

ES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Introduction

This Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) assesses impacts related to the USS *Iowa* project proposed by the Pacific Battleship Center (PBC) and the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD). The LAHD administers development within the Port of Los Angeles (POLA) and overall Port operations. The proposed project is located within POLA, adjacent to the City of Los Angeles, community of San Pedro. The proposed project is located at Berth 87 along the west side of the Main Channel just south of the Vincent Thomas Bridge within LAHD property.

The USS *Iowa* project (proposed project) includes the relocation of ex-USS *Iowa* (BB-61) battleship from San Francisco to the Port of Los Angeles, placing her at existing Berth 87 for use as a museum/educational facility. The purpose of the museum would be for the public to learn and explore the history of US Navy battleships, the USS *Iowa*, the *Iowa* class battleships and their characteristics, service history, and crew.

The proposed project includes the following:

Phase 1

- Transport of *Iowa* from San Francisco Bay to the Port of LA;
- Mooring the battleship at Berth 87 in the North Harbor area of the Port of Los Angeles;
- Use of an existing parking lot;
- Delivery and set up of a prefabricated 480 sq. ft., single-story Ticket Booth/Office;
- Delivery and set up of a prefabricated 480 sq. ft., single-story Restroom facility;
- Delivery and set up of two prefabricated Entry Platforms to accommodate access and egress from the USS *Iowa*;

Phase 2

- Construction of an approximately two-story 33,800 sq. ft. landside Visitor Center, and;
- Ongoing operations and maintenance.

This DEIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the City of Los Angeles Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Article I) (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code [PRC] Section 21000 et seq.) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 15000 et seq.). The LAHD is the CEQA lead agency because the project is proposed within the Port of Los Angeles.

This DEIR describes the affected resources and evaluates the potential impacts to those resources as a result of building and operating the proposed project, as well as several alternatives.

ES.2 Purpose of this Draft EIR

This DEIR will be used to inform decision makers and the public about the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project and selected alternatives. Section 1.3 describes the agencies that are expected to use this document, including the lead, responsible, and trustee agencies under CEQA. Section 1.5 describes the scope and content required of an EIR, and Section 1.6 describes the intended uses of this document.

This DEIR is being provided to the public for review, comment, and participation in the planning process. After public review and comment, a final EIR will be prepared. The final EIR will include responses to comments on the DEIR received from agencies, organizations, and individuals. It will be distributed to provide the basis for decision making by the lead agency, as described below, and other concerned agencies.

ES.2.1 CEQA Introduction

This DEIR is being prepared by the LAHD in compliance with the CEQA Statute (PRC Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15000 et seq.), which require the evaluation of potential environmental impacts resulting from the LAHD discretionary decisions.

In 1970, the California legislature enacted CEQA and requires public agency decision makers to consider the environmental effects of their actions. When a state or local agency determines that a proposed project has the potential to significantly affect the environment an EIR is prepared. According to Section 15121 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines (CCR, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3), the

purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that identifies significant effects of a proposed project on the environment, to identify alternatives to the project, and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided. A public agency must mitigate or avoid significant environmental impacts of projects it carries out or approves whenever it is feasible to do so. In instances where significant impacts cannot be avoided or mitigated, the project may nonetheless be carried out or approved if the approving agency finds that economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits outweigh the unavoidable significant environmental effects.

LAHD operates the Port under the legal mandates of the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City Charter, Article VI, Sec. 601; California Tidelands Trust Act of 1911) and the California Coastal Act (PRC Div 20 S30700 et seq.), which identify the Port and its facilities as a primary economic/coastal resource of the state and an essential element of the national maritime industry for promotion of commerce, navigation, fisheries, and harbor operations. Activities should be water dependent and give highest priority to navigation, shipping, and necessary support and access facilities to accommodate the demands of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce. LAHD is chartered to develop and operate the Port to benefit maritime uses and functions as a landlord by leasing Port properties to more than 300 tenants.

The actions under consideration by LAHD involve physical changes to the environment that would have a potentially significant impact. In addition, comments provided by public agencies, including responsible and trustee agencies, and the public in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) have also indicated that the proposed project may have significant impacts. Accordingly, an EIR is required. This DEIR evaluates the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project in accordance with the provisions set forth in the CEQA Guidelines.

The primary intended use of this DEIR by LAHD is to inform agencies considering permit applications and other actions required to construct, lease, and operate the selected alternative and to inform the public of the potential environmental consequences of the proposed project and alternatives. LAHD's certification of the EIR, Notice of Completion (NOC), and Statement of Overriding Considerations (if necessary) will document the Port's decision as to the adequacy of the EIR and will inform subsequent decisions by the LAHD whether to approve and construct the proposed project or other selected alternative. LAHD will use this DEIR to support permit applications, construction contracts, the lease, and other actions required to implement the selected alternative and to adopt mitigation measures that, where possible, could reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts. LAHD could also use this DEIR to obtain California Coastal Commission approvals to amend the Port Master Plan to redesignate land areas for Port operations.

Other agencies (federal, state, regional, and local) that have jurisdiction over some part of the proposed project or a resource area affected by the proposed project are expected to utilize this EIR as part of their approval or permit processes.

ES.3 Existing Setting/Affected Environment

The proposed project analysis covers the transport of the battleship from its existing location, Port of Richmond near San Francisco, within the San Francisco Bay, the route of travel of the battleship from San Francisco Bay to the proposed location of the battleship – Berth 87 in the Port of Los Angeles. Refer to Exhibit 1, *Regional Location Map* (San Francisco Bay to Port of Los Angeles); Exhibit 2, *Port of Richmond – Terminal 3*; and Exhibit 3, *Port of Los Angeles – Berth 87*. The proposed project site at Berth 87 is located within the POLA, San Pedro Waterfront Plan area, which encompasses approximately 400 acres along the western boundary of the Port, adjacent to the community of San Pedro. The project locations are further described in subsection 2.3, *Existing Setting*.

ES.3.1 Regional Context

Port of Los Angeles

The Port is located at the southernmost portion of the City of Los Angeles (City) and is composed of 43 miles of waterfront and 7,500 acres of land and water, with approximately 300 commercial berths. The Port is adjacent to the community of San Pedro to the west, the Wilmington community to the north, the Port of Long Beach to the east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south. Figure 2.0-1 and 2.0-3 show the regional and local location of the proposed project area.

