED A DETAILED COST ESTIMATES

9. TIME SCHEDULE PROVIDED BY REQUESTING PARTY DID NOT PERMIT TIME FOR A FIELD INSPECTION.

10. OTHER (EXPLAIN):

CURRENT VALUE
(FUTURE USE)

ESCALATED
VALUE

1-R/W ACQ (INCL. CONTINGENCY G/W - CONDEM. ADM. STL.)

$676,838

$687,054

2-CLEARANCE /DEMOLITION (CONT.)


3- RAP. (CONT.)


4- ESCROW COSTS (CONT.)

$2,571

$2,602

UTILITY RELOCATION COSTS


TOTAL ESTIMATED COST
(CURRENT VALUE-FUTURE USE)

$681,409

TOTAL ESCALATION COST TO CERT. DATE

$699,656

ESCALATION RATE RAW 5%
ESCALATION RATE UTILITIES 8%
ERT DATE 06/01/96 YEARS 0.25 TO CERT.

N/A -- COST DATA IS NOT VALID FOR BUDGET, STIP, PROGRAMMING NOR COST SCREENS #1

ATTACHMENT
### Parcel Data Information

**Authorized for the Event Screens**

It is the preferred or highest cost.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>NUM</th>
<th>DUAL APP</th>
<th>UTILITIES</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PY HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U4-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U4-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>U4-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U4-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>US-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>US-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARCELS NUM.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FEE</td>
<td>EASE</td>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidelines Only**

- **Activity %**
  - APP: 40% 0.28
  - ACQ: 35% 0.24
  - DEMO: 17% 0.12
  - UTIL: 8% 0.06
  - TOTAL: 100% 0.69

- **Person Yrs**
  - Full: 4
  - Part: 4
  - TOTAL: 4

**Total Parcels per Assessors Records and/or Maps**

- 4

**RAP Impact**

- Yes

**Are Railroads Facilities or RW Affected**

- Yes

**Spur Line Impacted**

- Yes

**Are Hazardous Waste and/or Material Found**

- Yes

**General Description of Right of Way**

- Temp and perm. Easements from the gov't's entities

**Are Utility Facilities or Right of Ways Affect**

- Yes

**Are Existing or Potential Air Space Parcels Affected**

- Yes

**Is It Anticipated That All Right of Way Work Will Be Performed by CIT Staff**

- Yes

**Evaluation Prepared By**

- Right of Way Prepared by: Tom McVarish
- Railroad Prepared by: Al Hughes
- Utilities Prepared by: U. Anakaivene
- Date: 07/13/98
- Date: 07/14/98
- Date: 07/15/98

**RW Agent Approves Data Sheet for Budgetary Purposes**

- J. Cabrera
- Date: 07/14/98

**RW Agent Does Not Approve Data Sheet Costs for Budgetary Purposes**

- Date: __________

I have personally reviewed this RW Data Sheet and all supporting information and certify that the probable highest and best use, estimated values, and assumptions are reasonable and proper subject to the limiting conditions set forth and I find this data sheet complete and current.

This data sheet is not to be signed unless accompanied by final scoping report (PR, PSR, PSSR) for review and/or signature.

**Chief**

Date: 7/21/98
### APPENDIX H
**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Land Use, Recreation, and Coastal Zone</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Growth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Community Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character and Cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocations CI-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide relocation assistance or compensation to eligible persons and businesses in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (42 USC Sections 4601-4655) and the California Relocation Act (California Government Code, Section 7260 et. seq.).</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4 Utilities and Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide advance notification to utility users of the potential for service disruption and the anticipated time/date of the disruption.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to bridge construction, notify watch commanders and station chiefs of all fire, police, and other land- and water-based response stations that service the port area or use the Schuyler Heim Bridge or Cerritos Channel as a travel route to respond to service calls in order to minimize delays to emergency response providers during project construction. This action will allow for the identification of alternate routes and the development of contingency response plans, including:</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Temporary interim policies that will identify alternative resources within the public service and emergency response organization (i.e., alternative response units located closer to the incident); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Mutual aid agreements between bordering public service and emergency response organizations (i.e., LAFD and LBFD) that could be dispatched.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify in the contract that construction in the Cerritos Channel must occur in a manner that allows emergency</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H
AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marine vessels to pass or be carried out in such a way that barges with construction equipment will be moved quickly to allow passage of emergency vessels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-4</strong> Determine where construction-related activities have the potential to disrupt response routes, and coordinate with Los Angeles and Long Beach police and fire departments, as well as any local emergency medical service units.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-5</strong> Utilize a Transportation Management Plan that is agreeable to all emergency service providers and the project design team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U-6</strong> During final design, after selection of the preferred alternative, a determination will be made regarding which of the identified utilities will be relocated. Plans for the relocations will be developed in consideration of the project schedule and consultation with the utility providers which include, but are not limited to, LADWP, LBWD, SCE, SCG, GTE/Verizon, AT&amp;T, City of Los Angeles. In addition, pipeline relocations will be planned and implemented in consultation with TOPCO, Exxon Mobil, Gulf Oil, and SCG. In further consultation with utility providers, some obsolete utilities may be removed at the request of the provider.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Traffic and Transportation

| **T-1** Prior to construction, temporary parking spaces will be provided to replace existing parking capacity that will not be available during project construction. Caltrans will coordinate with the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles to identify replacement parking for the Pier A East and Pier S Terminals. Exact locations will be determined after consultation with responsible parties, including property owners. Considerations of feasibility will include, but not be limited to, vehicle capacity, time of availability, distance from terminal(s), and the need for employee shuttles. | No Mitigation Measures are required. | X | X | X | X | -- | -- |
| **T-2** The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) will be implemented to enhance vehicular and pedestrian traffic. | | X | X | X | X | -- | -- |
| **T-3** Compensation for the permanent loss of an estimated 15 employee parking spaces at the Port of Long Beach Pier S Terminal will be provided. Compensation will be based on an agreement between Caltrans and the Port of Long Beach. | No Mitigation Measures are required. | X | X | -- | X | -- | -- |

