FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

USS *IOWA* PROJECT

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR)

Prepared by:
ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT DIVISION
LOS ANGELES HARBOR DEPARTMENT
425 S. Palos Verdes Street
San Pedro, CA 90731
Contact: Chris Cannon, Director
c/o Kevin Grant, Project Manager
Phone: (310) 732-7693

With Assistance From:
RBF CONSULTING
3300 E. Guasti Road, Suite 100
Ontario, CA 91761-8656
Contact: John Gifford
Project Manager
(909) 974-4900

May 2012

Also available online at:

http://www.portoflosangeles.org/environment/public_notices.asp

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction

These Findings of Fact have been prepared by the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) as the Lead Agency pursuant to Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 15091 of the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines to support a decision on the USS *Iowa* Project. Section 21081 of the PRC and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines provide that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been certified that identifies on ore more significant environmental effect of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanies by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

1. Changes or alteration have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects as identifies in the final EIR.
2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provisions of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identifies in the final EIR.

Additionally, the Lead Agency must not approve a project that will have a significant effect on the environment unless it finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects (PRC S 21081(b); 14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] S 15093). The Board of Harbor Commissioners (Board) adopts the Statement of Overriding Consideration set forth below, which identifies the specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project that outweigh the significant environmental impacts identified in the final EIR (EIR).

Project Objectives

The Los Angeles Harbor Department operates the Port under legal mandates such as the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust (Los Angeles City Charter, Article VI, Sec. 601) and the Coastal Act (PRC Div 20 Section 30700 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. According to the Tidelands Trust, Port related activities should be water dependent and should give highest priority to navigation and shipping, as well as provide necessary support and access facilities for accommodating the demands of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce.

The overall purpose of the proposed Project is to provide a historic attraction at the LA waterfront for the public to enjoy which would in turn boost the local economy.

The CEQA project objectives are described below:

- 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.

Project Description

The USS *Iowa* project consists of the following elements:

Phase 1
- Transport of *Iowa* from San Francisco Bay to the Port of LA;
- Off-shore hull cleaning;
- 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

The USS *Iowa* would 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 Angles 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.

Upon initial mooring at Berth 87, the USS *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 the 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 and Existing Parking Lot

Berth 87 is currently used periodically for cargo and cruise ship docking. The existing mooring facilities and dredge depth are suitable for the USS *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 USS *Iowa* is moored at Berth 87, the battleship will be tugged out of the Main Channel annually and turned for even weathering.

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. Refer to Section 3.3, Traffic and Circulation, 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.

Although, the Project will provide sufficient parking to meet "visitors" demand during most hours of operation, this demand may not be met during the period from 12:00 PM to 2:00 PM on weekends for both opening year and stabilized conditions as shown in Attachment 4 of FEIR Appendix E (LA DOT Letter). Since the parking shortage is estimated to occur during a short period of time, the Project proposes to address this deficiency by providing an off-site parking facility for the employees, or by identifying nearby overflow parking lots or available street parking. A final determination regarding the use of on-street parking to fulfill the Project "visitors" parking requirement should be sought by consultation with the Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety. In addition, Exhibit 2.0-6, *Tentative Site Plan*, and Exhibit 2.0-7, *Parking Lot Plan*, are now included in the final EIR.

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.

2.0 CEQA Findings

The Findings of Fact are based on information contained in the draft EIR and the final EIR for the San Pedro Waterfront Project, as well as information contained within the administrative record. The administrative record includes, but is not limited to, the project application, project staff reports, project public hearing records, public notices, written comments on the project and responses to those comments, proposed decisions and findings on the project, and other documents relating to the agency decision on the project. When making CEQA findings required by Public Resources Code Section 21081(a), a public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other material, which constitute the record of proceedings upon which its decision is based. These records are in the care of the Director of Environmental Management, Los Angeles Harbor Department, 425 South Palos Verdes Street, San Pedro, California 90731.

