

## 1.1 Overview

The Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD), as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), is analyzing modifications to the San Pedro Public Market (SPPM) Project, previously approved in May 2016. The modifications would involve a 6,200-seat outdoor Amphitheater and entertainment lawn venue (Amphitheater), a 175-foot-diameter Ferris wheel, approximately 175 feet tall by 50 feet wide, and Amusement Attractions that would be constructed after the Amphitheater is complete. The modifications would occur within a previously approved site formerly known as Ports O'Call Village, located between the Main Channel and Sampson Way, from Berths 73-Z to 83 within the Port of Los Angeles. The 6,200-seat Amphitheater would replace the previously approved Discovery Sea Amusement Area and 500-seat amphitheater. The 175-foot-diameter Ferris wheel would replace a previously analyzed 100-foot-diameter Ferris wheel. The Amusement Attractions proposed as part of the modified project are similar in nature to the entertainment attractions previously included within the Discovery Sea Amusement Area. In addition, improvements to the 208 E. 22nd Street Parking Lot are proposed that would accommodate up to 2,600 parking stalls, which would be available for use by the larger San Pedro Waterfront area. Modifications to previously approved mitigation measures are being made to update certain requirements to current regulatory standards and assess their effectiveness and need. All modifications described above compose the West Harbor Modification Project (Proposed Project).

Enacted in 1970, CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] §§ 21000 *et seq.*) and its implementing guidelines (State CEQA Guidelines; 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] §§ 15000 *et seq.*) require that all state and local governmental agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority prior to taking action on those projects. As authorized by Section 15050 of the State CEQA Guidelines, LAHD will serve as the lead agency for the environmental review. Prior to approving these modifications to the previously approved SPPM Project, LAHD is required to undertake an environmental analysis in accordance with CEQA to determine if the proposed changes to the SPPM Project would result in new significant impacts or in a substantial increase in severity of previously identified impacts.

## 1.2 Background and Previous Environmental Documentation

A Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the SPW Project was certified by the Board of Harbor Commissioners (Board) on September 29, 2009 (State Clearinghouse [SCH] No. 2005061041) (referred to hereafter as the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR). It addressed potential impacts associated with implementation of redevelopment of the SPW area. In May 2016, the Board approved an addendum to the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR for the SPPM Project (2016 SPPM

Addendum). The Proposed Project herein represents a change to the SPPM and SPW Projects previously reviewed in accordance with CEQA. No changes are proposed that would affect any federal permits or require any federal approvals. Therefore, National Environmental Policy Act evaluation is not required for the Proposed Project.

One of the primary objectives of the SPW Project was enhanced visitor-serving commercial opportunities within the Ports O'Call Village area along the main channel. Many of the significant environmental impacts identified in the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR were determined to be less than significant or were reduced to a level that is considered less than significant, through either the adoption of mitigation measures or the incorporation of revisions. Impacts related to aesthetics, air quality and meteorology, biological resources, geology, noise, recreation, ground transportation and circulation, and water quality sediments and oceanography, however, were identified as significant and unavoidable in the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR. For those impact areas, LAHD adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program containing 91 mitigation measures to address the impacts during both construction and operation of the SPW Project.

The SPPM Project included a more specific concept for the former Ports O'Call Village site. In May 2016, LAHD prepared the 2016 SPPM Addendum to address development of a smaller building area, the inclusion of a portion of the Town Square originally evaluated in the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR, reconfiguration of the waterfront promenade, extension of the term of the lease from 30 years to 50 years, and possible modification to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits. The 2016 SPPM Addendum found that the SPPM Project, with incorporation of mitigation, would not result in any new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts that were analyzed in the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR. A revised Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program identifying 28 mitigation measures that apply specifically to the SPPM Project was incorporated into the 2016 SPPM Addendum. In November 2019, a second addendum to the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR was prepared to extend the duration of the lease for an additional 16 years.

## 1.2.1 Previous Environmental Documents Incorporated by Reference

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, the following documents were used in preparation of this Subsequent EIR (SEIR) and are incorporated herein by reference.

- Port of Los Angeles. 2008. *San Pedro Waterfront Project Draft EIS/EIR* (SCH No. 2005061041). September.
- Port of Los Angeles. 2009a. *San Pedro Waterfront Project Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations*. September.
- Port of Los Angeles. 2009b. *San Pedro Waterfront Project Mitigation Monitoring Report and Program*. September.
- Port of Los Angeles. 2009c. *San Pedro Waterfront Project Final EIS/EIR* (SCH No. 2005061041). September.