3.6 Marine Vessel Transportation

No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required. No Mitigation Measures are required. -- -- -- -- -- --
### APPENDIX H
AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.7 Visual Resources/Aesthetics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VR-1</strong></td>
<td>The surfaces of columns, roadway barriers, soundwalls, and gore points will receive surface color treatments at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VR-2</strong></td>
<td>Elements of the design of the proposed bridge and expressways, such as color, line, texture, and style, would be aesthetically pleasing and as unobtrusive as possible. During final design, particular attention would be paid to the vertical columns and soundwalls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VR-3</strong></td>
<td>All visual design elements, including landscaping, would be designed and implemented with the concurrence of the Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect and in compliance with local policies and guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VR-4</strong></td>
<td>Trees and vines will be planted along soundwalls and other walls at specified locations, as determined by a Caltrans Licensed Landscape Architect.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VR-5</strong></td>
<td>Design of the elevated expressway would be compatible (scale and massing) with the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge or future bridge and the Badger Avenue/Henry Ford Railroad bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.8 Cultural Resources

| **CR-1** Measures for Unknown Archaeological Resources | Under compliance with federal historic preservation laws, mitigation measures will be presented in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that will be submitted to SHPO pursuant to Section 106 PA Stipulation XI, 36 CFR 800.6(a) and 800.6(b)(1). The final suite of mitigation would be determined by the SHPO and incorporated into a Final MOA that is signed by Caltrans and FHWA. The FHWA shall ensure that some or all of the following measures are implemented. | X | X | X | X | -- | -- |
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### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR-3</td>
<td>The bridge shall be offered for sale for reuse in an alternate location to interested public agencies and non-profits. A marketing plan shall be prepared for the sale of the bridge including: a notification letter, fact sheet, list of intended recipients, as well as provisions for the salvage of smaller components in the case that there is no interest in re-use of the bridge. Advertisements shall be placed in appropriate newspapers of record. The offer shall run for 6 months. If no acceptable bids are received after 6 months this stipulation shall be deeded to have been met. The above shall be done in accordance with the U.S. Department of Transportation Historic Bridge Program 23 USC144(o)(4)(A) and (B).</td>
<td>X X -- X -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-4</td>
<td>Informative permanent metal plaques shall be installed at both ends of the new bridge at public locations that provide a brief history of the original bridge, its engineering features and characteristics, the reasons for its demolition, and a statement of the characteristics of the replacement structure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-5</td>
<td>Pursuant to Section 110(b) of the NHPA, before the Bridge is demolished, the Historic American Buildings Survey/Historic American Engineering Record (HABS/HAER) shall be contacted to determine what level and kind of recordation is required for the property. All documentation shall be completed and accepted by HABS/HAER before the Bridge is demolished.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-6</td>
<td>Copies of the HABS/HAER report shall be disseminated to the City of Los Angeles Public Library and the City of Long Beach Public Library.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-7</td>
<td>Information from the HABS/HAER report shall be available to the public for 10 years on an appropriate internet website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR-8</td>
<td>A documentary (motion picture or video) shall be produced and shall address the history of the Bridge, its importance and use within the history of the Port of Long Beach and Port of Los Angeles, and demonstrate its operation and function. The motion picture or video will be of broadcast quality, of sufficient length for a standard 30-minute time period and will be made available for local broadcast stations to public access channels in local cable systems and to schools/libraries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **CR-9** Traveling museum exhibits shall be prepared and shall address the history of the Bridge, its importance and use within the history of the Port of Long Beach and the Port of Los Angeles, and demonstrate its operation and function, appropriate for display in small museums, or for use in schools.  
**CR-10** Artifacts removed from the Bridge during preliminary stages of the demolition process shall be offered to local museums, and provide for their delivery to accepting institutions. Examples of such artifacts may include, but not be limited to, control panels, instruments, structural members, railings, signage, plaques or other identifying ornamentation, street lights, navigation lights, etc.  
**CR-11** Measures CR-3, CR-5, CR-8, and CR-10, above, shall be completed prior to demolition of the Bridge. All stipulations shall be completed within 1 year of demolition, unless an extension of time is agreed upon. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

### 3.9 Hydrology, Floodplains, and Oceanography

**Construction HY-1** The following are BMPs for protection of water quality during construction:
- Tires on construction equipment that leaves a contaminated work site will be washed before the equipment leaves the site.
- Within a contaminated work area, construction equipment will be cleaned only as necessary (e.g. moved to a non-contaminated area) to minimize the volume of decontamination wash water and prevent transport of contaminants from work site areas.
- Designated locations will be provided for servicing, washing, and refueling equipment, away from temporary channels or swales that would quickly convey runoff to the drainage system and into the Cerritos Channel or Consolidated Slip/Dominguez Channel.
- Contaminated material (e.g. oil, lubricants) will be kept at a safe distance, a minimum of 30.5 m (100 ft) from an entry into a receiving water body. Temporary barriers and containers will be used to confine any contaminated materials. Upon completion of construction, all contaminated material on the construction site will be |

