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Introduction
Regional Background

April 2014: Boeing Corporation announced layoffs and plant closings due to the ending of production of the C-17 Globemaster, a large military transport aircraft.

More than one-third of the 2,714 Boeing layoffs were at the Long Beach California production facility.

Additional economic impacts across the supply chain are likely to affect Long Beach and surrounding areas. Aside from manufacturing, engineering, and project management jobs within the aerospace/defense sector, other job losses will occur in the service realm, including health care, retail trade, professional, accommodation and food services, and more.
In 2015, the DoD’s Office of Economic Adjustment awarded the City of Long Beach a Defense Industry Adjustment Grant to develop and implement a comprehensive economic transition program in the wake of the C-17 production facility closure.

The grant is focused on ensuring the region can retain its regional skills base, competitiveness, and sector expertise through three tracks:

**Economic Development Planning**

To adjust effectively to impacts from Boeing facility closures and identify opportunities to advance the site, the supply chain, and the regional cluster.

**Land Use and Infrastructure Planning**

To assess the existing conditions of the Boeing C-17 facilities (i.e. public infrastructure) and conceptual reuses with the goal of ensuring compatibility with future economic development strategies.

**Assistance to Impacted Defense Firms and Workers**

To establish a Boeing and defense dislocated worker case management tracking platform that incorporates customized training modules and provides direct assistance to impacted suppliers.
Projected Outcomes

As a result of this project, the City of Long Beach and its surrounding area expects to:

✓ Transition its displaced workers successfully
✓ Minimize the economic impact of the plant closure by supporting the reemployment of as many as 3,000 defense workers directly dislocated
✓ Conduct a compatibility study of the site with respect to the Long Beach Airport (LBG)
✓ Produce a C-17 Transition Master Plan as a guiding economic and land use/infrastructure planning strategy for use by the region
Summary of August Workshop
Summary of August Workshop

- Dudek presented an overview of the Existing Conditions Report
- Groups exercises were held to discuss:
  - *Ideas for the C-17 Site*
  - *Thoughts regarding vacant buildings on the C-17 site (keep them, start over?)*
  - *Ideas for Cherry Avenue*
  - *Types of businesses that might fit well in the study area*
  - *Observations related to streets, amenities, circulation, etc.*
  - *Other improvements*
Summary of Group Exercise

Key Land Use Themes
1. Manufacturing
2. Distribution/Warehouse
3. Technology
4. Commercial/Office
5. Utilities
6. Farm Uses
7. Entertainment/Tourism
8. Live/Work

Thoughts on Buildings
1. Keep and reuse
2. Repurpose
3. Keep large ones, modify small
Summary of Group Exercise

Ideas for Cherry Avenue

1. Allow uses that support C-17 site
2. Create sense of place
3. Restore older buildings
4. Provide amenities
5. Create “complete street”
6. Enhance Cherry/Wardlow
7. Address traffic
8. Screen outdoor uses

Other Improvements

1. Ensure heavy weight corridors
2. Update 405/Cherry interchange
3. Provide employee amenities
4. Create blue line connection
5. Improve landscaping
6. Install multi-use paths
7. Partner with Port for job creation
8. Demand good, high paying jobs
Presentation of Land Use Alternatives
### 3 Land Use Themes Selected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fulfillment Center</td>
<td>the process of receiving, packaging and shipping orders for goods.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing/Operations</td>
<td>The making of goods or wares by manual labor or machinery, especially on large scale.</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Campus</td>
<td>A center for innovation and research, supporting advancements in technology, the sciences and other disciplines.</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two Concept Scenarios Considered

**Scenario 1**

Retain Existing Industrial Facilities
- Assumes reuse of existing hangers
- Assumes reuse of some existing infrastructure (roads, streets, open space)
- Assumes two surface parking scenarios
  - 2:1000 parking
  - 4:1000 parking

**Scenario 2**

Redevelop Sites with New Facilities
- Assumes all existing facilities demolished
- Assumes new site infrastructure (roads, streets, open space)
- Assumes two surface parking scenarios
  - 2:1000 parking
  - 4:1000 parking
Two Concept Scenarios

Scenario 1 Assumptions

- Two large industrial buildings re-purposed (±925,000 sf of hanger area)
- 2 surface parking scenarios (2:1000 - lower intensity uses & 4:1000 – higher intensity uses)
- Lower Intensity = fulfillment uses w/additional job space/hotel/retail
- Higher Intensity = manufacturing w/additional job space/hotel/retail
- 375 sf of area per parking space (includes new on-site open spaces).
- Average of 2.5 stories across site with new construction.
- Three points of access from Cherry Avenue