The draft EIR addresses the project's potential effects on the environment, and was circulated for public review and comment pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines for a period of 45 days; January 23, 2012 to March 7, 2012. Comments were received from a variety of public agencies, organizations, and individuals. The final EIR contains copies of all comments and recommendations received on the draft EIR, a list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the draft EIR, responses to comments received during the public review, and changes to the draft EIR. This section provides a summary of the environmental effects of the project that are discussed in the draft EIR, and provides written findings for each of the significant effects, which are accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

Less Than Significant Impacts

The EIR concludes that some impacts of the proposed project in the following environmental resource areas would be less-than-significant:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Traffic

Significant Impacts

The EIR concludes that some, but not all, impacts of the proposed project in the following environmental resource areas would be significant prior to mitigation:

- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Traffic

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The EIR concludes that some, but not all, impacts of the proposed project in the following environmental resource areas would remain significant and unavoidable despite imposition of all feasible mitigation:

- Air Quality

Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Found to be Significant and Unavoidable

Table 1.1 Unavoidable Significant Impacts

Environmental Impact	*Impact Determination*	*Mitigation Measure*	*Impacts after Mitigation*
AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
AQ-1: The proposed project would 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.	**MM AQ-1:** Tugboats utilized for transport of the USS *Iowa* 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 Department's Sustainable Construction Guidelines (revised 2009), tugboats with C1 or C2 marine engines utilized for transport of the USS *Iowa* 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.	Significant and Unavoidable for towing emissions.

AQ-2: The proposed project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Short-term impacts from the transport of the USS *Iowa* 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.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1.	Significant and Unavoidable.

Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant after Mitigation

The LAHD Board of Commissioners hereby finds that the following environmental impacts of the USS *Iowa* Project are less than significant after implementation of mitigation measures.

Table 1.2 Significant Impacts that can be Mitigated

Environmental Impact	*Impact Determination*	*Mitigation Measure*	*Impacts after Mitigation*
AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
AQ-1: The proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Impacts for short-term construction (not including transport) and long-term operation would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2.	**MM AQ-2:** The project shall implement the following measures 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. <u>Best Management Practices</u> • Use of diesel oxidation catalysts and catalyzed diesel particulate traps.	Less than Significant for other short-term construction and long-term operational impacts.

		• 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 vehicles. • Maintain a minimum buffer zone of 300 meters between truck traffic and sensitive receptors. • Improve traffic flow by signal synchronization. • 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. <u>Fugitive Dust Control</u> 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: • SCAQMD's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) measures shall be followed on all projects. • 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. • 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 including resolution of issues related to PM_{10} generation. <u>On-Road Trucks</u> The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to import haulers only: • 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 PM_{10} and NO_X (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively). The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to earth movers only: • 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 PM_{10} and NO_X (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively). 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. <u>Off-Road Equipment</u> The following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be applicable to Construction Equipment (excluding Vessels, Harbor Craft, and On-Road Trucks): • 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. Equipment Engine Specifications shall adhere to the following: • 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. The above "Equipment Engine Specifications" measures shall be	

		met, unless one of the following circumstances exists, and the contractor is able to provide proof that any of these circumstances exists: • 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 *Step Down Schedule* 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 January 15, 2015) on an annual basis. <u>Sustainable Construction Guidelines</u> The LAHD has developed *Sustainable Construction Guidelines* for reducing air emissions from all LAHD-sponsored construction projects (LAHD 2009). The Guidelines include the use of Best Management Practices (BMP) and control measures. Although no air quality impacts from construction activities would occur, the applicable BMPs and control measures for project construction include the following: • Construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. • During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues must be kept with their engines off when not in use for more than 5 minutes to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities shall be	

		phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks, where feasible, and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts. • Where available, use electricity from power poles rather than temporary diesel- or gasoline-powered generators. • Construction activities that affect traffic flow on the arterial roadways shall be scheduled to off-peak hours to the extent possible. Additionally, construction trucks shall be directed away from congested streets or sensitive receptor areas. • Where possible, enforce truck parking restrictions; provide on-site services to minimize truck traffic in or near residential areas, including services such as meal or cafeteria. • Apply water or dust palliative to the site and equipment as frequently as necessary to control fugitive dust emissions. • Use low-sulfur fuel in all construction equipment as provided in California Code of Regulations Title 17, Section 93114. • On-road heavy-duty trucks shall comply with EPA 2004 on-road emission standards for PM10 and NOx and shall be equipped with a CARB verified Level 3 device. Emission standards will increase to EPA 2007 on-road emission standards for PM10 and NOx by January 1, 2012. • Construction equipment (excluding on-road trucks, derrick barges, and harbor craft) shall meet U.S. EPA Tier-2	

		nonroad standards. The requirement will increase to Tier 3 by January 1, 2012, and Tier 4 by January 1, 2015. In addition, construction equipment shall be retrofitted with a CARB certified Level 3 diesel emissions control device.	
AQ-2: The proposed project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.	Impacts for short-term construction (not including transport) and long-term operation would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2.	Refer to Mitigation Measure AQ-2.	Less than Significant for other short-term construction and long-term operational impacts.
GHG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.	Impacts for direct or indirect greenhouse gas generation by the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Less than Significant for direct and indirect greenhouse gas generation.
GHG-2: The proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses.	Impacts for the proposed project to conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2.	Less than Significant for conflicting with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION			
TRA-1: The project would result in impacts to volume/capacity (V/C) ratios or levels of service on regional roadway facilities.	Significant.	**MM TRA-1:** Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project construction. 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: • 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. Additionally, the traffic control plan will include the following stipulations: • 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,	Less than Significant.

		or constructing during nonpeak times of day. • 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 OSHA–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 access to the construction area. • Construction warning signs will be posted, in accordance with local standards or those set forth in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (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. **MM TRA-2:** Re-stripe the 1st Street eastbound approach and departure, to shift the shared through lane to the curb right-turn lane, yielding a dual left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane; and modify the east-west phasing to lead/lag protected left-turn phases. This mitigation would be implemented only if the project year 2042 LOS is reached, if operations continue beyond the term of the lease, and only if LADOT accepts such an improvement at that time. This mitigation would reduce long-term operational impacts to V/C ratios and levels of service for this intersection.	
TRA-2: Would the project result in additional demand on public transit?	Significant.	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1.	Less than Significant.

TRA-4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	Significant.	Refer to Mitigation Measure TRA-1.	Less than Significant.

Findings Regarding Environmental Impacts Found to be Less Than Significant

The LAHD Board of Commissioners hereby finds that the following environmental impacts of the USS *Iowa* Project are less than significant. Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (14 CCR Section 15126.4(a)(3)). Findings have not been prepared for impacts that are less than significant.

Table 1.3 Less Than Significant Impacts

Environmental Impacts	*Impact Determination*	*Mitigation Measure*	*Impacts After Mitigation*
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 state scenic highway.	Less than Significant.	No mitigation is required.	Less than Significant.

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.
AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
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.
TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION				
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.

Significant Environmental Impacts that are Reduced to a Less-Than-Significant Level by Mitigation Measures Incorporated into the Project

This EIR determines that all significant impacts in the following resource areas could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. With mitigation, all impacts of the proposed Project in this resource area are found to be less than significant:

- Traffic

In addition, some, but not all, of the significant impacts of the proposed Project in the following resource area could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. However, other significant impacts of the proposed Project in these resource areas cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures, and therefore remain significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Project.

- Air Quality

The Board hereby finds that mitigation measures have been identified in the EIR that will avoid or substantially lessen the following significant environmental impacts to a less than significant level. The significant impacts and the mitigation measures that will reduce them to a less than significant level are as follows:

Traffic

As discussed in Section 3.3 of the EIR, there would be three significant impacts to Traffic that would be mitigated to less than significant levels as a result of mitigation measures incorporated into the Project. The impacts and mitigation measures are discussed below.

