5.0

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a comparison of alternatives to the proposed Project. Various alternatives were considered during the preparation of this Draft EIR, but several were eliminated from further discussion because they did not satisfy the requirements for an alternative as defined by CEQA. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an "EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, which would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project." Accordingly, those alternatives that met most of the proposed project objectives and that would avoid or substantially lessen a significant impact are identified in Section 5.3. In addition, as required by CEQA, the No Project Alternative is included in the analysis. Section 5.4 identifies those alternatives that were considered but eliminated and explains why; and Section 5.5 compares the selected alternatives against each other and the proposed Project. Finally, Section 5.6 identifies the environmentally superior alternative. The alternatives have been qualitatively analyzed in this Draft EIR at a level that provides sufficient information about the environmental effects of each alternative for comparative purposes and to allow for informed decision-making.

5.2 Requirements for Alternatives Analysis

CEQA's evaluation criteria for alternatives are described fully in Chapter 1, Section 1.6.7. Briefly, Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR present a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project, or to the location of a project, that could feasibly attain a majority of the basic project objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant environmental impact of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires an EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones that meet the project objectives, are ostensibly feasible, and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[f]). The EIR must also identify the environmentally superior alternative, which cannot be the No Project Alternative. Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the

project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental effects (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]).

5.3 Alternatives Considered for Evaluation

This EIR presents a reasonable range of alternatives pursuant to CEQA. 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 (20 PRC 30700 et seq.), and LAHD's leasing policy (LAHD 2006). The Port is one of only five locations in the state identified in the California Coastal Act for the purposes of international maritime commerce (20 PRC 30700–30701). These mandates 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, environmental preservation, and public recreation (California State Lands Commission 2001). In developing an appropriate range of alternatives, the starting point is the proposed Project's objectives.

The proposed Project's objectives were developed based on the community planning process described in Chapter 2, "Project Description." Objectives are numbered 1 through 6 for ease of reference within this chapter.

1. Adaptively reuse Berths 56–60 and 70–71 to provide marine researchers in Southern California with world-class marine research facilities including laboratories, a seawater circulation system, offices, classrooms, a lecture hall/auditorium, and storage space to study the most pressing marine-related problems of the day.
2. Construct a natural seawater wave tank to allow scientists from around the world to study tsunamis, rogue waves, and the generation of wave energy; and conduct vessel, platform, and coastal engineering studies.
3. Provide space within Los Angeles Harbor to relocate, upgrade, and expand SCMI's operations, which are currently located at Berth 260 in Fish Harbor.
4. Provide an opportunity for SCMI and its members, government and other institutional researchers and research organizations with multiple deep draft berths to accommodate vessels ranging in size from small to large 300-foot vessels adjacent to landside facilities.
5. Provide a location for a marine-related business incubator park for synergy among research and commercial interests, and develop commercial technologies to address marine environmental problems.
6. Provide public amenities, including public education classroom space and interpretive exhibits related to marine studies and a cafe, along with a waterfront promenade, consistent with the San Pedro Waterfront Project while not impacting the health and safety of the visiting public.

Two alternatives—the No Project Alternative and a Reduced Project Alternative—are analyzed in this Draft EIR. The Reduced Project Alternative meets a majority of the proposed Project's objectives and would reduce at least one potentially significant

impact of the proposed Project. Several additional alternatives were considered, but none were found to meet the main project objectives and reduce at least one potentially significant impact in comparison to the proposed Project.

Under CEQA, the analysis of alternatives need not be as in-depth as the analysis for the proposed Project, but should be at a level that allows the decision-maker to make an informed determination regarding the differences in impacts between the proposed Project and each of its alternatives. Table 5-1 provides a summary comparison of each of the alternatives in relation to the proposed Project.