- Port of Los Angeles. 2016. *EIR Addendum to the San Pedro Waterfront Project Final EIR for the San Pedro Public Market Project* (SCH No. 2005061041). May.
- Port of Los Angeles. 2019. *EIR Addendum to the San Pedro Waterfront Project Final EIR for the San Pedro Public Market 2* (SCH No. 2005061041). November.

## 1.3 Purpose and Use of a Subsequent EIR

Because the Proposed Project and modifications to previously approved mitigation measures represent changes to a project previously reviewed and approved under CEQA, LAHD must determine whether additional environmental documentation is necessary to address the Proposed Project's changes to the SPM and SPW Projects. LAHD has reviewed the application in accordance with Sections 15162 and 15163 of the State CEQA Guidelines to determine whether the changes are within the scope of the previously certified 2009 SPW EIS/EIR, the 2016 SPPM Addendum, and the 2019 SPPM Addendum or whether an SEIR may be required.

Pursuant to Section 15162(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, when an EIR has been certified, no SEIR may be required for a project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence, that one or more of the following conditions are met:

1. Substantial changes in the project that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration because of the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
2. Substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration because of the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
3. New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - a. The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or Negative Declaration.
  - b. Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR.
  - c. Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would, in fact, be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
  - d. Mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based on the requirements above, LAHD has determined that a SEIR will be prepared to address potential environmental impacts associated with the changes to the SPW and SPPM Projects.

## 1.4 Lead, Responsible, and Trustee Agencies

CEQA defines the role of *lead agency* as the public agency that has principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project. The CEQA lead agency will decide whether an EIR or Negative Declaration will be required, thus necessitating preparation of the document (State CEQA Guidelines § 15367).

Other agencies could have special roles with respect to the Proposed Project and, if so, would use this SEIR as the basis for their decisions to issue any approvals and/or permits that might be required. Section 15381 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a “responsible agency” as

a public agency which proposes to carry out or approve a project, for which a lead agency is preparing or has prepared an EIR or negative declaration. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “responsible agency” includes all public agencies other than the lead agency which have discretionary approval power over the project.

In addition, Section 15386 of the State CEQA Guidelines defines a *trustee agency* as “...a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project which are held in trust for the people of the State of California.”

Several lead, responsible, and trustee agencies could rely on this SEIR in a review capacity or as a basis for issuance of a permit or other approval for the Proposed Project. Specifically, LAHD, as the lead agency, will use this document when considering approval of the Proposed Project and implementation of the mitigation measures. The City of Los Angeles Transportation Department and the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety may use the document when considering approvals for the implementation of any transportation mitigation measures.

## 1.5 Scope and Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

This SEIR, together with the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR, the 2016 SPPM Addendum, the 2019 SPPM Addendum, and other documents incorporated by reference herein, serve as the environmental review of the Proposed Project, as required pursuant to the provisions of PRC Section 21000 *et seq.*, the State CEQA Guidelines at 14 CCR Section 15000 *et seq.*, and City of Los Angeles CEQA procedures.

*Scoping* refers to the process used to assist the lead agency in determining the focus and content of an EIR. Scoping solicits input on the potential topics to be addressed in an EIR, the range of project alternatives, and possible mitigation measures. Scoping is also helpful in establishing methods of assessment and selecting the environmental effects to be considered in detail.

### 1.5.1 Notice of Preparation and Scoping Meeting

The scoping process for this SEIR was formally initiated on April 14, 2022, when LAHD submitted the Notice of Preparation (NOP) to the California State Clearinghouse for distribution to state agencies and the County Clerk for public posting. Originally, the 30-day review period was scheduled

to end on May 16, 2022. However, LAHD extended the public review period for an additional 30 days, which ended on June 15, 2022.

Written comments received during the scoping process are included in Appendix A. A total of 58 comment letters were received: two from public agencies; 14 from organizations; and 42 from individuals. A summary of the environmental comments received is provided in Table 1-1. Only comments that pertain to the environmental scope of the Draft SEIR are summarized.