The Port is an area of mixed uses, supporting various maritime-themed activities. The Port operations are predominantly centered on shipping activities, including containerized, break-bulk, dry-bulk, liquid-bulk, auto, and intermodal rail shipping. In addition to the large shipping industry at the Port, there is also a cruise ship industry and a commercial fishing fleet. The Port also accommodates boat repair yards, and provides slips for approximately 3,950 recreational vessels, 150 commercial fishing boats, 35 miscellaneous small service crafts, and 15 charter vessels that handle sport fishing and harbor cruises. The Port has retail shops and restaurants, which are primarily along the west side of the Main Channel. It also has recreation, community, and cultural facilities, such as a public swimming beach, Cabrillo Beach Youth Camp, the Cabrillo Marine Aquarium, and the Los Angeles Maritime Museum.

ES.3.2 Local Project Setting – Berth 87 and Current Uses

The Port was once used as a U.S Navy Base from 1919 until after WWII. The Port became known as “Battleship Country” as the battleship fleet was stationed here in Los Angeles during most of the 20th century. The location at Berth 87 offers the best visibility within the Port as it is adjacent to the cruise ship terminal which supports over 1 million cruise passengers each year.

Last year, the Port approved the \$1.2 billion dollar San Pedro Waterfront Development Plan which will bring more tourist and regional residents to the Port area. Nearby Berth 87 lies north of the destination of restaurants and shops known as Ports of Call (or Port’s O’Call). Revitalization plans of this area include complete redevelopment of all buildings and the addition of a 60,000 square foot conference hall. Several maritime and military museums including the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, the S.S. Lane Victory, and the Fort MacArthur Museum exist within the area. Berth 87 is easily reached at approximately one-quarter mile from the off ramps of the 110 freeway at the west side of the Vincent Thomas Bridge.

Berth 87 is located in the inner harbor, near the Vincent Thomas Bridge. The Maritime Museum is located to the south and a cruise ship terminal and the S.S. Lane Victory to the north. Container ships and cranes are located across the water. No dredging will be necessary as water depths are adequate at this site ranging from 38 feet on the pier side to 55 feet on the outboard side.

The project site at Berth 87 contains an existing parking lot and is currently used for temporary cargo and cruise ship docking. Project activity will be focused at Berth 87, which is bordered by the Main Channel on the east and Harbor Boulevard on the west. Refer to Exhibit 2.0-4, *Berth 87 and Proposed Site Plan*. Residential neighborhoods are west of to the project site along Harbor Boulevard.

A Navy fuel surge line runs through the project site at Berth 87 and requires a setback of 8 feet on each side. No permanent structures, such as the Visitor Center, may be placed above the surge line until it is either relocated or capped. Refer to Exhibit 2.0-4, *Berth 87 and Proposed Site Plan*, for the location of the existing surge lines.

ES.3.3 Project Site and Surrounding Uses

San Pedro Waterfront Project

Berth 87 is located within the San Pedro Waterfront (SPW) project area. The overall purpose of the SPW project is to create an active public waterfront in downtown San Pedro. The SPW project elements include the creation of three

new harbors and a public pier at 7th Street; new development, redevelopment, and cultural assets; completion of eight miles of waterfront promenade and open space for public enjoyment and recreation; and a wide variety of transportation options and improvements. The SPW project proposed a North Harbor cut located at Berths 87-90, which would accommodate approximately 12 tugboat vessels and the historic naval ship, the S.S. Lane Victory. The North Harbor cut would displace the occasional, temporary cruise ship berth at these berths. The SPW project proposed surface parking, the docking of the S.S. Lane Victory, and the S.S. Lane Victory Office at Berth 87 (refer to SPW Figure 2-9, San Pedro Waterfront – North Harbor). The LAHD decided to delay the North Harbor Cut as originally proposed, to provide parking for cruise ships. Per LAHD staff recommendation, the Final SPW project included an extension of surface parking to Berth 87, and restriping the lot to provide for more efficient use of space

ES.3.4 CEQA Baseline

To determine significance, the proposed project is compared to a baseline condition. The difference between the proposed project and the baseline is then compared to a threshold to determine if the difference between the two is significant. The CEQA baseline is fixed for the duration of the proposed project at the conditions that prevailed at the time of the NOP (in this case, August 29, 2011).

Section 15125(a) of the CEQA *Guidelines* provides the following:

An EIR must include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time of the notice of preparation is published, or if no notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, from both a local and regional perspective. This environmental setting will *normally* constitute the baseline physical conditions by which a lead agency determines whether an impact is significant.

The existing conditions are discussed in Section ES.3.

A description of the baseline conditions is included in Section 2, *Project Description*, of the Draft EIR and, when special circumstances are present, details are provided in the respective sections of the Draft EIR's Chapter 3 "Environmental Analysis," prior to the impact analysis. These environmental conditions constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines whether an impact would be significant.

ES.4 Proposed Project

ES.4.1 Project Background

The USS *Iowa* is the lead battleship of the *Iowa*-class battleships. *Iowa* was built at the New York Navy Yard, Brooklyn, New York and commissioned in February 1943. The *Iowa* was the U.S. Navy's first new World War II era battleship whose design was not encumbered by treaty limits and is the namesake of the four *Iowa*-class battleships. She was a new, "fast battleship", intended to protect aircraft carriers against the threat of similar Japanese "big-gun" ships. She was known as President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Big Stick".

Iowa spent her initial service in the Atlantic and carried President Franklin D. Roosevelt to and from Casablanca, Morocco, in November 1943. Early in January 1944, *Iowa* was sent to the Pacific where she took part in the Marshalls Campaign and campaigns to capture the Marianas, the Palau's, the Battles of the Philippine Sea and Leyte Gulf, Okinawa and the surrender of Japan in Tokyo Bay. The *Iowa* next served in the Korean War. The battleship was then modernized under the 1980s defense buildup and re-commissioned in April 1984. She went to European waters during the 1980s, with the latter cruise continuing into the Indian Ocean and Arabian Sea. *Iowa* was decommissioned for the last time in October 1990.

Iowa is one of several ships that were docked in Suisun Bay in Benicia, California, in the United States Department of Transportation Maritime Administration's (MARAD) NDRF, also known as the "mothball fleet" or the "ghost fleet". The NDRF was established under Section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 to serve as a reserve of ships for national defense and national emergencies. In the 1950s, the NDRF held over 2,000 ships at eight locations in the US. Ships from the NDRF have been reactivated and used in recent emergencies such as Hurricane Katrina and the earthquakes in Haiti. The *Iowa* is the only battleship remaining in the NDRF, which mostly consists of navy supply ships. The *Iowa* is held under the "custody vessel" category where ships are held on a reimbursable basis for other agencies, such as the U.S. Navy and U.S. Coast Guard. Other ships' from the fleet have been disposed of.