Impact TRA-1: Would the project result in impacts to volume/capacity (V/C) ratios or levels of service on regional roadway facilities?

> **Impact TRA-1** represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in impacts to roadways and intersections from an increase in construction truck and automobile traffic on a short-term temporary basis (construction) and long-term (operations). Construction-related traffic would consist of: an increase in short-term vehicle traffic from the construction workers commuting to and from the project site; and the transportation of the prefabricated office/ticket booth, a prefabricated restroom facility and two prefabricated access platforms and brows to board USS *Iowa*. Operations-related traffic would consist of an increase in visitors and users accessing the area.

Finding

Implementation of Mitigation Measures TRA-1(Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project construction) and TRA-2 (Implement Gaffey Street/1st Street intersection improvements) would reduce the contribution of the proposed Project to construction and operation impacts to a less-than significant level.

MM TRA-1. Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project construction. 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:

- a street layout showing the location of construction activity and surrounding streets to be used as detour routes, including special signage;
- a tentative start date and construction duration period for each phase of construction;
- the 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.

Additionally, the traffic control plan will include the following stipulations:

- 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 times of day.
- 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, MAX, and LAHD 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 access to the construction area.

- Construction warning signs will be posted, in accordance with local standards or those set forth in the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (Federal Highway Administration 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.

MM TRA-2. Implement Gaffey Street/1st Street intersection improvements. Re-stripe the 1st Street eastbound approach and departure, to shift the shared through lane to the curb right-turn lane, yielding a dual left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane; and modify the east-west phasing to lead/lag protected left-turn phases. This mitigation would be implemented only if the project year 2042 LOS is reached, if operations continue beyond the term of the lease, and only if LADOT accepts such an improvement at that time. This mitigation would reduce long-term operational impacts to V/C ratios and levels of service for this intersection.

Rationale for Finding

MM TRA-1 would ensure that traffic from other construction projects in the area are taken into account when coordinating schedules and activities to minimize effects of traffic disturbances and delays. This may include scheduling lane closures for non-peak traffic hours, providing detours for vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists, and traffic controls such as signage and flag personnel. Access at driveways would be maintained, along with access for emergency vehicles, and adequate off-street parking areas would be provided on Port property to minimize disruption in surrounding neighborhoods. With these measures in place, residual impacts would be less that significant under CEQA.

MM TRA-2 would ensure that necessary improvements would be made to the Gaffey Street/1st Street intersection to alleviate projected traffic impacts. With this measure in place, residual impacts would be less than significant under CEQA.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact TRA-2: Would the project result in a significant increase in related public transit use?

Impact TRA-2 represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in an increased use of public transit such as trains and buses by employees, visitors, or residents. There are five fixed-route transit lines (Metro 450, Metro 205, Waterfront Red Car, and the San Pedro Dash) within ¼ mile of the project area. However, the draft EIR determined that the project-related impacts on the regional transit system would not be considered significant.

Finding

Implementation of MM TRA-1 would reduce potential impacts to public transit associated with short-term construction of project features.

MM TRA-1. Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project construction.

Rationale for Finding

MM TRA-1 would ensure that short-term construction of project features would not interfere with public transit operations. The TMP would maintain access to Metro, LADOT, MAX, and LAHD transit services and ensure that public transit vehicles are detoured.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact TRA-4: Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Impact TRA-4 represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in inadequate emergency access. Due to the nature of the construction activities associated with the proposed Project, truck trips and delivery of materials by land is expected to be minimal as the structures are limited in size and scope.

Finding

The project does not propose construction of any roadways; however, the project could result in inadequate emergency access during short-term construction of project components due to increased traffic congestion. With implementation of mitigation measure TRA-1 above, emergency access would be maintained, and these impacts would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

MM TRA-1. Develop and implement a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) throughout proposed project construction.