**Table 1-1. Summary of Scoping Comments Received**

Commenter	CEQA Concern(s)	Other Concern(s)
<i>Agencies</i>		
City of Rancho Palos Verdes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Fireworks/sound system</li> <li>• <b>Air and Water Pollution:</b> Fireworks</li> </ul>	Illegal fireworks; fireworks triggering post-traumatic stress disorder in veterans or alarming pets
South Coast Air Quality Management District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Air Pollution:</b> All phases, including construction</li> </ul>	–
<i>Organizations</i>		
Cabrillo Beach Yacht Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic and Noise:</b> Associated with increased use of the SPW</li> </ul>	Adequacy of parking
Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Concert noise impact on City and Port of Los Angeles lands and waters</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> Security for the venue</li> <li>• <b>Biological Resources/Water Quality:</b> Pollution from microplastics</li> </ul>	Requests that the Proposed Project use biodegradable materials and recyclables and incorporate the principles of the <i>San Pedro Urban Greening Plan</i> .
Environmental Justice League	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Air Quality/Greenhouse Gases (GHGs):</b> Vehicular emissions and fireworks</li> <li>• <b>Land Use</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is the Proposed Project consistent with the <i>Plan for a Healthy Los Angeles</i>?</li> <li>○ Is the Proposed Project consistent with the Port Master Plan’s environmental-justice policies?</li> <li>○ Does it require a Level II Coastal Development Permit? If so, has the California Coastal Commission’s Environmental Justice Policy been considered?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Concert and loading docks; fireworks shows</li> <li>• <b>Recreation:</b> Replacing approved Discovery Sea Amusement Area with</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental Justice:</b> Proximity to communities that already bear adverse environmental impacts, specifically Census Tracts 6037296220 and 6037296110</li> <li>• What portions will be available without tickets/payment?</li> </ul>

Commenter	CEQA Concern(s)	Other Concern(s)
	other amenities that may require tickets • <b>Public Services:</b> Fire and police services effects on surrounding neighborhoods during concerts; emergency response times	
The Garden Church Board	• <b>Noise:</b> Fireworks/sound system • <b>Air and Water Pollution:</b> Fireworks, microplastics	Fireworks affecting neighborhood residents, triggering post-traumatic stress disorder in veterans, or alarming pets; strongly recommends removing fireworks from project description.
League of Women Voters of Palos Verdes Peninsula	• <b>Air Quality/Noise:</b> Fireworks • <b>Hazards/Water Quality:</b> Fireworks • <b>GHGs:</b> Chemical reactions of fireworks	–
Marine Mammal Care Center	• <b>Noise/Marine Biology</b> o Noise and light pollution impacts on marine wildlife o Urges study on a cap for a “noise pollution budget” • <b>Hazards:</b> Fireworks, trash, and debris; microplastics	–
Native American Heritage Commission	• <b>Tribal Cultural Resources:</b> Request for consultation pursuant to Assembly Bill 52	–
Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council	• <b>Noise and Light Pollution:</b> From venue and fireworks • <b>Hazards:</b> Seek alternatives to artificial turf (i.e., concerns about “forever” chemicals, such as perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances [PFAS]). • <b>Traffic:</b> Venue events • <b>Biological Resources/Air Quality/Water Quality:</b> Debris and microplastics from fireworks	• Parking, security for venue • Boat and vehicle gatherings outside the project area for tailgate parties and/or watching fireworks
Paddle Out Plastic	• <b>Aesthetics:</b> Light and glare, inadequate trash collection in existing condition (exacerbated by project) • <b>Biological Resources:</b> Noise, light, and water pollution impacts • <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise impacts on wildlife • <b>Air Quality and Light Pollution:</b> Impacts on wildlife • <b>Water Quality:</b> Trash and debris	Requesting prohibitions on cheap, single-use items and products, fireworks, polystyrene, artificial turf, smoking, and paper towels in restrooms

Commenter	CEQA Concern(s)	Other Concern(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Hazards:</b> Fireworks and artificial turf</li> <li>● <b>Water Use:</b> From watering down the turf</li> </ul>	
Save Our Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Land Use</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project description is not clear with respect to discretionary permits required.</li> <li>○ Is a Coastal Development Permit required?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Aesthetics:</b> Light and glare                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Will the Proposed Project comply with San Pedro Waterfront and Promenade Design Guidelines?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Air Quality:</b> Fireworks and artificial turf</li> <li>● <b>Biological Resources:</b> Marine wildlife impacts from trash and fireworks, sedimentation</li> <li>● <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What threshold was used to determine that 393,879 gallons of fuel annually would not be a significant impact?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>GHGs:</b> Mobile-source emissions</li> <li>● <b>Hydrology/Water Quality:</b> Windblown debris, trash, confetti into the channel</li> <li>● <b>Land Use:</b> Consistency with Port Master Plan policies and Public Trust Doctrine</li> <li>● <b>Noise:</b> Fireworks and associated cleanup activities afterward</li> <li>● <b>Water Supply:</b> Water for 6,200 patrons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● What fireworks permits from the U.S. Coast Guard are required?</li> <li>● <b>Piecemealing:</b> The Proposed Project does not intend to analyze construction-related impacts and vehicle trips.</li> </ul>
Sierra Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Hazards/Noise/Biological Resources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Artificial turf; trash from confetti, balloons, other plastic waste, and food container waste</li> <li>○ Impacts on wildlife from noise (both fireworks and venue)</li> <li>○ Trash from smoking and vaping resulting in microplastics in the ocean</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>GHGs</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Buildings need to be all-electric</li> <li>○ Need car chargers</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Water Quality</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Install water-filling stations and plant trees</li> <li>● Maintain landscaping without pesticides</li> </ul>