Scenario 1 - Alternative 1 @ 2:1000
- Reuse Industrial Hangers 1.4M SF
- (N) Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- (N) Retail/Commercial 265K SF
- Additional Job Space 999K SF
- Surface Parking 5,500 spaces

Scenario 1 - Alternative 2 @ 4:1000
- Retained Industrial Hangers 1.4M SF
- (N) Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- (N) Retail/Commercial 158K SF
- Additional Job Space 20K SF
- Surface Parking 6,650 spaces
Scenario 1
Scenario 1

Advantages and Disadvantages

Scenario 1 - Alternative 1 @ 2:1000
- Reuse Industrial Hangers 1.4M SF
- (N) Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- (N) Retail/Commercial 265K SF
- Additional Job Space 999K SF
- Surface Parking 5,500 spaces

Scenario 1 - Alternative 2 @ 4:1000
- Retained Industrial Hangers 1.4 M sf
- (N) Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- (N) Retail/Commercial 158K SF
- Additional Job Space 20K SF
- Surface Parking 6,650 spaces

- Alternative 1 creates a lot of job space.
- Both alternatives retain two, perhaps, inflexible and obsolete industrial structures; difficult to lease; may limit flexibility of future use.
- 2:1000 parking likely under-parks the combination of potential uses given the suburban location.
2 Concept Scenarios

Scenario 2 Assumptions

- Two large industrial sites redeveloped with new uses and structures.
- 2 surface parking scenarios (2:1000 - lower intensity uses & 4:1000 – higher intensity uses)
- Lower Intensity = flexibility of use w/additional job space/hotel/retail
- Higher Intensity = flexibility of use w/additional job space/hotel/retail
- 375 sf of area per parking space (includes new on-site open spaces).
- Average of 2.5 stories across site with new construction.
- Three points of access from Cherry Avenue

Scenario 2 - Alternative 1 @ 2:1000
- Job Space 3.15M sf
- Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- Retail/Commercial 261K sf
- Surface Parking 7,010 spaces

Scenario 2 - Alternative 2 @ 4:1000
- Job Space 1.9M sf
- Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms
- Retail/Commercial 122K SF
- Surface Parking 8,500 spaces
Scenario 2
## Scenario 2

### Advantages and Disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 2 - Alternative 1 @ 2:1000</th>
<th>Scenario 2 - Alternative 2 @ 4:1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Space 3.15M sf</td>
<td>Job Space 1.9M sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms</td>
<td>Hotel 90K SF; 150 rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Commercial 261K sf</td>
<td>Retail/Commercial 122K SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Parking 7,010 spaces</td>
<td>Surface Parking 8,500 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Scenario 2 realizes more, and more flexible job space than Scenario 1 which retains existing industrial hangers.
- 2:1000 parking likely under-parks the combination of potential uses given the suburban location.
Scenario 1 and Scenario 2