Iowa is the last battleship of her kind available for donation. There are no battleships currently located on the West Coast of the United States available for public tours. The USS Midway open for public tours in San Diego is an aircraft carrier. Today, seven battleships are available to visit in the United States: four on the east coast, two on the Gulf coast, and one in Hawaii. Congress has stipulated that the USS *Iowa* must reside in the State of California as a resource to West Coast populations.

Iowa offers a unique educational experience. This battleship has been a vital part of some of the Nation's most important historical events. It represents the pride and determination of a generation of Americans to meet the intense challenges of World War II, the Korean War and succeeding conflicts in Europe and the Middle East.

Suisun Bay

Suisun Bay (Bay) is located in Benicia, California, northeast of San Francisco Bay through the Carquinez Strait and San Pablo Bay. The Bay is approximately 26 miles northeast of downtown San Francisco. Since the 1940s, the Bay has been the home to decommissioned US Navy ships known as the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet (SBRF), part of the greater National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF).¹

Suisun Bay is within the San Francisco Estuary, one of the most heavily invaded estuaries in the world.² Many of the nonindigenous species (NIS) currently established in the San Francisco Estuary may not be established in the Port or southern California in general.

In addition, environmentalists have been concerned about toxins leaching into the bay from the ships in the SBRF including paint chemicals and metals; however, a study conducted by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in February 2009 concluded that sediments have a low to moderately low potential for toxicity to benthic invertebrates (such as clams and mussels). In the project area, 18% of the surface sediment grab samples contained such debris or paint chips, which is expected when observing the paint wearing off of the ships. NOAA did not find polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in the project area at concentrations that exceeded sediment quality guidelines or ambient values. There were some instances where concentrations of arsenic, copper, lead, and chromium observed across the project area were elevated relative to ambient values reported for other parts of San Francisco Bay.³

¹U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, National Defense Reserve Fleet.

http://www.marad.dot.gov/ships_shipping_landing_page/national_security/ship_operations/national_defense_reserve_fleet/national_defense_reserve_fleet.htm

² Cohen, A.N., and J.T. Carlton. 1995. Nonindigenous Aquatic Species in a United States Estuary: A Case Study of the Biological Invasion of the San Francisco Bay Delta. Washington, D.C.: US Fish and Wildlife Service, December, 1995.

Cohen, A.N., and J.T. Carlton. 1998. Accelerated invasion rate in a highly invaded estuary. *Science* 279: 555-558.

³ National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), *Assessment of Environmental Contaminants Associated with the National Defense Reserve Fleet in Suisun Bay, California* (February 2009).

http://response.restoration.noaa.gov/book_shelf/1845_ReportText_SuisunBayReportFinal.pdf

Port of Richmond

The USS *Iowa* was transported from Suisun Bay to the Port of Richmond. The traveling distance from the Suisun Bay to the Port of Richmond is approximately 30 miles. At this Port, work on the USS *Iowa* included painting of the exterior of the ship from the waterline to the top and replacement of the mast structure, radar arrays, and forward wood deck (from approximately mid-ship forward to the anchor/windlass). The battleship will be transported by tugboat approximately 398 nautical miles from the San Francisco Bay to the Port of Los Angeles.

Pacific Battleship Center

PBC is a non-profit organization formed to acquire the USS *Iowa* through donation from the US Navy and operate the tourist attraction and landside visitor center in the Port. PBC has support from numerous volunteers and veterans. At this time, the PBC is awaiting US Navy approval for donation of the battleship. The PBC would accept the battleship from the Navy under the condition that it could be called to duty and must remain “battle ready”. PBC is also seeking a lease for the project from the Port. The initial lease will be for a term of 10 years with options for renewal to be determined in accordance with Port leasing policies. For analysis purposes, this EIR assumes the permanent mooring of the battleship at Berth 87 for duration of 30 years.

ES.4.2 Project Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- Bring the USS *Iowa* to the Port, and place her at Berth 87 for year-round mooring; and,
- Prepare and fit the battleship as a tourist attraction, offering an interactive public experience that honors the historic contributions of USS *Iowa* and her crews. The history and technology of the battleship will provide the basis for educational programs teaching lessons in history, battleship design, mathematics, physics, science, leadership, team-building, character development, and community service.

ES.4.3 Proposed Project Elements

The USS *Iowa* project consists of the following elements to occur over two project phases:

Phase 1

- Transport of *Iowa* from San Francisco Bay to the Port of LA;
- Mooring the battleship at Berth 87 in the North Harbor area of the Port of Los Angeles;

- Delivery and set up of a prefabricated 480 sq. ft., single-story Ticket Booth/Office;
- Delivery and set up of a prefabricated 480 sq. ft., single-story Restroom facility;
- Delivery and set up of two prefabricated Entry Platforms to accommodate access and egress from the *Iowa*;

Phase 2

- Construction of an approximately two-story 33,800 sq. ft. footprint landside Visitor Center, and;
- Ongoing operations and maintenance.

Preparation and Transport

Iowa will be transported from San Francisco Bay to the Port of Los Angeles by a single ocean-going tug boat, according to a Navy approved tow plan. The battleship will make a brief stop offshore for hull cleaning before entering the Port of Los Angeles to avoid the spread of invasive species residing on the hull of the battleship. In preparation to receive visitors, safety railing, directional markers, hazard identification, and some interior painting will occur.

Preparation Prior to Berthing - Offshore Cleaning

The battleship will be towed to the approved offshore location depicted in Exhibit 2.0-6, *Off Shore Hull Cleaning Location*, for hull cleaning prior to placement in the Port of Los Angeles (outside of the 3 nautical mile [nm] limit line). The location is approved based on the hull cleaning location designated as SF3 and is located four nautical miles (nm) off shore from Seal Beach, California (approximately 8 nm from Berth 87), at coordinates 33-39.27 N 118-07.07 W and in sixteen fathoms (96 foot water depth). Hull cleaning will remove invasive and non-native species residing on the battleship's hull. Cleaning the battleship's hull in dry dock is not a feasible alternative to off shore hull cleaning, because there are no dry docks capable of accommodating the *Iowa* in the San Francisco area. The off shore hull cleaning proposed does not violate the Marine Invasive Species Act or related regulations. Prior to leaving San Francisco Bay, the anchor and anchor chain of the *Iowa* must be rinsed off to remove fouling organisms in their place of origin (California Public Resources Code 71204(e)).