Commenter	CEQA Concern(s)	Other Concern(s)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If any laundry machines are used, then they need filtration to keep microplastics from reaching the ocean</li> </ul>	
Sierra Club’s Los Cerritos Wetlands Task Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Water Quality/Biological Resources</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Opposed to the fireworks</li> <li>○ Cites public health threat and references the fact that San Francisco and San Diego area Regional Water Quality Control Boards are requiring National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits for fireworks shows</li> <li>○ Cites California Water Code 13267, Order No. R4-2022-0213, to provide relevant information on water quality impacts of the Big Bang on the Bay, Alamitos Bay</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	–
San Pedro Bay Historical Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Noise:</b> Impacts on the historic Muller House Museum                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The Palos Verdes Peninsula is already a natural amphitheater, and the venue would exacerbate the noise issue</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Echoes other residents’ concerns about water pollution, light pollution, air quality, traffic, and impacts on local wildlife</li> </ul>	–
Unite Here, Local 11 – Local Hospitality Workers Union	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Hazards/Water Quality:</b> Waste and single-use plastics; artificial turf</li> </ul>	–
<b>Individuals</b>		
Anderson, Natalie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Benedict, Bryan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Borst-Smith, Dave	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of project, but encourages a lot of thought be put into the placement of the sound system</li> </ul>	–
Brown, James	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Budzinski, Nicole	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supportive of project, but concerned about the trash/debris generated</li> </ul>	–
Burlingame-Smith, June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Noise:</b> Sound pollution; effects on sleep patterns</li> <li>● <b>Traffic:</b> General concerns</li> <li>● <b>Air Quality:</b> General concerns</li> </ul>	Parking and effects on San Pedro downtown merchants
Campeau, J.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Noise:</b> Venue sound, atmospheric effects of the sound when Santa Ana</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Poorly planned events causing disruptions to community</li> </ul>



<b>Commenter</b>	<b>CEQA Concern(s)</b>	<b>Other Concern(s)</b>
	<p>winds blow in from the east, fireworks, police response sirens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hazards:</b> Confetti, debris, cleanup</li> <li>• <b>Biological Resources:</b> Effects on marine and land wildlife</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> General concerns</li> <li>• <b>Light and Air Pollution:</b> General concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on local businesses</li> <li>• Crime and parking problems</li> </ul>
Feldman, Laurie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hazards:</b> Plastic trash and microplastics</li> </ul>	Parking, resident discounts, and signage
Ferguson, Lisa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally opposed based on impacts related to biological resources, hazards (i.e., trash and chemicals), traffic, air quality, and pollution</li> </ul>	–
Ferguson, Lisa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repeat of previous comment letter, but with a description of the Proposed Project. Generally opposed based on impacts related to biological resources, hazards (i.e., trash and chemicals), traffic, air quality, and pollution</li> </ul>	–
Gelfand, Robert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> General concerns</li> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests additional information on what kind of performances would be scheduled</li> <li>○ How far can we expect the noise to carry?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Parking
Gonzales, Celia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> Access, circulation for visitors</li> </ul>	Requests additional description of how parking will be handled for events
Gould, Austin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Gould, Noel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise Pollution:</b> Venue</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> Deficient infrastructure; lack of light rail service</li> <li>• <b>Air Quality:</b> Impacts from vehicles idling or looking for parking; food truck diesel/exhaust</li> <li>• <b>Hazards:</b> Trash/confetti</li> <li>• <b>Biological Resources:</b> Harm to marine life</li> </ul>	Inadequate parking
Grennan, Jacqui	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise</li> </ul>	–
Hall, Joyce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	Wonders where parking/disabled parking is located
Hall, Joyce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up email asking if first email was received</li> </ul>	–