**No Mitigation Measures are required.** | X | X | X | X | -- | -- |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>removed and disposed of in accordance with federal, regional, and local regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of marine construction equipment will not involve fuel transfers onsite.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A temporary spill containment system will be installed and maintained on either side of a water crossing. The contractor will be responsible for the containment plan and the execution of spill containment during the course of construction. The containment plan will be reviewed and approved by a resident engineer.</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To prevent potential introduction of any lead-based paint into receiving waters, the contractor(s) will take appropriate measures to eliminate lead-based paint from reaching the receiving waters. If paint removal is necessary during the bridge dismantling process, the contractor will comply with all applicable laws and regulations relative to this process to ensure protection of receiving waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At project construction sites, as appropriate, the contractor will:</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- provide stabilized entrances and exits</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- regularly water the non-paved surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- regularly sweep and vacuum paved surfaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install silt fences at the toe of excavation and embankment slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install sand or gravel bag berms along the top of slopes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install slope protection such as geotextiles, plastic covers, soil binders and erosion control blankets/mats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install slope interruption devices such as fiber rolls and slope drains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- install permanent erosion control seeding, landscape planting or slope/rock paving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- protect storm drain inlets with inserts or linear interrupters such as gravel bag and/or sand bag berms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- manage stockpiles against wind and water erosion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Monitor and report BMP performance and conditions before and immediately after the completion of work, in accordance with SWPPP specifications.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HY-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities that would produce sediment transport of pollutants through the Cerritos Channel or Consolidated Slip/Dominguez Channel will be minimized through strict adherence to construction BMPs, which include, but are not limited to, the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Channel bank work will include bank protection (riprap, concrete walls, and sheet piling) to eliminate the possibility of enhanced bank erosion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cofferdams will be used during blasting or other bank or sediment disturbing construction activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of turbidity curtains in lieu of silt curtains.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HY-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater encountered during construction will be temporarily stored onsite, tested, transported, treated, and disposed offsite. A dewatering permit will be obtained from the Los Angeles RWQCB.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on results of the groundwater assessment and recommendations from the RWQCB, one of the following will be utilized for disposal of groundwater from the proposed dewatering operation: Onsite Treatment, Treatment and Disposal Offsite, or Disposal into Local Sewer System.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onsite Treatment:</strong> This would entail designing and constructing a temporary water treatment plant for treating water generated from dewatering operations to reduce the concentrations of pollutants of concern below NPDES limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment and Disposal Offsite:</strong> This would entail temporary storage of water on the project site, waste profiling, and then transporting the water to a regulated facility for treatment and disposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposal into Local Sewer System:</strong> This would entail disposal of the groundwater into the City of Los Angeles sewage treatment system, which is connected to the Terminal Island Treatment Plant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To dispose of groundwater into the City of Los Angeles sewer system, an Industrial Wastewater Discharge Permit is required, which is issued by the City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation, Industrial Waste Management Division (IWMD). To satisfy permit conditions, treatment of discharge water could be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.10 Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff</strong></td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>X X X X -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See HY-1, HY-2, HY-3, above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X X -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs for surface runoff include construction of barriers at entry points to receiving waters to prevent large debris from entering the receiving water, and continuous monitoring of the new bridge structures for excessive buildup of debris that could be discharged in a precipitation event.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WQ-2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>-- -- X -- X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The following BMPs will be continued as related to ongoing maintenance for the existing Schuyler Heim Bridge:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Remove excess grease from moving parts of bridges manually and collect it for disposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Degrease prior to painting, and hydro-blast to remove old paint with additive-free water, where possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Erect shrouds around working areas and suspend nets and tarps below bridges to catch debris from abrasive removal of old paint and over-spray from painting, where wind conditions permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Anchor tarps to barges below and enclose the bridge above to confine debris, where the bridge deck is not too far above water level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use barges and booms to capture fugitive floating paint chips and custom-built enclosures to confine and capture the abrasives, old paint chips, and paint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Use vacuum or suction shrouds on blast heads to capture grit and old paint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carry out storing, mixing, and cleaning operations on land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Schedule bridge maintenance to avoid egg incubation, juvenile rearing, and downstream migration periods of fish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H: Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.11 Geology/Soils/Seismicity/Paleontology/Topography/Mineral Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEO-1</strong> Design criteria, standards, and procedures contained in state and local jurisdiction standards and specifications (e.g., Uniform Building Code) would be applied during final design of the project, including earthquake-resistant standards to reduce potential effects from a major earthquake.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required for geologic resources.</td>
<td>X X X X -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEO-2</strong> A geotechnical study would be completed for all areas associated with load-bearing features, and areas with potential for slope failure (e.g., trenches) and soil subsidence, and a geotechnical report would be prepared. The geotechnical report would include project-specific recommendations consistent with standards established by state and local jurisdictions. Geotechnical report recommendations would be incorporated into final project design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEO-3</strong> Monitoring during construction would be performed by a licensed geologist or engineer to verify construction occurs in compliance with features, standards, and practices included in final design to reduce potential effects from earthquake damage; slope and/or foundation instability; erosion, sedimentation, and flooding; land subsidence; and volcanic hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALEO-1</strong> Implement Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Program which includes, but is not limited to, the tasks shown below. Additional detail is provided in the Paleontological Resources EIS/EIR Technical Section (Jones &amp; Stokes, 2005).</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required for paleontological resources.</td>
<td>X X X X -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program will be directed by a paleontologist or paleontological consulting firm approved by Caltrans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct program in compliance with lead agency and professional society guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and obtain museum storage agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinate with construction contractor to provide information regarding lead agency requirements for the protection of Paleontological resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct paleontological monitoring, as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Treat any specimens collected in accordance with museum repository requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transfer any collected fossils to museum repository.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain daily monitoring logs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prepare final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

#### 3.12 Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials

**Construction**

**HAZ-1**

Conduct a soil investigation prior to any soil excavation for the build alternatives. The investigation would assess the potential presence of hazardous contaminants and determine disposal options if necessary for the contaminated soil. The soil investigation could consist of an ADL investigation and investigation for other contaminants of concern due to effects from adjoining properties.

**HAZ-2**

Evaluate soil and groundwater information for the adjoining Sunshine Truck Stop, LA Refining Company, Texaco Refining, TCL, Dow Chemical, and former Long Beach Naval Shipyard property to assess potential effects. If the review indicates evidence of contamination or a lack of sufficient data, a soil and groundwater investigation will be conducted, and further measures will be implemented, as necessary.