Hull cleaning will be accomplished in accordance with U.S. Navy protocol as presented in S9086-CQ-STM-010, *Waterborne Underwater Hull Cleaning of Navy Ships*. The hull cleaning will be performed by Muldoon Marine Services, Inc., utilizing a combination of underwater tools from hydraulic powered multi and single brushed machines, to divers utilizing hand scrapers and low pressure water. These methods will be used to clean the battleship as efficiently and as carefully as possible. *Iowa*'s existing hull paint is a tributyltin (TBT)-free anti-fouling coating. The USS *Iowa*'s existing hull coating does not contain TBT.

The cleaning of *Iowa*'s hull will take approximately 48 hours during which Muldoon Marine will utilize 2 teams, each working one 12 hour shift each day for a total of 48 hours. However, the bottom of the hull will be cleaned only during daylight hours. The sides will be cleaned around the clock to reduce the hull cleaning duration. Lights will illuminate the sides for cleaning during darkness. After hull cleaning, *Iowa* will be towed via the ocean going tug to a location inside the Los Angeles breakwater where she will be transferred to local tugs for placement at Berth 87.

In addition to hull cleaning, some interior painting and preparations to receive visitors would occur during this time. Improvements would include guard railings, security barriers, directional markers, and hazard identification.

Temporary impacts to aesthetics and air quality during transport of the battleship from San Francisco Bay to the Port of Los Angeles and during temporary movement within the Harbor to rotate the battleship every couple of years, are anticipated and further analyzed in Chapter 3, *Environmental Analysis*, of this EIR.

Preparation at Berth 87

Upon initial mooring at Berth 87, *Iowa* will undergo refurbishment in preparation for visitors. Approval will be required from the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) that all work is done in accordance with standard requirements and stipulations to ensure protection of water quality. The work will take approximately nine months to complete and includes general cleaning, painting of exposed surfaces, and upgrading onboard restroom facilities. Painting of the interior and exterior surfaces would utilize paints that meet the current standards to prevent corrosion.

Berth 87

Berth 87 is currently used periodically for cargo and cruise ship docking. The existing mooring facilities and water depth are suitable for *Iowa*. Water, electric, sewer, and telephone utilities needed for operation of the project are located at, or near, the berth. Approximately 500 feet of trenching will be necessary to install the 8-inch sewer line and electrical lines. While the *Iowa* is moored at Berth 87, the battleship will be tugged out of the Main Channel annually and turned for even weathering.

Parking Lot

The existing lot will accommodate parking in a shared arrangement with other Port attractions. The parking area will include ingress lanes that direct traffic to the parking area past a small entry gate and at least one egress lane to return traffic to a controlled intersection at Harbor Boulevard. Parking to the north of the USS *Iowa* lot is designated as cruise ship parking and may be used as overflow parking when cruise ship operations are not occurring, which is

generally in the summer months. Refer to Section 3.3, *Traffic*, for a more detailed discussion regarding parking.

A Visitor's Center is planned for Phase 2 (6 to 8 years post Phase 1 completion). When constructed, the structure will reduce available shared parking within the existing lot. Additional offsite parking will be required at this time to accommodate the shared parking. Existing offsite parking sites have been identified across Harbor Boulevard along with various other sites identified in the Waterfront EIR.

Project Phasing and Construction

Phasing

The proposed project would be completed in two phases which includes the items listed in the "Proposed Project Elements" section above. Depending on the certification of the EIR, the duration of Phase 1 would begin in early 2012 and extend through August 2012.

Phase 2 is likely to occur 6 to 8 years after the completion of Phase 1. The construction of Phase 2 depends on funding. In Phase 2, the 480 sq. ft. prefabricated ticket booth/office and 480 sq. ft. prefabricated restroom facility would be replaced by a permanent structure to be called the Visitor Center. The Visitor Center would include ticket booths, offices, restrooms, museum/educational exhibits, and gift shop.

Construction

Construction activities will include a security fence, the set up of a prefabricated office/ticket booth, a prefabricated restroom facility and two prefabricated access platforms and brows to board *Iowa*. The ticket booth structure, the restroom facilities both cover approximately 1,000 sq. ft. and will consist of temporary, moveable, and self contained units.

Two prefabricated access platforms will be installed for ingress and egress to *Iowa*. The structures consist of stairs and gangways sufficient in size to accommodate peak visitor traffic. They will be designed and constructed of steel or similar material and each will contain a chair lift built in accordance with the ADA requirements.

Construction activities will employ approximately 30-40 workers over a period of 6 to 9 months. Work will take place Monday through Saturday from 07:00 a.m. to 05:00 p.m. Truck trips and delivery of materials by land is expected to be minimal as the structures are limited in size and scope. Commencement of work is dependent upon funding and regulatory approvals. Work is tentatively scheduled to begin in early 2012.

Visitor Center

Only when funding is identified, an approximately two-story 33,800 sq ft footprint landside Visitor Center may be constructed as Phase 2 of the project. The anticipated structure will be multi-story conventional building construction. The facility will house the educational exhibits, murals, models, artifacts, audio-visual presentations, food, concessions, gift shop, offices, ticketing, and restroom facilities.

An existing Navy fuel surge line transects the parking area (Exhibit 2.0-4). Currently, construction of permanent structures must not be closer than 8 feet from the pipeline. Future construction of the Visitors Center may require the surge line to be placed outside of the easement or may require the relocation of the surge line if still operative, in cooperation with the U.S. Navy. This will be subject to further CEQA review.

Operations and Maintenance

Day-to-day operation of the facility includes various tours of the battleship; guided and self-guided. The battleship will be presented as a “living” battleship which provides “at sea” experiences. Audio and visual backgrounds, interactive exhibits, and commemorative information will be provided to help visitors understand the history and function of the *Iowa* over her 50 years of service.

Several types of programs will be offered to a variety of groups that visit the battleship. Public battleship tours, K through 12 educational programs to supplement state curriculum guidelines, and youth and family weekend programs will provide different ways to understand the significance of the USS *Iowa*. A General Battleship Tour is primarily a brief overview of the major spaces aboard battleship including the *Officers’ Wardroom*, *Captain’s Quarters*, *Main Gun Turret*, *Command Engagement Center (CEC)*, *Secondary 5” Gun Mount*, *Main Bridge*, *Anti-Missile Battery “CWIS”*, *Tomahawk Cruise Missile Armored Box Launchers*, *Anti-Ship Harpoon Missile Launchers* and the *Crew’s Galley and Mess Deck*. Specialized tours include a *Main Gun tour*, an *Engineering and Armor* tour, and other specific tours to accommodate special interest groups.