Table 5-1. Summary of Proposed Project and Alternatives at Full Buildout (2024)

Feature	*Proposed Project*	*Alternative 1 – No Project*	*Alternative 2 – Reduced Project*
Total Project Area Redeveloped and Enhanced	33.8 ac	33.8 ac	18.85 ac
Project Area Structures	411,100 sf	NC	249,600 sf
Proposed Cafe	1,000 sf	NC	1,000 sf
Proposed Office-Related	132,000 sf	NC	82,000 sf
Proposed Laboratory	144,500 sf	NC	144,500 sf
Proposed Outdoor Space	38,100 sf	NC	38,100 sf
Learning Center at Berth 56	11,500 sf	NC	NC
Wave Tank Building	100,000 sf	NC	NC
ac = acres; sf = square feet; NC= No change from existing conditions			

5.3.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 considers what would reasonably be expected to occur on the site if no future discretionary actions occurred. LAHD would not issue any discretionary permits or discretionary approvals, and would take no further action to construct or permit the construction of any portion of the proposed Project. Under this alternative, no construction impacts associated with a discretionary permit would occur.

Under Alternative 1, the proposed Project would not be constructed. Berths 57–60 would continue to be used for warehousing space; these berths would not be converted to a marine research center, and wharf repair and transit shed repairs would not occur. SCMI would continue to operate the 19,000-square-foot office building in Fish Harbor and continue to face the inadequate space and conditions required for their research. Berth 56 would continue with existing uses, which include the paved area where the 11,500-square-foot Learning Center would no longer be proposed for construction.

As part of the SPWP action (and not part of the proposed Project), the Westway Terminal liquid bulk storage tanks would be removed and Berths 70–71 would subsequently be remediated. With the exception of the existing historic Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House, which would remain, and the

existing office building, Berths 70–71 would otherwise remain vacant indefinitely after remediation until new development plans could be established and evaluated.

The No Project Alternative would maintain the existing conditions at the proposed project site and none of the proposed project objectives would be met.

5.3.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Under this alternative, only Berths 57–60 would be developed into marine research space, with Berth 57 to be occupied by SCMI; repairs, rehabilitation, and upgrades would be made to Berth 57 and Berths 58–60 transit sheds and wharves as described in Chapter 2, "Project Description." SCMI would be relocated to Berth 57, and SCMI facilities at Berth 260 would be demolished as described in Chapter 2.

Development of Berths 70–71, including the NOAA facilities, opportunity site, and wave tank, would not occur. Because it is proceeding under a separate permitting process (i.e., not part of the proposed Project), the Westway Terminal liquid bulk storage tanks would be removed, and Berths 70–71 would subsequently be remediated. With the exception of the existing historic Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House, which would remain, and the existing office building, Berths 70–71 would otherwise remain vacant indefinitely after remediation until new development plans could be established and evaluated. This alternative would also not include the auditorium at Berth 56 or the additional 15 parking spaces proposed at Berth 56. The waterfront promenade would be constructed within City Dock No. 1 as part of implementation of the SPWP. Table 5-2 summarizes development under this alternative.

Table 5-2. Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative

Phase/Element	*Area*
PHASE I (2012–2016)	
Berth 57	
▪ Convert Berth 57 Transit Shed into SCMI Research Facility and Develop Marine Research- and Education-Related Facilities □ Office-Related Space (12,000 sf) o Faculty Office Space o Administrative Suite o Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers)	46,500 sf
□ Laboratory-Related Space (34,500 sf) o Teaching Laboratories o Research Laboratories and Facilities o Lab Support Space o Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous waste, scuba gear, instrument support, etc.)	

Phase/Element	*Area*
□ Outdoor Space (8,200 sf)[1] o Outdoor Teaching/Outreach Classroom o Outside Storage Space	
▪ Replace Berth 57 Entrance (3,640 sf) with New Addition (Public Interpretive Center)	3,600 sf
▪ Install Seawater Circulation and Life Support System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berth 57 and Seawater Intake/Discharge Infrastructure to Serve City Dock No.1 Research Laboratory Buildout	New utility
▪ Construct Floating Docks Adjacent to Berth 57 (12 vessel slips)	18,500 sf
▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berth 57 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements	625 lf[1]
□ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf for Crane	--
▪ Construct Public Plaza at Berth 57	7,500 sf[1]
▪ Relocate SCMI from Berth 260 to New Berth 57 Facilities	--
Berth 260	
▪ Demolish Existing SCMI Facility (demolition of existing 19,000-sf building, 2,700-sf warehouse, and 2,400-sf shop storage)	(24,100 sf)
Total Structure Square Feet in Phase I	*80,100 sf*[2]
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
▪ Repair/Repave/Restripe	625 lf[1]
▪ Add Surface Parking Adjacent to Berth 57	40 spaces
▪ Utilize Sampson Way and 22nd Street (existing parking lot)	409 spaces
Total Parking Added in Phase I	*40 spaces*
Total Available Parking in Phase I	*449 spaces*
Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase I	*7.35 ac*[3]
PHASE II (2013–2024)	
Berths 58–60	
▪ Covert Transit Sheds into Marine Research Facility □ Office-Related Space (50,000 sf) o Office/Administrative Space o Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) o Hallways, Walkways □ Laboratory-Related Space (70,000 sf) o Research Laboratories and Facilities o Lab Support Space o Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels) o Marine Research Vessel Support Facilities (crew quarters, showers, etc.) o Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous	120,000 sf