Rationale for Finding

MM TRA-1 would ensure that traffic from other construction projects in the area are taken into account when coordinating schedules and activities to minimize effects of traffic disturbances and delays. This may include scheduling lane closures for non-peak traffic hours, providing detours for vehicles and pedestrians/bicyclists, and traffic controls such as signage and flag personnel. Access at driveways would be maintained, along with access for emergency vehicles, and adequate off-street parking areas would be provided on Port property to minimize disruption in surrounding neighborhoods. With these measures in place, residual impacts would be less that significant under CEQA.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As discussed in Section 3.2 of the EIR, there would be significant impacts to Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions that would be mitigated to less than significant levels as a result of mitigation measures incorporated into the Project. However, two of these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable after mitigation related to the one time towing emissions of the battleship. The impacts and mitigation measures are discussed below.

Impact AQ-1: The proposed project would conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

Impact AQ-1 represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in air emissions that would exceed thresholds of an air quality plan. This would include exceeding the daily thresholds of a specific pollutant of a regional or local air quality plan. The exceedance could be temporary or long-term.

Finding

The proposed project is located within the SCAB, which is governed by the SCAQMD. Consistency with the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan for the South Coast Air Basin (2007 AQMP) means that a project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and assumptions in the respective plan to achieve the federal and state air quality standards.

Criterion was addressed in the draft EIR according to the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, in order to determine consistency with the 2007 AQMP:

- The project would not increase the frequency or severity of existing air quality violations.
- The project would not delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or 2007 AQMP emissions reductions.
- The project would be consistent with the population, housing, and employment growth projections utilized in the preparation of the AQMP.
- The project would implement all feasible air quality mitigation measures.
- The project is an infill project, and its long-term influence would also be consistent with the goals and policies of the AQMP.
- The project would have the potential to cause or affect a violation of the AAQS.

The only project element that exceeds thresholds for any air quality plans, after implementation of mitigation, include the daily exceedances of NOx and PM by the tug boats that would transport the battleship from San Francisco to Los Angeles; therefore, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Impacts for 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.

More specifically, transport emissions would exceed thresholds for NOx in the Bay Area AQMD, San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Ventura County APCD, and the SCAQMD. Emissions would also exceed the San Luis Obispo APCD thresholds for PM. The tug operations associated with arrival activities (transporting the USS *Iowa* within the Port and placing the ship at Berth 87) would be subject to Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires the project to comply with CAAP Control Measure HC1. Therefore, emissions resulting from arrival activities within the Port (and within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction) would be reduced; however, NOX emissions would still exceed SCAQMD's daily NOX threshold. Although emissions during the transport of the USS *Iowa* to Berth 87 would be temporary, substantial emissions would occur that would not be mitigated to less than significant levels.

> **MM AQ-1.** All tugboats utilized for transporting the USS *Iowa* (within the Port of Los Angeles and for the ocean tug used for one-time transport of the battleship from San Francisco Bay to Los Angeles) shall comply with the Port's Clean Air Action Plan Control Measure HC1, Performance Standards for Harbor Craft (further reduces emissions from engines). Additionally, all tugboats with C1 or C2 marine engines utilized for transport of the USS *Iowa* within the Port of Los Angeles and for the one time transport of the battleship from San Francisco Bay to Los Angeles shall utilize an EPA Tier-3 engine or cleaner, if available, in accordance with the Los Angeles Harbor Department's Sustainable Construction Guidelines (revised 2009).

MM AQ-2. The project shall implement the following measures 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.

Best Management Practices

- 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 synchronization.
- 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.

Fugitive Dust Control

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:

- SCAQMD's Best Available Control Technology (BACT) measures shall be followed on all projects.
- 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.
- 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 including resolution of issues related to PM10 generation.

On-Road Trucks

The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to import haulers only:

- 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 NOX (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively).

The following EPA Standards shall be applicable to earth movers only:

- 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 NOX (0.10 g/bhp-hr and 2.0 g/bhp-hr, respectively).

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.