Operation of the battleship includes the various tours, food and drink concessions, and security personnel. The *Iowa* will be open from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., seven days per week. Annual visitor estimates are approximately 430,000 during the first year of operation and stabilizing to 386,000 during subsequent years.

Pacific Battleship Center has prepared a Maintenance Plan that will assist the caretakers of the battleship with tools for long-term planning and care of the historic vessel. The Maintenance Plan is a result of an extensive ship inspection by former naval architects, construction professionals, and battleship enthusiasts. The full Maintenance Plan is included in Appendix C.

In general, *Iowa* must be maintained in a condition satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy. The detailed maintenance plan includes specific maintenance operations for the initial restoration work before the battleship opens to the public and an ongoing Maintenance Plan. The maintenance of the battleship to be completed prior to the opening to the public is included in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.

ES.5 Summary of Project Alternatives

ES.5.1 Requirements for Alternatives Analysis

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 require that an EIR, describe a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. According to CEQA Guidelines, the EIR should compare merits of the alternatives and determine an environmentally superior alternative. LAHD defines a reasonable range of alternatives in light of its legal mandates under the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City Charter, Article VI, Sec. 601), the California Coastal Act (PRC Div 20 S30700 et seq.), and LAHD's leasing policy. The EIR shall include sufficient information about each alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.

The lead agencies may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible and therefore merit in-depth consideration, and which alternatives are infeasible.

ES.5.2 Alternative Sites Analyzed in this EIR

Four alternatives—including the proposed project, the No Project Alternative, and two additional alternative development scenarios— were considered during preparation of this DEIR. Each of the four alternative development scenarios meets most of the project objectives and has been carried forward for detailed analysis in Section 6.0, *Comparison of Alternatives*. This section presents a description of these alternatives and provides a summary of other alternatives considered but eliminated from further discussion, including the rationale for eliminating the other alternatives from detailed analysis.

The Los Angeles Harbor Department's preferred alternative entails the siting of the USS *Iowa* at Berth 87 in the Port of Los Angeles in the Main Channel. The following alternatives are considered in this EIR:

- Proposed Project (Berth 87)
- Alternative 1 – S.P. Slip
- Alternative 2 – Berths 45-47
- Alternative 3– No Project Alternative

Proposed Project (Berth 87)

The proposed project places the battleship at Berth 87 – the site of the proposed North Harbor Cut of the San Pedro Waterfront project. The harbor cut was planned to house the S.S. Lane Victory, a historic navy ship, and tugboats. With the proposed project, the North Harbor Cut would not be constructed. The site is currently used intermittently for temporary loading and unloading of cruise ships and includes an existing parking lot that has at least 4.5 acres of backland available.

Alternative 1 – S.P. Slip

This alternative would place the USS *Iowa* into the Southern Pacific Slip (S.P. Slip), an existing boat slip in the south part of the harbor between berths 72 and 74 that is home to an active commercial fishing fleet. This fleet remains in-tact after over 100 years of providing fresh fish to the US and Asian markets. Placing the USS *Iowa* at this location would displace a portion of the commercial fishing fleet, reducing fishing operations and hinder dockside work.

Alternative 2 – Berths 45-47

Berths 45-47 is a 15-acre site located in the Outer Harbor of the Port of Los Angeles on the peninsula between the East Channel and West Channel. This site is a former liquid bulk berth and has a terminal control building that is not usable in addition to an 800 foot long concrete wharf structure. The existing Berths 45–47 are used on occasion by visiting cruise ships and other large wharf vessels, such as the visiting U.S. Navy vessels on Armed Forces Day. This alternative would prevent cruise ships from loading and unloading at this site. In addition, this site is not located near any freeways and would result in significant impacts to traffic.

Alternative 3 – No Project Alternative

The No Project alternative would assume that the USS *Iowa* does not get relocated by tugboat to the Port of Los Angeles. The USS *Iowa* would be removed from the Port of Richmond as a result of the Obama Administration’s commitment to clean up the environment to protect the unique ecosystem of the bay; however the fate of the battleship would be unknown. Most of the ships in the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet are slated for disposal.

The proposed project and other feasible site alternatives (Alternatives 1 and 2) include the year-round mooring of the battleship for use as a tourist attraction and

Visitor Center including restrooms, food service, offices, and gift shop. Alternative 1 would displace an existing commercial fishing fleet, and Alternative 2 would displace cruise ship loading/unloading.

ES.6 Environmental Impacts

ES.6.1 Scope of Analysis

The scope of this draft EIR was established based on the initial study prepared pursuant to CEQA (See *Appendix A*) and comments received during the notice of preparation (NOP) review process. The scope of analysis and technical work plans developed as part of preparing this draft EIR were designed to ensure that the comments received from regulatory agencies and the public during the NOP review process would be addressed.

This draft EIR focuses on the significant *environmental effects* of the proposed project and alternatives and their relevance to the decision-making process. *Environmental impacts*, as defined by CEQA, include physical effects on the environment. The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15360) define the environment as follows:

The physical conditions which exist within the areas which will be affected by a proposed project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

The following issues have been determined to be potentially significant and are therefore evaluated in this draft EIR:

- Section 3.1, Aesthetics;
- Section 3.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions; and
- Section 3.3, Traffic and Circulation.

Section 3.0, *Environmental Analysis*, discusses issues that would be significantly affected by the proposed project or alternatives. The criteria for determining the significance of environmental impacts in this draft EIR analysis are described in the section titled “Thresholds of Significance” under each resource topic in Chapter 3. Mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level are proposed whenever feasible.

ES.6.2 Impacts Not Considered in this Draft EIR

The scope of this draft EIR was established based on the August 29, 2011 NOP/IS, and comments received on that document, which identified potential impact areas of the proposed project. The NOP/Initial Study also determined that agricultural resources, biological resource, cultural resources, geology/soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use/planning,

mineral resources, noise, population/housing, public services, recreation, and utilities/service systems would not be affected by the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA, issues found in the NOP/Initial Study that would have no impact would not require further evaluation in the EIR.