**HAZ-3**

Inform demolition contractors of the potential presence of LBP in structures subject to demolition, and applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and other regulatory measures shall be adhered to in the demolition of such structures. If contamination is encountered during the construction process, implement appropriate health and safety measures to protect workers and the general public. Such measures may include engineering controls, requiring appropriate personal protective equipment, worker monitoring, and site-specific health and safety plans.

**HAZ-4**

A licensed professional will conduct a predemolition survey of the Schuyler Heim Bridge ACM and LBP. The purpose of the survey would be to determine the presence of regulated and/or potentially hazardous construction materials on the bridge. Any demolition activities that would remove or disturb these materials would implement measures in accordance with applicable regulations. As required by law, the abatement contractor shall be a licensed professional.

**HAZ-5**

Conduct asbestos removal in conformance with Rule 1403 of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) and EPA’s National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants regulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12 Hazardous Waste/Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX H
### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint from the dismantled bridge sections would be chemically removed at a suitable offsite location in an upland area. This will be done to avoid the introduction of lead-based paint into the receiving waters. If paint removal is necessary during the dismantling process, the contractor would comply with all applicable laws and regulations to ensure protection of receiving waters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwater data for Alternative 2 currently are not available. However, considering the history and nature of activities conducted at some of the sites within the Alternative 2 right-of-way, it is recommended that a groundwater evaluation be conducted, both to assess disposal alternatives for groundwater encountered during construction, and to comply with requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process. If groundwater is found to be contaminated, it would be treated in place and/or transported for treatment and/or disposal at an appropriate facility, in accordance with applicable regulations.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>-- X -- -- -- --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAZ-8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If soil excavation is necessary in the vicinity of the two former landfills along the Alternative 2 alignment, there is the potential to encounter hazardous waste, based on past activities. Therefore, it is recommended that a soil investigation be conducted. If soil is found to be contaminated, it would be treated in place and/or excavated and transported for treatment and/or disposal at an appropriate facility, in accordance with applicable regulations. One of the former landfills, the Alameda Street Landfill, is proposed to be included in the National Priority List (NPL). Therefore, coordination with the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is recommended while evaluating the viability of Alternative 2.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>-- -- X -- X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations**
Under Alternatives 3, 5, and 6, the Schuyler Heim Bridge would remain in place and would require ongoing maintenance. The following would apply.

**Maintenance Activities**
A Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) study concluded that most highway maintenance practices that could adversely affect water quality can be effectively minimized or reduced through readily available control practices or BMPs. An NCHRP report notes that fully enclosed containment structures are capable of recovering 85 to 90 percent of abrasives, paint particles, and dust.
### APPENDIX H

**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for simple spans. However, this may not be feasible for bridges with high trusses or other complex structures.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**See WQ-2, in Section 3.10, Water Quality and Stormwater Runoff, above.**

**3.13 Air Quality**

No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.

**Mitigation Measures for PM$_{10}$/PM$_{2.5}$**

- **AQ-1**
  - Apply nontoxic soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for 10 days).

- **AQ-2**
  - Replace ground cover in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

- **AQ-3**
  - Reduce traffic speed on all unpaved roads to 15 mph or less.

**Mitigation Measures for CO, ROG, and NOx**

- **AQ-4**
  - Develop and implement a trip reduction plan to achieve a 1.5 average vehicle ridership for construction employees.

- **AQ-5**
  - Implement a shuttle service for construction workers to and from retail services and food establishments during lunch hours.

- **AQ-6**
  - Prohibit truck idling in excess of 2 minutes.

- **AQ-7**
  - Suspend use of all construction equipment operations during second-stage smog alerts.

- **AQ-8**
  - Use electricity, if feasible, from power poles rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators.

- **AQ-9**
  - **Heavy Duty Truck Buyback Program**
    - The purpose of the buyback program would be to accelerate the modernizing of the heavy duty engine fleet operating in the South Coast Air Basin. By removing the older engines in the fleet and requiring replacement with newer, cleaner vehicles, a net reduction of NOx emissions (and other combustion pollutants) would occur. This reduction would help offset marine vessel detour emissions.
    - The protocols to be used would be consistent with the Carl Moyer Program, which is already being administered by the SCAQMD.
    - However, this program is not available to projects such as...
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AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</strong></th>
<th><strong>ALTERNATIVES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and could not be used to actually implement this project’s buy-back program. The Gateway Cities Diesel Fleet Modernization Program would be an example of a buyback program with similar reduction goals. Also, the POLA/POLB Clean Air Action Plan has a heavy duty truck buy back component. While participating in already existing programs might be preferable (and possible), it would not be necessary in order to accomplish heavy duty truck buy back. The heavy duty truck buy back could be done independently, though it would have to adhere to already accepted protocols (SCAQMD). A heavy duty truck buyback program would consist of three steps 1) identify target vehicles based on year of make; 2) provide incentives for operators to participate 3) establish a means to ensure that replacements meet the net improvement forecasted. The construction phase of this project is where the greatest impact of increased emission levels occurs. Therefore, the buyback program would be designed to mitigate the NOx emissions during that time. Based on recent buyback programs, the program for the proposed project would cost from $25,000 to $50,000 ton of NOx reduced. This cost can vary significantly and will continue to increase as time passes. The number of tons mitigated would be based on marine vessel detour NOx emissions during construction. The rerouting of shipping vessels during project construction would amount to 132.8 lbs NOx per day, which is equivalent to 24.2 tons NOx per year. The indirect marine vessel emissions would be mitigated to a level that is below the SCAQMD significance threshold for construction emissions. It is estimated that each truck replacement would reduce an average of 0.55 tons per year of NOx and 0.12 tons per year of PM. This is based on emission factors representative of current buyback programs such as the Gateway Cities Diesel Fleet Modernization Program. These emission reductions would continue for 3 to 5 years, depending on the year of the truck updated. This timeframe would exceed the duration of the project construction phase.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.14 Noise

| **N-1** Construction noise monitoring and control plans consistent with local noise ordinances will be prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer who is a current member of the Institute of Noise | **N-2** During project construction, pile driving will occur during daylight hours only. | X X X X X -- -- |