Phase/Element	*Area*
waste, scuba gear support, etc.) □ Outdoor Space (16,400 sf) o Outside Storage Space	
▪ Convert Transit Shed to Marine Business Incubator Space □ Office-Related Space (20,000 sf) o Office/Administrative Space o Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) □ Laboratory-Related Space (40,000 sf) o Research Laboratories and Facilities o Laboratory Support Space o Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels)	60,000 sf
▪ Develop Waterfront Promenade including Public Plaza/Viewing Platform at Berth 60	6,000 lf[1]
▪ Construct Waterfront Café	1,000 sf
▪ Install Seawater Circulation System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berths 58–60	New utility
▪ Relocate Items Stored by Water Taxi Service (to within the general vicinity)	--
▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berth 58–60 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements	1,875 lf[1]
□ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf	--
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
▪ Implement Repaving and Restriping	1,875 lf[1]
▪ Install New Diagonal Parking	155 spaces
▪ Remove Existing Heavy Rail Line from Street	8,000 lf[1]
Total Parking Added in Phase II	*155 spaces*
Total Parking Available in Phase II	*604 spaces*[4]
Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase II	*10.70 ac*[5]
PROPOSED PROJECT TOTALS	
Total Project Area Structures	249,600 sf
Total Parking Spaces Available for Proposed Project	604
Total Project Area Redeveloped and Enhanced	18.85 acres[5]

[1] Not a structure and is therefore not counted in total structure sf.

[2] Excludes demolition of existing SCMI Facility at Berth 260.

[3] Acreage was calculated by taking the 8 acres of Phase I minus the 0.65 acre at Berth 56 for the auditorium and parking.

[4] In addition to the 155 new parking spaces provided under Phase II, visitors and employees would have access to the 449 parking spaces identified under Phase I for a total of 604 spaces for the proposed Project.

[5] Acreage was calculated by taking the Phase II total of 25 acres from the proposed Project and subtracting 14.3 for Berths 70–71.

[6] Acreage was calculated by taking the total 33.8 acres from the proposed Project and subtracting 0.65 for Berth 56 and 14.3 for Berths 70–71.

sf=square feet; lf = linear feet

Alternative 2 would meet a majority of the proposed Project's objectives except for Objective 2, which includes development of a natural seawater wave tank and part of Objective 1, which includes the lecture hall/auditorium and classroom development at Berth 56 and adaptive reuse of Berths 70–71.

5.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated

As discussed in Section 5.2 above, CEQA requires an EIR to present a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed Project, or to the location of the proposed Project, that could feasibly attain the main project objectives, but would avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant environmental impacts of the proposed Project. CEQA also requires an evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that would be infeasible or that would not reduce any identified significant impact.

The following proposed project alternatives were considered in the selection process, but were rejected due to one or more of the following:

- infeasibility due to physical, legal, or technical factors;
- inability to meet the main project objectives; or
- inability to reduce one or more identified significant impact(s).

The alternatives discussed below were considered but eliminated from further analysis due to their infeasibility.

5.4.1 New Construction at Berths 57–60

This alternative would involve demolition of the existing transit sheds at Berth 57 and Berths 58–60, and construction of new buildings in their place. The programming of the site would be the same as the proposed Project, but this alternative would not adaptively reuse the transit shed structures. Because these structures are considered potentially eligible for listing as historic resources, their demolition would constitute a significant impact, and this alternative would not avoid or minimize the proposed Project's significant unavoidable impacts on cultural resources. Additionally, the demolition of these structures and construction of new buildings in their place would likely increase other impacts, such as air quality, GHGs, and noise. Therefore, because this alternative would not reduce significant impacts, it has been rejected from further consideration in this EIR.