Off-Road Equipment

The following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be applicable to Construction Equipment (excluding Vessels, Harbor Craft, and On-Road Trucks):

- 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.

Equipment Engine Specifications shall adhere to the following:

- 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.

The above "Equipment Engine Specifications" measures shall be met, unless one of the following circumstances exists, and the contractor is able to provide proof that any of these circumstances exists:

- A piece of specialized equipment is unavailable as specified in the LAHD Sustainable Construction Guidelines, versus 3(a), 3(b) or 3(c), 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 Step Down Schedule as shown in Table A below. 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.

Rationale for Finding

MM AQ-1 would ensure that tugboats utilized for the transport of the USS *Iowa* 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.

MM AQ-2 would ensure that construction activities of the proposed project would utilize the Port's sustainable construction guidelines and best management practices, reducing air emissions.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact AQ-2: The proposed project would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Impact AQ-2 represents the potential for Project-related air emissions to result in concentrations of air contaminants that could result in either a violation of an ambient air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation. The USS *Iowa* will be towed from San Francisco Bay in Northern California to POLA and operated as a tourist attraction, and would result in construction and operational emissions. Air emissions were modeled for Phase 1, Phase 2, and transport of the battleship.

Finding

Construction short-term emissions would not exceed thresholds after implementation of mitigation. Transport emissions would exceed local thresholds. Long-term operational emissions from mobile sources, stationary sources, and maintenance would be less than significant after mitigation. Phase 1 construction emissions would be minimal. Phase 2 construction activities would be less than significant before and after mitigation. The SCAB is currently designated as nonattainment for ozone and $PM_{2.5}$.

MM AQ-1 and MM AQ- 2

Rationale for Finding

MM AQ-1 would ensure that tugboats utilized for the transport of the USS *Iowa* 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.

MM AQ-2 would ensure that construction activities of the proposed project would utilize the Port's sustainable construction guidelines and best management practices, reducing air emissions.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact AQ-3: The proposed project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

Impact AQ-3 represents the potential for the proposed Project to cause cumulative air quality impacts within the region.

Finding

Compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations, as well as implementation of LAHD Construction Guidelines and programs within the CAAP (as required by Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2), would reduce the project's construction-related impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, it can be reasonably inferred that the project-related construction emissions, in combination with those from other projects in the area, would not substantially deteriorate the local air quality.

Based on the SCAQMD's methodology, a project would have a significant cumulative air quality impact if the project's contribution to VMT growth exceeds its contribution to

employment growth in the region. Based on these criteria, development of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact in this regard. In addition, no local CO violations would occur in the project area as a result of project implementation. As such, the mass regional emissions that would occur as a result of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable.

MM AQ-1 and MM AQ- 2

Rationale for Finding

MM AQ-1 and MM AQ-2 would ensure that project construction and operations comply with the Port's Clean Air Action Plan Control Measure HC1, and with LAHD Sustainable Construction Guidelines which include best management practices. Cumulative impacts for project operation (VMT, employment, and cumulative ratios) are found in Table 3.2-11, *Project Cumulative Air Quality Impacts*, of the draft EIR.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact GHG-1: The proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.

Impact GHG-1 represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in the generation of greenhouse gases. Direct project-related GHG emissions include emissions from construction activities, area sources, and mobile sources. Indirect project related emissions would be related to energy consumption, solid waste, and water demand.

Finding

Construction-Related GHG Emissions

Similar to the construction air quality analysis under Impact Statement AQ-2, GHG emissions from construction would result from the transport of the USS *Iowa* to the Port of Los Angeles from San Francisco Bay, construction Phase 1, and construction Phase 2. GHG emissions from tugboats transporting the USS *Iowa* would occur along the coast and within the jurisdiction of six air districts. The transport of the USS *Iowa* would result in approximately 761.59 MTCO2eq. Once the USS *Iowa* arrives to the Port, the tugboats used to place the ship at Berth 87 would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which would reduce tugboat-related emissions.