<b>Commenter</b>	<b>CEQA Concern(s)</b>	<b>Other Concern(s)</b>
Hattin, Donna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Somewhat positive, but with reservations about space for children’s play areas, picnic areas, and trash/recycling</li> </ul>	Wonders about shower/bathroom facilities, adequate parking
Larson, Keith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	Cautions the need for security and policing
Leach, Drew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Disruptions from venue</li> </ul>	–
Leach, Rosalyn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	Requests grass “blanket” seating
Lee, Marcia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> Congestion</li> </ul>	–
McGahey, Barbera	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Messel, Charles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic and Noise:</b> From the venue</li> </ul>	Applauds the revenue generation, but has concerns about where the revenue will go
Moore, Rhonda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	Requests healthy food options
Nguyen, Stanly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supportive of project</li> </ul>	–
Nizich-Atty, Robert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise</li> </ul>	–
Paddock, Lori	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Traffic, Noise, and Pollution:</b> General concerns</li> </ul>	–
Ragland, Cathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Aesthetics:</b> Downgrade from the previous SPPM design</li> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise will cause residents to have to close their windows</li> <li>• <b>Light:</b> Pollution</li> <li>• <b>Traffic Congestion:</b> Exacerbated</li> <li>• <b>Hazards/Water Quality:</b> Trash, single-use plastics, and artificial turf</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design “bait and switch” from the previously approved project</li> <li>• Gentrification/affordable housing</li> </ul>
Ragland, Kenneth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise:</b> Venue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Design “bait and switch” from the previously approved project</li> <li>• Lack of outreach; environmental justice concerns</li> <li>• Concerned about use of Amphitheater for paid events precluding other visitors from enjoying the area (closing of the waterfront)</li> </ul>
Rasmussen, Karen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise and Light:</b> Pollution from the venue</li> </ul>	–
Rosenberger Halder, Laura	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hazards/Water Quality:</b> Artificial turf; microplastics from the tire crumb (i.e., black pellets used in turf)</li> </ul>	Requests a place to return used drink bottles
Rosenberger Halder, Laura (revised letter)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Hazards/Water Quality:</b> Artificial turf; microplastics from the tire crumb</li> </ul>	Requests a place to return used drink bottles

Commenter	CEQA Concern(s)	Other Concern(s)
Sandell, Scott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Noise and Biological Resources:</b> Venue noise</li> <li>• <b>Light:</b> Pollution</li> <li>• <b>Air:</b> Pollution</li> <li>• <b>Odors:</b> From fireworks</li> <li>• <b>GHGs:</b> Emissions</li> <li>• <b>Land Use:</b> Conflicts with circulation-system programs and policies</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> CEQA vehicle-miles-traveled guidelines</li> <li>• <b>Aesthetics:</b> General concerns</li> </ul>	Generally positive toward waterfront redevelopment, but opposed to the Amphitheater
Schmidt, Crystal	• <b>Noise:</b> Venue	–
Schueller, Kathleen	• <b>Noise:</b> Venue	–
Thacker, Raechel	• <b>Noise and Biological Resources:</b> Venue noise impacts	–
Williams, Lee	• Supportive of project	–
Williams, Tom	• Wants the context from the original Final EIR included, along with all modifications, previous goals, and objectives, and any other modifications leading into this SEIR	–
Williams, Tom (revised)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wants the context from the original Final EIR included, along with all modifications, previous goals, and objectives, and any other modifications leading into this SEIR</li> <li>• <b>Aesthetics:</b> Requests viewshed and sound-shed assessment of light and noise impacts for venue events</li> <li>• <b>Hazards/Historic Land Uses:</b> Contamination from previous uses.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Requests historic aerial photos</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Land Use:</b> Consistency concerns about using maritime property for entertainment purposes</li> <li>• <b>Recreation:</b> General concerns</li> <li>• <b>Traffic:</b> Visitors</li> <li>• <b>Hydrology:</b> Ocean discharges</li> <li>• <b>Sea-Level Rise:</b> Need assessment</li> <li>• <b>Biological Resources:</b> Compensatory mitigation assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Environmental Justice/Equity:</b> Concerns about traffic trips generating noise/traffic/air quality issues for adjacent residents</li> <li>• Parking</li> <li>• Requests piecemealing analysis</li> <li>• Requests process and conditions for setup and takedown of events</li> </ul>
Young, Nancy	• <b>Noise:</b> Venue noise	–

CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; EIR = Environmental Impact Report; GHG = greenhouse gas; PFAS = perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances; SEIR = Subsequent Environmental Impact Report; SPPM = San Pedro Public Market; SPW = San Pedro Waterfront

## 1.5.2 Significant Environmental Topics

Consistent with CEQA's Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form, the SEIR includes analysis of resource topics with potential for new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. A discussion of the existing setting and environmental impact analysis for each CEQA topic has been included in Chapter 3 of this SEIR, *Environmental Impact Analysis*.