5.4.2 Alternative Site

Alternative sites within the Port were considered but rejected. No other sites within the Port with substantial size, availability, and locational qualities were identified. The City Dock No. 1 site provides approximately 28.3 acres of waterfront property with available buildings that can be adaptively reused for the proposed marine research facilities. The location provides synergies with the future buildout of the

SPWP, and includes public amenities that provide connections to the community and brings additional visitors to the waterfront. Additionally, the location provides deep draft berths to accommodate vessels ranging in size from small to large 250-foot vessels adjacent to landside facilities. Therefore, no other sites were considered feasible for the proposed Project.

5.5 Analysis of Impacts from Alternatives

Thirteen environmental resources are analyzed in Chapter 3 of this Draft EIR, which identifies resource areas that would have impacts with implementation of the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative and the Reduced Project Alternative are qualitatively evaluated in this chapter. Section 5.6 identifies the alternative that qualifies as the overall Environmentally Superior Alternative.

5.5.1 Summary of Alternatives Impact Analysis

Table 5-3 presents a summary of the results of the analysis for the resource areas that involve significant impacts from one or more of the alternatives, and identifies the alternatives that would result in significant unavoidable impacts. Resources with significant impacts that can be mitigated to less than significant are also discussed below.

Table 5-3. Summary of CEQA Significance Analysis by Alternative

Environmental Resource Area	*Proposed Project*	*No Project Alternative 1*	*Reduced Project Alternative 2*
Aesthetics	L	N	L
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	S	N	S
Biological Resources	M	N	M
Cultural Resources	S	N	M
Geology	L	N	L
Groundwater and Soils	L	N	L
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	M	N	M
Land Use and Planning	M	N	M
Noise	S	N	S
Public Services and Recreation	L	N	L
Transportation and Circulation—Ground and Marine	M	N	M
Utilities	L	N	L
Water Quality, Sediments, and Oceanography	L	N	L

L = Less than Significant
N = No Impact
M = Significant but Mitigable
S = Significant Unavoidable

Alternative 2 would avoid a significant and unavoidable impact on cultural resources as a result of not constructing the five-story, 100,000-square-foot wave tank building. However, the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would both have unavoidable significant impacts in the areas of air quality and greenhouse gases and noise. Additionally, the proposed Project and Alternative 2 would have the same significant but mitigable impacts on biological resources and transportation and circulation. The No Project Alternative, which would continue the current conditions on site indefinitely, would have no impacts on the baseline condition.

Table 5-4 ranks the alternatives on the basis of a comparison of their environmental impacts with those of the proposed Project. The ranking is based on the significance determinations for each resource area, as discussed in Chapter 3 and the qualitative analysis below, and reflects differences in the levels of impact among alternatives. This ranking also takes into consideration the relative number of significant impacts that are mitigated to a level below significance, the number of impacts that remain significant after mitigation, and the relative intensity of impacts.

As shown in Table 5-3 above and Table 5-4 below, the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would have an impact on fewer resources; however, because CEQA requires a selection of a design alternative in the event the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior, the Reduced Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative. As discussed in Section 5.5.2, the Reduced Project Alternative would have reduced impacts and notably would reduce the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact that would occur with the proposed Project to a less-than-significant impact with mitigation.

Table 5-4. Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project (with Mitigation; CEQA Impacts)

Environmental Resource Area[a]	*No Project / Alternative 1*	*Alternative 2*
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases	-2	-1
Biological Resources	-2	0
Cultural Resources	-2	-1
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	-1	-1
Land Use and Planning	-1	-1
Noise	-2	-1
Transportation and Circulation—Ground and Marine	-1	0
Total	**-11**	**-5**

[a] Only environmental resources with unavoidable significant impacts or significant but mitigable impacts are included in this table and the analysis used to rank alternatives; the analysis includes project-level impacts, not cumulative effects.