Operational Emissions

Direct operational GHG estimations are based on emissions from area and mobile sources. GHGs associated with area sources and mobile sources would be 0.00

MTCO2eq/yr and 1,085.13 MTCO2eq/yr, respectively. Total project-related direct operational emissions (including amortized construction emissions) would result in 1,128.33 MTCO2eq/yr.

Maintenance Emissions

Nominal GHG emissions would occur as a result of on-going maintenance activities at the project site. The USS *Iowa* will be towed out via tugboat and turned once per year to ensure even weathering. Tugboats would result in temporary emissions (approximately 9.98 MTCO2eq), and would be required to comply with Control Measure HC1 (performance standards for harbor craft) (refer to Mitigation Measure AQ-1). Other maintenance activities that would occur and may result in negligible GHG emissions associated with on-going repairs, minor painting, and routine inspections, among others. GHG emissions as a result of maintenance activities would be less than significant.

Indirect Project Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases

Energy Consumption. Energy Consumption emissions were calculated using the CalEEMod model and project-specific land use data. Electricity would be provided to the project site via Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The project would indirectly result in 292.07 MTCO2eq/year due to energy consumption; refer to Table 3.2-13.

Solid Waste. Solid waste associated with operations of the proposed project would result in 16.14 MTCO2eq/year; refer to Table 3.2-13, *Project Related Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, of the draft EIR.

Water Demand. The City would be the main water supply provider to the proposed project. The project's water supply would be provided by imported sources and local groundwater. Emissions from indirect energy impacts due to water supply would result in 30.20 MTCO2eq/year.

Total Project-Related Sources of Greenhouse Gases. As shown in Table 3.2-13, the total amount of project-related operational GHG emissions from direct and indirect sources combined would total 1,466.74 MTCO2eq/yr which are below the 3,000 MTCO2eq/yr GHG threshold.

MM AQ-1 and MM AQ- 2

Rationale for Finding

Although the proposed project would generate greenhouse gas emissions, both directly and indirectly, the emissions resulting from the transport of the battleship would occur one time and most of the emissions would be generated off shore. Tugboats utilized

would have to comply with project mitigation, including Control Measure HC1 (engine performance standards for harbor craft), reducing impacts to less than significant.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Impact GHG-2: The proposed project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Impact GHG-2 represents the potential for the proposed Project to result in the generation of greenhouse gas emissions that would conflict with any regulations, plans, or policies adopted for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Finding

The Clean Air Action Plan was approved in November 2006 (updated in 2010) by governing boards of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The CAAP primarily addresses pollution and toxic air contaminants (TACs); however the programs and controls within the plan reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Project implementation of CAAP Control Measure HC1 (performance standards for harbor craft) and LAHD Construction Guideline BMPs as a result of implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would result in project consistency with the CAAP.

In May 2007, the City of Los Angeles adopted Green LA, which is a plan with the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The goal of Green LA is to reduce CO2 emissions 35 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. Green LA directed the Port to develop an individual Clean Air Program (CAP), consistent with the goals of Green LA, to explore opportunities to reduce GHGs from municipal operations. Green LA was developed to reduce emissions from major tenant operations such as operation of heavy duty vehicles/trucks, ocean-going vessels, harbor craft, cargo handling equipment, and railroad locomotives.

MM AQ-1 and MM AQ- 2

Rationale for Finding

The project proposes the mooring of the USS *Iowa* at Berth 87 as well as a Visitor Center. Therefore, as the proposed uses/operations are not associated with municipal operations, the measures within the Port's CAP do not necessarily apply to the project. However, the project would incorporate several GHG reduction measures similar to those included within the Port's CAP. The project would be required to comply with the CalGreen requirements for non-residential uses which include water and energy conservation measures. Additionally, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1,

the project would also be required to implement the VSRP and CAAP Control Measure HC1 during the annual turning of the ship. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

Public Comments

No public comments were received relative to this impact.