Other Considerations

• Good airport connectivity – work with this.
• Minor transit connectivity – improve.
• Airport noise and intensity planning parameters allow greater development in some locations; above 2 to 3 stories. Consider providing for this flexibility.
• 2:1000 parking probably inadequate for most new uses.
• Structured parking may need to be considered for some uses if 4:1000 parking inadequate; increases costs.
• 375 SF/ Parking Space may need to be increased:
  • Provides for additional 10% landscape area at surface parking.
  • Increase in complete street infrastructure = increase parking area/space.
  • Additional open space = increase parking area/space.
• Preliminary Design Analysis – consider flexibility; leasing and market potential of existing formative and critical.
Fiscal Impact Analysis
## Summary of Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bldg. Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>1,668,300</td>
<td>3,900,519</td>
<td>2,121,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>267,000</td>
<td>158,000</td>
<td>260,519</td>
<td>121,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other commcl.</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (re-use site)</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (outside re-use site)</td>
<td>999,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,550,000</td>
<td>1,909,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Rooms</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobs</strong></td>
<td>14,517</td>
<td>8,591</td>
<td>21,240</td>
<td>11,426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$1,947,300</td>
<td>$1,175,500</td>
<td>$2,772,800</td>
<td>$1,488,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Gov’t</td>
<td>$384,700</td>
<td>$232,200</td>
<td>$547,700</td>
<td>$294,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Dept.</td>
<td>$817,900</td>
<td>$494,100</td>
<td>$1,159,500</td>
<td>$621,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services/ Emer. Prep.</td>
<td>$392,800</td>
<td>$237,400</td>
<td>$560,400</td>
<td>$301,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>$215,700</td>
<td>$129,500</td>
<td>$309,800</td>
<td>$166,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Dev</td>
<td>$66,900</td>
<td>$40,400</td>
<td>$96,000</td>
<td>$51,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Svcs</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>$36,600</td>
<td>$19,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$43,800</td>
<td>$26,500</td>
<td>$62,800</td>
<td>$33,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tot. Bldg. Sq. Ft.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,756,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,668,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,900,519</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,121,556</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$6,288,900</td>
<td>$3,987,600</td>
<td>$8,440,000</td>
<td>$4,741,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>$1,834,500</td>
<td>$1,124,000</td>
<td>$2,541,700</td>
<td>$1,390,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$2,778,700</td>
<td>$1,663,500</td>
<td>$3,697,500</td>
<td>$1,945,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Occup. Tax</td>
<td>$480,800</td>
<td>$480,800</td>
<td>$480,800</td>
<td>$480,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>$1,194,900</td>
<td>$719,300</td>
<td>$1,720,000</td>
<td>$925,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Bldg. Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>1,668,300</td>
<td>3,900,519</td>
<td>2,121,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Net Fiscal Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues vs. Costs</td>
<td>$4,341,500</td>
<td>$2,812,100</td>
<td>$5,667,200</td>
<td>$3,253,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Ann. Costs</td>
<td>$1,947,400</td>
<td>$1,175,500</td>
<td>$2,772,800</td>
<td>$1,488,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Ann. Rev</td>
<td>$6,288,900</td>
<td>$3,987,600</td>
<td>$8,440,000</td>
<td>$4,741,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Bldg. Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>1,668,300</td>
<td>3,900,519</td>
<td>2,121,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Impact Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$18,498,700</td>
<td>$11,158,800</td>
<td>$26,440,200</td>
<td>$14,325,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Facilities</td>
<td>$388,000</td>
<td>$232,400</td>
<td>$538,200</td>
<td>$284,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Facilities</td>
<td>$641,000</td>
<td>$384,000</td>
<td>$889,000</td>
<td>$470,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>$1,543,400</td>
<td>$934,200</td>
<td>$2,184,300</td>
<td>$1,188,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$7,603,200</td>
<td>$4,508,600</td>
<td>$11,049,100</td>
<td>$5,975,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site Runoff</td>
<td>$8,323,100</td>
<td>$5,099,600</td>
<td>$11,779,600</td>
<td>$6,407,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Bldg. Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>1,668,300</td>
<td>3,900,519</td>
<td>2,121,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Impact Fees (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Fee</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.267</td>
<td>$71,300</td>
<td>$47,600</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
<td>$32,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.132</td>
<td>$316,700</td>
<td>$184,800</td>
<td>$468,600</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.442</td>
<td>$118,000</td>
<td>$78,800</td>
<td>$115,100</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$0.218</td>
<td>$523,000</td>
<td>$305,200</td>
<td>$773,900</td>
<td>$416,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$1,543,400</td>
<td>$934,200</td>
<td>$2,184,300</td>
<td>$1,188,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$293,700</td>
<td>$196,100</td>
<td>$286,600</td>
<td>$134,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$7,197,000</td>
<td>$4,200,000</td>
<td>$10,650,000</td>
<td>$5,728,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-Site run Off</strong></td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$8,323,100</td>
<td>$5,099,600</td>
<td>$11,779,600</td>
<td>$6,407,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Impact Fees (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 1 Alt 2</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 1</th>
<th>Sce. 2 Alt 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,498,700</td>
<td>$11,158,800</td>
<td>$26,440,200</td>
<td>$14,325,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$2,026,400</td>
<td>$1,256,700</td>
<td>$2,655,600</td>
<td>$1,409,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>$8,036,700</td>
<td>$4,690,000</td>
<td>$11,892,500</td>
<td>$6,396,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Site Run-Off</td>
<td>$8,323,100</td>
<td>$5,099,600</td>
<td>$11,779,600</td>
<td>$6,407,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tot. Bldg. Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>2,756,000</td>
<td>1,668,300</td>
<td>3,900,519</td>
<td>2,121,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pacific Gateway Workforce Investment Network | September 12
Comments or Questions?
Thank you!