-2 = Impact considered to be substantially less when compared with the proposed Project.
-1 = Impact considered to be somewhat less when compared with the proposed Project.
0 = Impact considered to be equal to the proposed Project.
1 = Impact considered to be somewhat greater when compared with the proposed Project.
2 = Impact considered to be substantially greater when compared with the proposed Project.

Where significant unavoidable impacts would occur across different alternatives but there are impact intensity differences between those alternatives, numeric differences are used to differentiate alternatives (i.e., in some cases, there are differences at the individual impact level, such as differences in number of impacts or relative intensity).

5.5.2 Resources with Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Tables 5-3 and 5-4 identify the alternatives that would result in both unavoidable and significant impacts and those impacts on resources that would be significant without mitigation but that would be reduced to levels less than significant with mitigation, as analyzed in Chapter 3 for the proposed Project and qualitatively analyzed for each alternative in the sections below.

5.5.2.1 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases

5.5.2.1.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Under Alternative 1, construction activities would not occur. Development on the site would consist of the existing operations. Because large-scale construction would not occur, air quality and GHG impacts from construction would not occur. Operational air quality and GHG impacts would also not occur because no new vehicle trips would be generated to the site, and no new stationary sources would occur. As compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would have a reduced impact on air quality and GHG emissions.

5.5.2.1.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would substantially reduce the amount of construction that would take place within the proposed project area. Impacts from air quality construction emissions would be substantially reduced as well. However, as discussed above, impacts from construction and operation would overlap largely. While air quality construction emissions would be reduced, the reduction would likely not be enough to reduce impacts from air quality construction emissions and the combination of construction and operation emissions during 2014 through 2016. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed Project, but would still remain significant even after implementation of mitigation measures.

In addition, GHG emissions from construction activities would be reduced under this alternative. GHG emissions associated with research vessels during operation would also be reduced. However, the combined total of amortized construction GHG emissions and operational GHG emissions would remain significant. As compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would have a reduced impact on air quality and GHG emissions.

5.5.2.2 Cultural Resources

5.5.2.2.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 would not have any construction-related impacts on historical resources. The wave tank would not be constructed, which in turn would not significantly affect the potentially historic district. This significant and unavoidable

impact on a historical resource would be avoided under the No Project Alternative when compared with the proposed Project. However, the proposed Project would have a beneficial impact on the potentially historic transit sheds by rehabilitating them; an improvement that would not be implemented under the No Project. Overall, however, the No Project Alternative would have reduced impacts on cultural resources when compared with the proposed Project.

5.5.2.2.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alterative 2 would reduce the development footprint and construction activities in comparison to the proposed Project by not including the learning center at Berth 56 (11,500 sf) and the NOAA administration building (50,000 sf), wave tank building (100,00 sf), and opportunity site at Berths 70–71. Therefore, Alternative 2 would avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts the wave tank would impose on the historic setting of the Westway Terminal Building, the transit shed at Berth 57, and the Municipal Pier No. 1 Historic District.

5.5.2.3 Noise

5.5.2.3.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Under Alternative 1, the existing uses on the proposed project site would continue. Noise levels would remain the same as the baseline measurements listed in Section 3.9, "Noise." No construction-related noise impacts would occur. No noise-related impacts would occur under the No Project Alternative.

5.5.2.3.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would reduce the development footprint and construction activities in comparison to the proposed Project by not including the learning center at Berth 56 (11,500 sf) and the NOAA administration building (50,000 sf), wave tank building (100,000 sf), and opportunity site at Berths 70–71. When compared with the proposed Project, Alternative 2 would result in reduced construction-related noise impacts because it is a smaller project and would eliminate pile driving associated with construction of the wave tank. However, construction-related impacts (Impact NOI-1) would remain significant and unavoidable due in large part to the pile driving at the wharf along Berths 57–60 and construction noise exceeding a noise threshold at the Cabrillo Way Marina MR-1 location. Impacts from Alternative 2 related to noise would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project, but would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.5.3 Resources with Significant Impacts that Can Be Mitigated to Less than Significant

5.5.3.1 Biological Resources

5.5.3.1.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 would continue the existing uses on the proposed project site. No in-water construction would occur and repairs, rehabilitation, and upgrades to Berths 57–60 transit sheds and wharves would not be performed. No impacts on biological resources would occur.