---

*Schuyler Heim Bridge Replacement and SR-47 Expressway Project*
*Draft EIS/EIR*
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### Avoidance and Minimization Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Engineering (INCE), and has 5 years of experience performing construction noise analyses. If mitigation is warranted, potential measures, such as screening, noise blankets, etc., would be evaluated for their effectiveness, and appropriate measures would be implemented.</strong></td>
<td><strong>N-3</strong> Residents identified as being impacted by noise from pile driving in Cerritos Channel or Consolidated Slip may obtain hotel vouchers for a local hotel so they can temporarily move. This mitigation measure would apply only during the time that pile driving is being conducted in the Cerritos Channel or Consolidated Slip. Some residents may, however, choose to stay and tolerate the noise. No other mitigation or compensation measure would be provided to residents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.

| **N-4** Leeward Bay Marina | Leeward Bay Marina Caltrans and FHWA will incorporate noise abatement in the form of a barrier along the SR-47 Expressway, with an approximate length of 239 m (785 ft) and an average height of 2.44 m (8 ft). The barrier will abate future traffic noise at 65 benefited receivers. Preliminary reasonableness calculations indicate the estimated barrier cost would be approximately $23,400 per benefited receiver, which is within the allowance per residence of $50,000 to $54,000. | X -- X -- -- -- |

| **N-5** Wilmington Neighborhood | Wilmington Neighborhood For the Wilmington neighborhood, a barrier along the SR-47 Expressway and another on ground level along Alameda Street, with an approximate combined length of 1,405 m (4,610 ft) and height of 3.66 m (12 ft) to 5.49 m (18 ft) would be constructed to abate future traffic noise levels at 56 benefited receivers. Preliminary reasonableness calculations indicate that the estimated barrier cost would be approximately $37,500 per benefited residence, which is within the allowance per residence of $48,000. | X -- X -- -- -- |

No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.

| **N-6** Long Beach Neighborhood/SR-103 Extension | Long Beach Neighborhood/SR-103 Extension Caltrans and FHWA will incorporate noise abatement in the form of two barriers along SR-103 with an approximate combined length of 835 m (2,740 ft) to abate traffic noise levels. The two barriers would be 3.66 m (12 ft) high, although the barrier section along the northbound off-ramp would be 4.57 m (15 ft) high. The barriers would reduce noise levels in the receiver areas to below the NAC and would reduce noise levels by 1 to 14 dBA for 27 equivalent frontage units. Preliminary reasonableness calculations indicate that the barriers would cost approximately $37,100 per benefited unit, which is below the allowance per residence of $44,000 to $52,000. The locations of the noise barriers are based on preliminary engineering plans and, as such, are considered to be approximate. The exact locations of these barriers would be determined during final design based on safety, engineering, and feasibility. | -- X -- -- -- -- |
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## AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.15 Energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.</td>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3.16 Biological Resources</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### B-1 Wetland Avoidance

To avoid the wetlands present to the east of the Schuyler Heim Bridge along the low tidal terrace on Cerritos Channel and along SR-103 near Gabriel Street, construction staging, traffic, and vehicle access would be excluded from these areas to the extent feasible. Caution fencing would be installed to protect the small wetlands, and construction activities would be modified to avoid them. This measure would be implemented, as necessary, to avoid adverse effects to jurisdictional waters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B-2 Protecting Aquatic Communities (including EFH, Coast Pelagic Species, Groundfish)

Sediment resuspension would be minimized by adherence to construction measures such as cofferdams and turbidity curtains, which would contain resuspended sediment onsite until it settles. For some underwater construction activities (such as blasting to remove portions of the Schuyler Heim Bridge, pile driving for new bridge), these would be implemented. These measures also would reduce the noise effects of blasting and pile-driving on fish larvae.

Measures that would be implemented during construction, including retrofit [Alternative 3 only], demolition, and/or new bridge installation to minimize sediment resuspension effects include:

- Channel bank work would include bank protection (riprap, concrete walls) to eliminate the possibility of enhanced bank erosion.
- Cofferdams and blasting mats would be used during blasting operations.
- Cofferdam, silt curtains, and/or turbidity curtains would be used during pile-driving operations in the channel.
- Turbidity curtains that are constructed of a permeable material allowing water to flow through the membrane while trapping suspended sediment would be used during underwater construction.

To reduce effects to channel water quality from lead compounds in paint during removal or during bridge demolition, the following measures in some combination would be implemented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Mitigation Measures are required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Erect shrouds around working areas and suspending nets and tarps below bridges to catch debris from abrasive removal of old paint, where wind conditions permit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anchor tarps to barges below and enclose the bridge above to confine debris, where the bridge deck is not too far above water level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use barges and booms to capture fugitive floating paint chips and custom-built enclosures to confine and capture the abrasives, old paint chips, and paint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use vacuum or suction shrouds on blast heads to capture grit and old paint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perform lead-based paint removal offsite, following demolition of steel members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B-3 Protecting Special-Status Plants
Preconstruction surveys for southern tarplant would be conducted prior to construction. Surveys would be conducted during the blooming period for this plant, between June and October. If identified on site:

- The feasibility of avoiding areas that support the species would be evaluated and, if feasible, the area would be avoided during construction.
- If avoidance is infeasible, then mitigation would be required (see Mitigation Measure B-13).

#### B-4 Protecting Special-Status Bat Species
Avoidance and minimization measures apply to the following species: pallid bat; long-legged myotis; long-eared myotis; Yuma myotis; western mastiff bat; pocketed free-tailed bat; big free-tailed bat.