The Proposed Project would result in significant impacts regarding the following topics, which are discussed in detail in this SEIR.

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological and Aquatic Resources
- Cultural Resources
- GHG Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Public Services

The following environmental topics were fully analyzed and addressed in the Initial Study/NOP (Appendix A) and will not be discussed further in this SEIR.

- Agricultural and Forestry Resources
- Energy
- Geology and Soils
- Land use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Recreation
- Utilities
- Wildfire

The following topics are also analyzed in this SEIR.

- Cumulative Impacts
- Alternatives
- Significant, Irreversible Changes in the Environment
- Growth Inducement

## 1.6 Organization and Contents of this SEIR

The content and organization of this SEIR are designed to meet the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines and present issues, analysis, mitigation, and other information in a logical and understandable way. This SEIR is organized into the sections listed below:

- The *Executive Summary* provides a description of the Proposed Project and a summary of the environmental impacts and mitigation measures;
- Chapter 1, *Introduction*, provides an overview of the Proposed Project, background, and current CEQA compliance information, an overview of the decision-making process, and information regarding the organization of the SEIR;
- Chapter 2, *Project Description*, provides a description of the Proposed Project's location, characteristics, and objectives, as well as a summary of the major components of the Proposed Project;
- Chapter 3, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, provides a description of the existing conditions within the Project Site and surrounding areas as they relate to the environmental issues discussed in this SEIR. In addition, any changes that may have occurred to the setting since the 2016 and 2019 SPPM Addenda are discussed. Chapter 3 also contains a summary of the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR findings, 2016 SPPM Addendum findings, detailed environmental analysis of the Proposed Project's impacts, including any significant and unavoidable impacts, applicable mitigation measures from the 2009 SPW EIS/EIR, as well as any revisions and updates, and any new mitigation measures that may be required;
- Chapter 4, *Cumulative Impacts*, provides an update to the cumulative impacts analyses for each resource and the relative importance of the Proposed Project's contribution to any significant cumulative impact;
- Chapter 5, *Alternatives*, describes a reasonable range of alternatives to the Proposed Project that could reduce significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided;
- Chapter 6, *Significant and Irreversible Changes*, describes the significant irreversible changes associated with the Proposed Project;
- Chapter 7, *Growth-Inducing Impacts*, discusses whether the Proposed Project would result in growth-inducing impacts;
- Chapter 8, *References*, identifies referenced sources for the SEIR;

- Chapter 9, *List of Preparers*, identifies persons involved in the preparation of the SEIR;
- Chapter 10, *Acronyms*, provides the full definitions for acronyms and abbreviations used in the SEIR; and
- Appendices provide information and technical studies that support the environmental analysis contained within the SEIR.

## 1.7 Availability and Public Review of this Draft SEIR

This Draft SEIR will be distributed for review and comment to the agencies, interested parties, organizations, and others who requested a copy of the document. This Draft SEIR will be available for public review for 45 days, pursuant to Section 15105 of the State CEQA Guidelines, beginning on November 6, 2024, and ending on December 23, 2024. During this review period, this Draft SEIR will be available for review at the LAHD's Environmental Management Division office, located at the following address:

Los Angeles Harbor Department  
Environmental Management Division  
425 S. Palos Verdes Street  
San Pedro CA, 90731

Please contact Sarah Workman at (310) 732-3151 to schedule an appointment for document review. This Draft SEIR will also be available in its entirety as PDF files on the Port of Los Angeles website at [www.portoflosangeles.org/ceqa](http://www.portoflosangeles.org/ceqa).

Interested parties may provide written comments on this Draft SEIR, which must be postmarked by December 23, 2024. Please address comments to the following address:

Director of Environmental Management  
Los Angeles Harbor Department  
425 S. Palos Verdes Street  
San Pedro, CA 90731

Comments may also be sent by email to [ceqacomment@portla.org](mailto:ceqacomment@portla.org). Please include the Proposed Project's title in the subject line of the email.