ES.6.3 Impacts of the Proposed Project Considered in this Draft EIR

Sections 3.1 through 3.3 discuss the anticipated potential environmental effects of the proposed project. Summary descriptions of the significant impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the proposed project and alternatives are provided in Table ES-1, *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures*.

For each of the three environmental resources analyzed in this Draft EIR, Section 3 identifies significant impacts associated with the proposed project and each of the four alternatives. The following sections describe the significant and less than significant impacts for each resource and identify to which alternative the impacts apply.

Table ES-1: *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures.*

Environmental Impacts	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measure	Impacts After Mitigation
3.1 AESTHETICS			
AES-1: Implementation of the proposed project may have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
AES-2: The proposed project would substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

	state scenic highway.			
AES-3:	The proposed project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
AES-4:	The proposed project would create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
AES-5:	The proposed project would result in substantial negative shadow effects on nearby shadow-sensitive uses.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
3.2 AIR QUALITY,				
AQ-1:	The proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Impacts would be significant and unavoidable for short-term construction emissions involving the transport of the battleship. Impacts for	AQ-1: Tugboats utilized for transport of the USS <i>Iowa</i> within the Port of Los Angeles (during the transport of the ship from San Francisco Bay to Berth 87 and each year the ship is turned for weathering) shall comply with the Port’s Clean Air Action Plan Control Measure HC1. Additionally, in accordance with the Los Angeles Harbor	Significant and Unavoidable for towing emissions. Less than Significant for other short-term construction and long-term

	<p>short-term construction (not including transport) and long-term operation would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.</p>	<p>Department’s Sustainable Construction Guidelines (revised 2009), tugboats with C1 or C2 marine engines utilized for transport of the USS <i>Iowa</i> within the Port of Los Angeles (during the transport of the ship from San Francisco Bay to Berth 87 and each year the ship is turned for weathering) shall utilize an EPA Tier-3 engine, or cleaner.</p> <p>AQ-2: The project shall implement the following measures, where applicable and/or feasible, as required by the Los Angeles Harbor Department’s Sustainable Construction Guidelines (revised 2009) during project construction activities. These requirements shall be stipulated in the construction contracts and bid documents.</p> <p><u>Best Management Practices</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and catalyzed diesel particulate traps. • Maintain equipment according to manufacturers’ specifications. • Restrict idling of construction equipment and on-road heavy-duty trucks to a maximum of 5 minutes when not in use. • Install high-pressure fuel injectors on construction equipment vehicles. • Maintain a minimum buffer zone of 300 meters between truck traffic and sensitive receptors. • Improve traffic flow by signal 	<p>operational impacts.</p>
--	---	---	-----------------------------

		<p>synchronization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforce truck parking restrictions. • Provide on-site services to minimize truck traffic in or near residential areas, including, but not limited to, the following services: meal or cafeteria services, automated teller machines, etc. • Re-route construction trucks away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas. • Provide dedicated turn lanes for movement of construction trucks and equipment on- and off-site. • Use electric power in favor of diesel power where available. • All construction activities located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors (defined as schools, playgrounds, daycares, and hospitals) shall notify each of these sites in writing at least 30 days before construction activities begin. <p><u>Fugitive Dust Control</u></p> <p>South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 requires a Fugitive Dust Control Plan to be prepared and approved for construction sites. Construction contractors are required to obtain a 403 Permit from the SCAQMD prior to construction. The following measures, at minimum, to reduce dust shall be included in the contractor’s Fugitive Dust Control Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SCAQMD’s Best Available 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Control Technology (BACT) measures shall be followed on all projects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Active grading sites shall be watered three times per day.• Contractors shall apply approved non-toxic chemical soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas or replace groundcover in disturbed areas.• Contractors shall provide temporary wind fencing around sites being graded or cleared.• Trucks hauling dirt, sand, or gravel shall be covered or shall maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard in accordance with Section 23114 of the California Vehicle Code. (“Spilling Loads on Highways”).• Construction contractors shall install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved roads, or wash off tires of vehicles and any equipment leaving the construction site.• The grading contractor shall suspend all soil disturbance activities when winds exceed 25 miles per hour or when visible dust plumes emanate from a site; disturbed areas shall be stabilized if construction is delayed.• Open storage piles (greater than 3 feet tall and a total surface area of 150 square feet) shall be covered with a plastic tarp or chemical dust suppressant.	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize the materials while loading, unloading and transporting to reduce fugitive dust emissions. • Belly-dump truck seals should be checked regularly to remove trapped rocks to prevent possible spillage. • Comply with track-out regulations and provide water while loading and unloading to reduce visible dust plumes. • Waste materials shall be hauled off-site immediately. • Pave road and road shoulders where available. • Traffic speeds on all unpaved roads shall be reduced to 15 miles per hour or less. • Provide temporary traffic controls such as a flag person, during all phases of construction to maintain smooth traffic flow. • Schedule construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial system to off-peak hours to the extent practicable. • Require the use of clean-fueled sweepers pursuant to SCAQMD Rule 1186 and Rule 1186.1 certified street sweepers. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil is carried onto paved roads on-site or roads adjacent to the site to reduce fugitive dust emissions. • Appoint a construction relations officer to act as a community liaison concerning on-site construction activity 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>including resolution of issues related to PM₁₀ generation.</p> <p><u>On-Road Trucks</u></p> <p>The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to import haulers only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From January 1, 2012 on: All on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks with a GVWR of 19,500 pounds or greater used to move dirt to and from the construction site via public roadways at the Port of Los Angeles shall comply with EPA 2004 on-road emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively). <p>The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to earth movers only:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> From January 1, 2012 on: All heavy-duty diesel trucks with a GVWR of 19,500 pounds or greater used to move dirt within the construction site at the Port of Los Angeles shall comply with EPA 2004 on-road emission standards for PM₁₀ and NO_x (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively). <p>A copy of each unit's certified EPA rating and each unit's CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be provided at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p><u>Off-Road Equipment</u></p> <p>The following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be applicable to Construction Equipment (excluding Vessels, Harbor Craft, and On-Road Trucks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment shall incorporate, where feasible, emissions-savings technology such as hybrid drives and specific fuel economy standards. • Idling shall be restricted to a maximum of 5 minutes when not in use. <p>Equipment Engine Specifications shall adhere to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp, except marine vessels and harbor craft, shall meet Tier-3 off-road emission standards at a minimum. In addition, all construction equipment greater than 50 hp shall be retrofitted with a CARB-verified Level 3 DECS. • From January 1, 2015 on: All off-road diesel-powered construction equipment greater than 50 hp, except marine vessels and harbor craft, shall meet Tier-4 off-road emission standards at a minimum. <p>The above “Equipment Engine Specifications” measures shall be</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>met, unless one of the following circumstances exists, and the contractor is able to provide proof that any of these circumstances exists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A piece of specialized equipment is unavailable within 200 miles of the Port of Los Angeles, including through a leasing agreement. If this circumstance exists, the equipment must comply with one of the options contained in the <i>Step Down Schedule</i> as shown in Table A in the Sustainable Construction Guidelines.. At no time shall equipment meet less than a Tier 1 engine standard with a CARB-verified Level 2 DECS. • The availability of construction equipment shall be reassessed in conjunction with the years listed in the above Tier Specifications (Prior to December 31, 2011, January 1, 2012 and January 15, 2015) on an annual basis. For example, if a piece of equipment is not available prior to December 31, 2011, the contractor shall reassess this availability on January 1, 2012. 	
<p>AQ-2: The proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or</p>	<p>Short-term construction impacts would be less than significant with implementatio</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.</p>	<p>Less than Significant and Significant and Unavoidable.</p>