To avoid or minimize effects to these species, the following measures would be employed during bridge or highway deconstruction or, under Alternative 3, seismic retrofit:

- Four quarterly bat surveys would be conducted in the 12 months prior to start of construction to determine the presence or absence of the species, as determined appropriate by a qualified biologist. Surveys may include, but are not limited to the following:
  - Exit surveys of potential roost sites conducted by survey biologists stationed around the bridge or highway with binoculars and echolocation meters at nightfall
  - Surveys of all accessible potential roost sites on the bridge conducted by biologists permitted by CDFG for bat survey and handling
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • In the event any of the above special-status bat species are identified during field surveys, the following would be conducted:  
  - Exclusion of active roost sites by appropriate barriers, installed during the nonbreeding season from September to March  
  - Taking appropriate steps to exclude roosts when vacant during nighttime foraging periods when identified during construction  
  - Delay of construction where maternity roosts are encountered, where feasible, until after the young have weaned and are in flight  
  - Education of construction workers to identify potential roost sites, to avoid activity when identified, and to advise biological monitors when roosts are encountered. | | |
| • Protecting Bird Nests and Eggs  
Preconstruction surveys to identify potential nest sites for birds will be conducted within all construction areas on the bridge prior to the nesting season. Potential nest sites will be passively excluded with bird spikes, plywood, or other means, as necessary. An onsite biological monitor will be present during construction activities to ensure that nests are not established within the construction zone, and to implement passive exclusion as necessary. | | |
| • Protecting California Least Tern  
Prior to construction, potential breeding habitat for least tern in the vicinity of the build alternatives (Alternatives 1 through 4) would be surveyed for least tern breeding colonies during the March 1 to September 1 bird nesting season. If the species is breeding within 457 m (1,500 ft) of proposed construction areas, measures would be developed in consultation with the USFWS. | | |
| • Protecting American Peregrine Falcon  
  - Historical nesting sites on the Schuyler Heim Bridge would be made unsuitable prior to the nesting season (January 15 to July 30) to avoid direct effects to individuals or an active nest site during construction. This may include positioning exclusion materials, such as plywood, on these nest sites prior to the nesting season to render the sites unsuitable.  
  - Site monitoring during the construction period would be conducted to observe the pair’s movements and document its activities. This may assist in identifying nesting attempts by the pair on adjacent structures or within the construction | | |
### Avoidance and Minimization Measures

#### for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA

- If this occurs, and the nest site is at risk or could be at risk during the nesting season, the site can be excluded. This includes risk from egg loss which may occur on a less than optimal nest site. If the nesting attempt site is not anticipated to be at direct risk from construction disturbance during the upcoming nesting season, then the pair will be allowed to nest, and nesting success will be monitored.

- Efforts will be made to coordinate the construction schedule of the Schuyler Heim Bridge with the construction schedule of the future Gerald Desmond Bridge replacement project. If these two schedules do not overlap, then the Gerald Desmond Bridge may provide a nesting location for one peregrine pair to breed at the Schuyler Heim/Gerald Desmond bridge complex, which has generally been the case in past years. Coordination meetings with the Gerald Desmond Bridge project team are ongoing.

#### Mitigation Measures

#### for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Protecting Burrowing Owl

To avoid effects on burrowing owls, preconstruction surveys of potential breeding sites would be conducted onsite within 152 m (500 ft) of construction activities. Construction activities would be delayed, if feasible, within 152 m (500 ft) of nest sites until after the breeding season for this species (February to July). If breeding birds are present, then mitigation would be implemented (see Mitigation Measure B-14).

#### Protecting Against Invasive Species

To avoid the introduction or spread of noxious weeds into previously uninfested areas, Caltrans and/or its contractors will implement the following measures:

- Educate construction supervisors and managers on weed identification and the importance of controlling and preventing the spread of noxious weed infestations.
- Clean construction equipment at designated wash stations before entering the construction area.
- Landscaping and erosion control included in the project would use species that are not listed as noxious weeds.
- Seed all disturbed areas with certified weed-free native mixes. Use only certified weed-free straw or rice mulch in uplands only.
- Conduct a follow-up inventory of the construction area during the first spring following the completion of construction to verify that construction activities have not resulted in the introduction of new noxious weed infestations.
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**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

| Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA | Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA | ALTERNATIVES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| • If new noxious weed infestations are located during the follow-up inventory, contact the appropriate resource agency to determine species-specific treatment methods. | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| **B-10 Protecting Avian Species at Transmission Towers**  
To protect against operational impacts to birds moving about or utilizing new transmission towers, construction design standards for avian protection will be followed, including use of visual line enhancers and adequate spacing between energized parts. No lighting will be associated with new transmission towers. Design standards for avian protection will be developed from the Edison Electric Institute’s Avian Power Line Interaction Committee (APLIC) and USFWS Avian Protection Plan Guidelines (APLIC and USFWS, 2005), APLIC’s Suggested Practices for Raptor Protection on Power Lines: The State of the Art in 1996 (APLIC, 1996), or APLIC’s Mitigating Bird Collisions with Power Lines: The State of the Art in 1994 (APLIC, 1994). | | | | | | |
| **B-11 Mitigating for Breeding Colonies of Least Tern**  
This measure may include the following, pending consultation with USFWS:  
• Breeding habitat would be disrupted during the non-nesting season when terns are absent from the site. The disruption may include placement of barriers to discourage nesting.  
• Breeding habitat to compensate for loss would be identified and established, possibly in coordination with existing tern mitigation programs implemented by Los Angeles Harbor at other locations, such as at Pier T. | X | X | X | X | -- | -- |
| **B-12 Mitigating for Loss of Peregrine Falcon Nest**  
This measure may include the following, as appropriate, pending informal consultation with CDFG:  
• Create a new nest site by placing a nesting box (and potential additional support material) on a tower of the Badger Avenue Bridge or other elevated structure, as determined by a qualified biologist. Because the Badger Avenue Bridge is located immediately adjacent to the Schuyler Heim Bridge, and is approximately the same height, there is the potential that it could provide a suitable vantage point and nesting location to peregrine falcons. The peregrine pair has never nested on this bridge in the past but this may be due to an absence of suitable nesting platforms and substrate. Further evaluation of any design changes or nesting ledge installations by a qualified peregrine expert would be conducted. | | | | | | |
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**AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B-13 Mitigating for Loss of Special-Status Plant Species</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If special-status plant species cannot be avoided during project construction, then seed and/or propagules of the species would be collected and replanted at an alternative location. These activities will be conducted in coordination with the resource agencies.</td>
<td>- Mitigation measures would be refined in coordination with the resource agencies and standard practices for this species. Measures may include the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Areas determined to have appropriate hydrology and soil chemistry (salinity) shall be reseeded with seed collected from populations of southern tarplant. Southern tarplant is restricted to saline, vernally mesic areas, often along the margins of estuaries or areas of high salinity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For one year prior to construction as feasible, southern tarplant seed shall be collected by personnel experienced in collection of native seeds. Seed collection shall be conducted during successive years from September through December. One-half of the first year’s collected seed shall be hand-broadcast at the reintroduction site with the remaining one-half stored in appropriate conditions for introduction the following year. Seed collected during the second season shall be stored for potential later use in the event that success standards are not met following the seeding during years one and two.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Impacts Determined Less than Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures for Impacts Determined Significant under CEQA</th>
<th>ALTERNATIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Because southern tarplant is an annual species, population numbers are expected to naturally fluctuate from year to year depending upon environmental conditions. Reseeded areas shall be monitored for three years following the initial seeding. Establishment shall be considered successful if plant densities during any of the three years of monitoring are comparable to densities of the impacted populations based on sampling quadrants. If established populations do not achieve comparable densities of impacted populations, additional reintroduction sites shall be identified and stored seed, obtained during the collection period, shall be introduced into additional sites over a two-year period (as in the initial reintroduction program described above).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B-14 Mitigating for Burrowing Owl**