5.5.3.1.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would reduce the development footprint and construction activities in comparison to the proposed Project by not including the learning center at Berth 56 and the NOAA administration building, wave tank, in-take for the wave tank, and opportunity site at Berths 70–71. Alternative 2 would perform the same repairs, rehabilitation, and upgrades to Berths 57–60 transit sheds and wharves and have the same in-water impacts. As with the proposed Project, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts on marine mammals and special-status terrestrial birds to less-than-significant levels.

Impacts from Alternative 2 related to biological resources would be the same as the proposed Project's, and would be less than significant after mitigation.

5.5.3.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

5.5.3.2.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 would continue the existing uses on the proposed project site. Mike's fueling station currently meets all safety and environmental standards for the handling and storing of hazardous materials, and would not expand or increase its inventory of materials. Although the facility would remain in its existing location, it would not continue to handle hazardous materials with flashpoints below 140°F per Mitigation Measure MM RISK-1 of the San Pedro Waterfront Project EIS/EIR. Moreover, Berths 70–71 would not be developed with the wave tank or office space. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not increase the risk of an accidental spill, release, or explosion at Mike's fueling station. Moreover, because no mitigation would be required under the No Project Alternative, impacts would be slightly less than the proposed Project.

5.5.3.2.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would reduce the development footprint and construction activities in comparison to the proposed Project by not including the learning center at Berth 56 and the NOAA administration building, wave tank, in-take for the wave tank, and

opportunity site at Berths 70–71. Mitigation Measure MM RISK-1 of the San Pedro Waterfront Project EIS/EIR, carried over to Alternative 2, would ensure hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed Project.

5.5.3.3 Land Use and Planning

5.5.3.3.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 would continue the existing uses on the proposed project site. No additional people or facilities would be proposed adjacent to Mike's fueling station, which stores and handles hazardous liquid bulk materials; therefore, Alternative 1 would not result in an inconsistency with the objective of the RMP of the PMP to locate vulnerable populations away from hazardous facilities. No impacts on land use and planning would occur under the No Project Alternative.

5.5.3.3.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

Alternative 2 would reduce the development footprint and construction activities in comparison to the proposed Project by not including the learning center at Berth 56 and the NOAA administration building, wave tank, in-take for the wave tank, and opportunity site at Berths 70–71. However, there would be additional people and structures would be developed in proximity to Mike's fueling station. As with the proposed Project, implementation of Mitigation Measure MM RISK-1 would reduce impacts related to land use and planning to less-than-significant levels.

5.5.3.4 Transportation and Circulation—Ground and Marine

5.5.3.4.1 Alternative 1—No Project Alternative

Alternative 1 would keep the existing uses in place and only allow modest improvements in future years that are allowed by right through the underlying zone. No significant construction would occur under this alternative, and, therefore, this alternative would not result in any construction-related traffic impacts. When compared to the proposed Project, Alternative 1 would have a reduced impact on ground transportation.

5.5.3.4.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project Alternative

During construction, Alternative 2 would still have many if not all of the same impacts discussed under the proposed Project. Lane closures would be likely and disruption to local street networks and transit schedules might occur. As with the proposed Project, a Traffic Control Plan would be implemented throughout construction. Impacts during construction would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

5.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Based on the above analysis, the No Project Alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it would create fewer adverse impacts, including those that would be significant and unavoidable. Under the No Project Alternative, impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise, and traffic would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project. However, none of the proposed project objectives, such as the rehabilitation of the potentially historic transit sheds, would be met (See Section 5.3).

However, State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that in cases where the No Project Alternative is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, another must also be identified as environmentally superior. Consequently, the Reduced Project Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. Under the Reduced Project Alternative, Berths 57–60 would be developed in the same manner as the proposed Project. However, development of Berths 70–71, including the NOAA facilities, opportunity site, and installation of the wave tank, would not occur. Therefore, proposed project objectives #1 and #2 would not be met, which call for the redevelopment of Berths 70-71 and the construction of a wave tank, respectively. Significant and unavoidable impacts on cultural resources would be avoided; impacts on air quality, GHG, and noise would be slightly reduced; and impacts on biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, and transportation and circulation would remain similar to the proposed Project.