<p>projected air quality violation.</p>	<p>n of Mitigation Measure and AQ-2. However, short-term impacts from the transport of the USS <i>Iowa</i> from San Francisco Bay to Berth 87 would be significant and unavoidable, as emissions would exceed thresholds of four of the six air districts the ship would pass through during transport, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1.</p>		
<p>AQ-3: The proposed project would not 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</p>	<p>Less than Significant with Mitigation.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

	exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).			
AQ-4:	The proposed project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
AQ-5:	The proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.
GHG-1:	The proposed project would not generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	Less than Significant with Mitigation.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Less than Significant.
GHG-2:	The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.	Less than Significant with Mitigation.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Less than Significant.
3.3 TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION				
TRA-1:	Would the project result in impacts to	Less Than Significant with	TRA-1: Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project	Less than Significant.

<p>volume/capacity (V/C) ratios or levels of service on regional roadway facilities?</p>	<p>Mitigation.</p>	<p>construction.</p> <p>In accordance with the City’s policy on street closures and traffic diversion for arterial and collector roadways, the construction contractor shall prepare a TMP to be approved by the city and county engineers before construction. The TMP shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street layout showing the location of construction activity and surrounding streets to be used as detour routes, including special signage; • Tentative start date and construction duration period for each phase of construction; • Name, address, and emergency contact number for those responsible for maintaining the traffic control devices during the course of construction; and • Written approval to implement traffic control from other agencies, as needed. <p>Additionally, the traffic control plan will include the following stipulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide access for emergency vehicles at all times. • Avoid creating additional delay at intersections currently operating at congested conditions, either by choosing routes that avoid these locations, or constructing during nonpeak 	
--	--------------------	---	--

		<p>times of day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain access for driveways and private roads, except for brief periods of construction, in which case property owners will be notified.• Provide adequate off-street parking areas at designated staging areas for construction-related vehicles.• Maintain pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation during proposed project construction where safe to do so. If construction encroaches on a sidewalk, a safe detour will be provided for pedestrians at the nearest crosswalk. If construction encroaches on a bike lane, warning signs will be posted that indicate bicycles and vehicles are sharing the roadway.• Traffic controls may include flag persons wearing Occupational Safety and Health Administration–approved vests and using a “Stop/Slow” paddle to warn motorists of construction activity.• Maintain access to Metro, LADOT, LAHD and MAX transit services and ensure that public transit vehicles are detoured.• Post standard construction warning signs in advance of the construction area and at any intersection that provides	
--	--	---	--

		<p>access to the construction area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction warning signs will be posted, in accordance with local standards or those set forth in the <i>Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices</i> (FHWA 2001) in advance of the construction area and at any intersection that provides access to the construction area. • During lane closures, notify LAFD and LAPD, as well as the Los Angeles County Sheriff's and Fire Departments, of construction locations to ensure that alternative evacuation and emergency routes are designed to maintain response times during construction periods, if necessary. • Provide written notification to contractors regarding appropriate routes to and from construction sites, and weight and speed limits for local roads used to access construction sites. Submit a copy of all such written notifications to the City of Los Angeles Planning Department. • Repair or restore the road right-of-way to its original condition or better upon completion of the work. <p>TRA-2: Implement Gaffey Street/1st Street Intersection improvements. Reconfiguration of the westbound approach of 1st Street including provision of an</p>	
--	--	---	--

		exclusive right-turn lane along the westbound approach would reduce impacts to this intersection	
TRA-2: Would the project result in additional demand on public transit?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1	Less than Significant.
TRA-4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation.	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1	Less than Significant.
TRA-5: Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding parking, or supporting alternative transportation (bikeways and pedestrian walkways)?	Less Than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

ES.6.3.1 Summary of Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

As identified in Table ES-1, *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, and in Chapter 3 of this document, the only significant unavoidable impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project involves short-term impacts to air quality associated with the transport of the USS *Iowa* from San Francisco Bay to Berth 87. Emissions would exceed thresholds of four of the six air districts the ship would pass through during transport, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1.

ES.6.3.2 Summary of Significant Impacts That Can Be Mitigated, Avoided, or Substantially Lessened

Table ES-1, *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, identifies significant impacts associated with the proposed project that can be mitigated, avoided, or substantially lessened. This Draft EIR has determined that implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts that can be mitigated to a less than significant level on:

- Air Quality:
 - Conflicts with an applicable air quality plan.
 - Violate air quality standard.
 - Contribute to cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutant.
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions:
 - Generate greenhouse gas emissions that may significantly impact the environment.
 - Conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation.
- Traffic and Circulation
 - Result in impacts to volume/capacity (V/C) ratios or levels of service on regional roadway facilities.
 - Result in additional demand on public transit.
 - Result in inadequate emergency access.

ES.6.3.3 Summary of Less Than Significant or No Impacts

Based on the environmental review in this Draft EIR, as summarized in Table ES-1, *Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, less than significant impacts are expected for:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality:
 - Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations.
 - Create objectionable odors.
- Traffic and Circulation:
 - Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.
 - Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding parking, or supporting alternative transportation.
 - Result in a change in air traffic patterns.

ES.6.3.4 Summary of Project Alternatives Evaluated

The project alternatives described in detail in Chapter 6.0 of this document and in Section ES 5.2, above, were selected as a range of reasonable alternatives that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts. Table ES-2, *Comparison of Alternatives*, provides a brief summary of the significance of impacts of each alternative relative to those of the proposed project.