Burrowing owl individuals present within the construction area would be flushed from active burrows during the non-nesting season (August to January) and burrows excluded. These activities would be conducted in a manner consistent with the *Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines*, prepared by The California Burrowing Owl Consortium in 1997. Exclusions would require maintenance and monitoring to assure that individuals do not return.

No Avoidance and Minimization Measures are required.

**B-15 Mitigating Loss of Wetland**

Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, a permit would be required from USACE prior to impacting waters of the U.S. including wetlands. This may be achieved through the Nationwide Permit system, or an Individual Permit. Compliance to permit conditions would be required. The permit is likely to require implementation of mitigation to offset effects to waters of the U.S., including wetlands. This may include creation of offsite wetlands, or payment of fees into existing mitigation banks.

---

**ALTERNATIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
Rights-of-Way
RW 100-122
NOTES:

1. SEE DWG HW107 FOR PARCEL TABLE.
2. LIMITS OF EXISTING R/W TO BE VERIFIED AT THE TIME OF DESIGN.
3. ACTUAL TOPOGRAPHY WEST OF SR47 BASED ON OCEAN BLVD GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT, HD-2103, AS PREPARED BY PARSONS TRANSPORTATION GROUP.
4. EXISTING R/W PER OCEAN BLVD GRADE SEPARATION PROJECT, HD-2103, AS PREPARED BY PARSONS TRANSPORTATION GROUP.

LEGEND:
- PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)
- PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HE)
- TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (TCE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>PARCEL NO.</th>
<th>GRANTOR</th>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>ACQUISITION TYPE</th>
<th>DOC NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T260-021-913</td>
<td>SRT-1795</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT NAVA</td>
<td>468.60</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td>RW102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T260-021-913</td>
<td>SRT-1795-1</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT NAVA</td>
<td>615.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T260-021-913</td>
<td>SRT-1795-2</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT NAVA</td>
<td>562.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T266-030-907</td>
<td>SRT-1796</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>6,193.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T266-032-907</td>
<td>SRT-1796-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>2,153.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T266-032-907</td>
<td>SRT-1796-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,495.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>6,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>4,061.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-5</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>2,410.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-6</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>897.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-7</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-8</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-9</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-10</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>490.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-11</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-12</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-13</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-14</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,459.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-15</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-16</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-17</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-18</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-19</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-20</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-21</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,459.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-22</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-23</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-24</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-25</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-26</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-27</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-28</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,459.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-29</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-30</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-31</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-32</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-33</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-34</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>240.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-35</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,459.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>T266-032-904</td>
<td>SRT-1796-36</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ALTERNATIVE 2 FLYOVER ONLY

** INCLUDED AS PART OF ALTERNATIVE 2 COST ESTIMATE
MATCH LINE SEE DWG RW-108

STATE EXISTING HOW
(SEE NOTE 1)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

NOTE:

1. PRECISE LIMITS OF EXISTING CALTRANS ROW TO BE DETERMINED AT THE TIME OF FINAL DESIGN.

LEGEND:

- PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)
- PERMANENT "DOWN" EASEMENT (DE)
- TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (TCE)
- RELINQUISHMENT BY CALTRANS
- EXISTING CALTRANS HIGHWAY EASEMENT
- LKC: CO LOS ANGELES COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT
RW 200-225
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>PARCEL NO.</th>
<th>GRANTOR</th>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>ACQUISITION TYPE</th>
<th>DMG NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T460-023-913</td>
<td>T46T-195</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>468.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T460-023-913</td>
<td>T46T-195-1</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>815.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T460-023-913</td>
<td>T46T-195-2</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>562.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T466-052-907</td>
<td>T46T-198</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>6,393.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T466-052-907</td>
<td>T46T-198-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>2,221.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T466-052-907</td>
<td>T46T-198-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,967.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T466-052-907</td>
<td>T46T-198-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,560.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T466-052-907</td>
<td>T46T-198-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>406.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T466-052-904</td>
<td>T46T-197</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T466-052-904</td>
<td>T46T-197-1</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>815.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T466-052-904</td>
<td>T46T-197-2</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>598.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T466-052-904</td>
<td>T46T-197-3</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>868.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T466-052-904</td>
<td>T46T-197-4</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>598.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T466-052-900</td>
<td>T46T-198</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>405.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T466-052-900</td>
<td>T46T-198-1</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>139.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T466-052-900</td>
<td>T46T-198-2</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T466-052-900</td>
<td>T46T-198-3</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>74.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T466-052-900</td>
<td>T46T-198-4</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T466-052-901</td>
<td>T46T-199</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>168.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T466-052-901</td>
<td>T46T-199-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>374.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T466-052-901</td>
<td>T46T-199-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>276.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T466-052-901</td>
<td>T46T-199-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>173.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T466-052-901</td>
<td>T46T-199-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>T46T-174</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,459.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>T46T-174-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>236.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>T46T-174-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>185.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>395.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T466-029-906</td>
<td>T46T-102-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>291.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>519.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-5</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>447.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-6</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-7</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>404.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-102-8</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-103-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T466-029-914</td>
<td>T46T-103-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>234.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>T315-010-020</td>
<td>T46T-190-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T315-010-020</td>
<td>T46T-190-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T315-010-029</td>
<td>T46T-191</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HI)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T315-010-029</td>
<td>T46T-191-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T315-010-029</td>
<td>T46T-191-5</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>905.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T315-010-029</td>
<td>T46T-191-5</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>376.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>T315-010-020</td>
<td>T46T-189-**</td>
<td>SOUTHERN PACIFIC [STOP]</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT AERIAL EASEMENT (AE)</td>
<td>RN0235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ALTERNATIVE 2 FLYOVER ONLY
** INCLUDED AS PART OF ALTERNATIVE 2 COST ESTIMATE
EXISTING UTILITY CORRIDOR

HENRY FORD AVENUE

HENRY FORD ON RAMP

SR-10G

PIER A

MATCH LINE SEE DWG. RW-213

1. HIGHWAY EASEMENT LIMITS FROM GRIFF LINE TO GRIP LINE:
2. AERIAL EASEMENT LIMITS EXTEND FROM GRIP LINE PLUS 6.37M (21 FEET) TO GRIP LINE.
3. FOR PARCEL TABLE SEE DWG RW-225.

ATTACHMENT C

SR-47 EXPRESSWAY
ALTERNATIVE 2
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT
RIGHT-OF-WAY EXHIBIT

SCALE: 1:500
RW-214
ATTACHMENT C

SR-47 EXPRESSWAY
ALTERNATIVE 2
PRELIMINARY LAYOUT
CALTRANS ACCESS ROAD
RIGHT-OF-WAY EXHIBIT

SCALE: 1:500
RW-220

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>PARCEL NO.</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>MEAS</th>
<th>ACQUISITION TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>1,362 SQ. FT</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7315-011-612</td>
<td>SOUTHERN PACIFIC (UPRR)</td>
<td>2,173 SQ. FT</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (TCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7315-011-615</td>
<td>SOUTHERN PACIFIC (UPRR)</td>
<td>2,143 SQ. FT</td>
<td>PERMANENT MORTAL EASEMENT (MCE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RW 300-317
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>APN</th>
<th>PARCEL NO.</th>
<th>GRANTOR</th>
<th>AREAS</th>
<th>ACQUISITION TYPE</th>
<th>DNG NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T440-001-96</td>
<td>S/H-118</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>458.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T440-001-96</td>
<td>S/H-118-1</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>845.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>T440-001-96</td>
<td>S/H-118-2</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>792.00</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T446-002-907</td>
<td>S/H-118</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>6,233.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T446-002-907</td>
<td>S/H-118-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>2,055.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T446-002-907</td>
<td>S/H-118-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,907.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T446-002-907</td>
<td>S/H-118-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,382.00</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>T446-002-907</td>
<td>S/H-118-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>436.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>T446-002-904</td>
<td>S/H-182</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>2,831.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T446-002-904</td>
<td>S/H-182-1</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>898.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T446-002-904</td>
<td>S/H-182-2</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>598.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T446-002-904</td>
<td>S/H-182-3</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>898.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T446-002-904</td>
<td>S/H-182-4</td>
<td>US GOVERNMENT (NAVY)</td>
<td>437.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>437.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161-1</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>141.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161-2</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161-3</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>174.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161-4</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>126.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>T446-002-800</td>
<td>S/H-161-5</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON</td>
<td>66.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T446-002-901</td>
<td>S/H-182</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>633.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T446-002-901</td>
<td>S/H-182-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>291.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>T446-002-901</td>
<td>S/H-182-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>772.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T446-002-901</td>
<td>S/H-182-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>71.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>T446-002-901</td>
<td>S/H-182-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>S/H-182</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,054.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>S/H-182-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>254.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>S/H-182-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>193.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T446-002-814</td>
<td>S/H-161</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,054.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>T446-002-814</td>
<td>S/H-161-1</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>435.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T446-002-906</td>
<td>S/H-182-2</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>307.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>T446-002-906</td>
<td>S/H-182-3</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>107.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T446-002-906</td>
<td>S/H-182-4</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T446-002-914</td>
<td>S/H-182-5</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T446-002-914</td>
<td>S/H-182-6</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>1,355.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T446-002-914</td>
<td>S/H-182-7</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>585.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>T446-002-914</td>
<td>S/H-182-8</td>
<td>CITY OF LONG BEACH</td>
<td>494.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T375-010-002</td>
<td>S/H-176</td>
<td>NO TRUST</td>
<td>210.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T375-010-002</td>
<td>S/H-176-1</td>
<td>NO TRUST</td>
<td>222.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T375-010-002</td>
<td>S/H-176</td>
<td>Hertz Equipment Rental Corp.</td>
<td>305.50</td>
<td>PERMANENT HIGHWAY EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T375-010-002</td>
<td>S/H-176-1</td>
<td>Hertz Equipment Rental Corp.</td>
<td>377.50</td>
<td>TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT (HC)</td>
<td>RM541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>