Table ES-2: Comparison of Alternatives

<i>Environmental Resource Area</i>	<i>Proposed Project</i>	<i>Alt.1</i>	<i>Alt.2</i>	<i>Alt.3 No Project</i>
<i>Aesthetics</i>	L	M	L	N
<i>Air Quality/GHG</i>	S	S	S	N
<i>Traffic and Circulation¹</i>	M	M	M	N
Notes: S = Unavoidable significant impact M = Significant but mitigable impact L = Less than significant impact (not significant) N = No impact ¹ = Traffic impacts were analyzed for the proposed project only; therefore, the results of the preferred project are assumed to be similar to those of each alternative.				

ES.6.3.5 Cumulative Impacts

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires that an EIR include a discussion of cumulative impacts "...when the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(a)(3)]." Cumulatively considerable effects are those "...incremental effects of an individual project [which] are significant when viewed in conjunction with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects" [State CEQA Guidelines Section 15065(c)]. A lead agency may conclude that an incremental effect is not "cumulatively considerable," but must briefly describe its basis for that conclusion.

Cumulative impacts of the proposed project combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects are evaluated in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR. The assessment of cumulative impacts takes into consideration existing conditions, plus the proposed project, in combination with the long-term buildout projections as outlined in Chapter 4.0 of this EIR.

The proposed project was analyzed in conjunction with other related projects in the area for potential to contribute to significant cumulative impacts. The proposed project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts (after applicable mitigation) for the following resource areas:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Traffic and Circulation

Cumulative impact evaluations for each resource are included in Chapter 4.0 of this Draft EIR.

ES.6.3.6 Growth-Inducing Impacts

The State of California CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to discuss the ways in which a proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The proposed project and Alternatives 1 and 2 would foster economic growth but would not directly induce population growth or the construction of new housing in the Port's region of influence (Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties). Although the proposed project would lead to development of a currently underutilized industrial area and increase commercial and recreational use, this would not stimulate significant population growth or remove obstacles to population growth.

The proposed project is designed to both improve the Port itself and foster private sector economic investment and growth by making the waterfront more attractive and user-friendly for both residents of the area and visitors. A more attractive and user-friendly waterfront will encourage the development of residential and commercial properties in the nearby community because of the desirability of being located near the improved waterfront. The proposed project and Alternatives do not include the development of new housing or infrastructure that would directly induce population growth.

Such additional development will necessarily result in some additional environmental impacts such as traffic congestion, air quality impacts, increased noise levels, and aesthetics/visual changes. Thus, the proposed project and Alternatives 1 and 2 may result in some significant growth-inducing effects.

The proposed project would increase visitor's throughput in the Port. The environmental impacts associated with provision of these facilities are discussed throughout the respective sections of this Draft EIR and include air quality impacts, traffic congestion, increases in noise, aesthetic/visual impacts, water quality degradation, and increased public services and utility consumption.

The expansion of the facilities would indirectly result in economic growth by providing patrons commercial development along the waterfront and in downtown. The proposed project and Alternatives 1 and 2 would accommodate economic and physical growth by providing additional harbor and transportation infrastructure. As part of the proposed project, transportation system improvements would be constructed in the vicinity of the proposed project site to accommodate increased traffic to the proposed and existing harbor facilities

(refer to Section 3.3, *Traffic and Circulation*, for a list of proposed improvements).

Construction of the additional transportation infrastructure would not trigger or cause substantial new residential or other development in the proposed project area. However, these transportation improvements would accommodate the anticipated growth from the proposed project and Alternatives 1 and 2, and would allow increased development to occur. The impacts of the proposed infrastructure improvements have been adequately assessed in the respective sections of this Draft EIR.

As discussed in Section 5.0, *Effect Found Not to Be Significant*, implementation of the proposed project would generate increased demand for water, natural gas, and electricity. However, neither the proposed project nor the alternatives would require upgrades or new construction of major water, natural gas, or power infrastructure. Existing infrastructure and supplies are adequate to serve the proposed project and alternatives. Although the site currently has water supply, natural gas, and power infrastructure, additional local distribution facilities would need to be extended to new facilities. These new utilities would tie into the existing utilities that currently serve the proposed project site. These improvements would accommodate expected growth associated with the proposed project and Alternatives.

ES.7 Public Comment

Public involvement and outreach was a chief component of the environmental review process for the proposed project. The NOP/Initial Study flyers were sent to 725 residents and property owners within the vicinity of Berth 87. The flyers notified the public that copies of the NOP/IS were available online at www.portoflosangeles.org/NOP/USSIOWA/nop_uss Iowa.asp, and invited the public to the public scoping meeting. LAHD conducted one scoping meeting on September 13, 2011 at the Port of Los Angeles Administration Building at 6:00 pm.

ES 7.1 Issues Raised

A summary of comments received and issues raised during the scoping meeting periods is provided in Table ES-3. This table includes issues identified and discussed in comment letters and orally at public meetings, and identifies the location in which the issues are addressed in the Draft EIR, as applicable.

Table ES-3: Summary of Public Comments

Commenting Agency	Issues of Concern	Location of Discussion in the Draft EIR
California State Lands Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The risk of transporting non-indigenous species to POLA. 2. The feasibility and availability of dry docks in San Francisco Bay area to accommodate the USS <i>Iowa</i>. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refer to Draft EIR Section 5.2. 2. Refer to Draft EIR Section 2.6.1.
Port Community Advisory Committee	No issues of concern were raised.	N/A

ES.7.2 Issues to be Resolved in the EIR

Section 15123(b) (3) of the State CEQA *Guidelines* requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved; this includes whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. The major issues to be resolved include decisions by the Lead Agency as to whether:

- This Draft EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the proposed project and alternatives;
- The proposed project is preferable over one or more of the alternatives;
- The recommended mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
- Additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the project; or
- The project should or should not be approved for implementation.

ES.7.3 Port Community Advisory Committee Issues Raised

The PCAC was established in 2001 as a standing committee of the Port of Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners (Board). The PCAC provides a public forum to discuss Port-related quality of life issues through a series of subcommittees. These subcommittees provide guidance on environmental issues, review of EIRs, master planning, and Port redevelopment. PCAC members commented on the proposed project and the Draft EIR during the NOP period. Their comments are included with other members of the public in Appendix A.