Cumulatively Considerable Impacts

The State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15130) require a reasonable analysis of the significant cumulative impacts of a proposed project. Cumulative impacts are defined by CEQA as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts" (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15355). Currently there are nine projects with approved environmental documentation proposed to occur within or near the Port of Los Angeles. Nine more projects are under environmental review by the Port. The adopted San Pedro Waterfront Plan includes 66 projects.

The discussion below identifies significant cumulative impacts for which the proposed Project's contribution is cumulatively considerable prior to mitigation (i.e. less than significant with mitigation) and for which the proposed Project's contribution is significant and unavoidable. All feasible mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the cumulatively considerable contribution of the proposed Project to these impacts have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Project.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Cumulative Impact AQ-1: Would the proposed project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Cumulative Impact AQ-1 assesses the potential for the proposed Project construction or operation, along with other cumulative projects, to produce a cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutant emissions for which the proposed Project region is in nonattainment under a national or state ambient air quality standard or for which the SCAQMD has sent a daily emissions threshold.

Finding

Cumulative Short-Term Emissions (Construction-Related)

With respect to the proposed project's construction-period air quality emissions and cumulative SCAB-wide conditions, the SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the 2007 AQMP pursuant to FCAA mandates. As such, the proposed project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements, as well as adhere to all BMPs within the LAHD Construction Guidelines and programs within the CAAP (refer to Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2). Rules 403 requires that fugitive dust be controlled with the best available control measures in order to reduce dust so that it does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the proposed project. In addition, the proposed project would comply with adopted 2007 AQMP emissions control measures. Per SCAQMD rules and mandates, as well as the CEQA requirement that significant impacts be mitigated to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects throughout the SCAB, which would include related projects.

Compliance with SCAQMD rules and regulations, as well as implementation of LAHD Construction Guidelines and programs within the CAAP (as required by Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2), would reduce the project's construction-related impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, it can be reasonably inferred that the project-related construction emissions, in combination with those from other projects in the area, would not substantially deteriorate the local air quality. Thus, a less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

Cumulative Long-Term Emissions

The SCAQMD has set forth both a methodological framework as well as significance thresholds for the assessment of a project's cumulative operational air quality impacts. The SCAQMD's approach for assessing cumulative impacts is based on the SCAQMD's AQMP forecasts of attainment of AAQS in accordance with the requirements of the federal and state CAAs. This forecast also takes into account SCAG's AQMP forecasted future regional growth. As such, the analysis of cumulative impacts focuses on determining whether the proposed project is consistent with the growth assumptions upon which the SCAQMD's AQMP is based. If the project is consistent with the growth assumptions, then future development would not impede the attainment of AAQS and a significant cumulative air quality impact would not occur.

Based on the SCAQMD's methodology, a project would have a significant cumulative air quality impact if the project's contribution to VMT growth exceeds its contribution to

employment growth in the region. This is determined by comparing the following two ratios:

- The ratio of daily project-related VMT to daily countywide VMT; and
- The ratio of project-related employment growth to countywide employment growth.

As shown in draft EIR Table 4.0-1, *Project Cumulative Air Quality Impacts*, the project's VMT ratio does not exceed the employment ratio. Based on these criteria, development of the proposed project would have a less than significant impact in this regard. In addition, as stated above, no local CO violations would occur in the project area as a result of project implementation. As such, the mass regional emissions that would occur as a result of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable.

Rationale for Finding

Air quality impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable regarding construction or operation of the proposed project, even when combined with emissions from concurrent projects. The only air quality impact that exceeds thresholds is the towing of the battleship, which would occur one time and therefore, not a cumulative impact.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the draft EIR regarding mitigation measures related to Cumulative Impact AQ-1.

Cumulative Impacts GHG-1: Would the proposed project result in cumulative impacts related to GHG emissions?

Cumulative Impact GHG-1 assesses the potential for the proposed Project construction and operation along with other cumulative projects to contribute to global climate change.

Finding

As stated in draft EIR Section 3.2, *Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, GHG emissions impacts resulting from the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of mitigation. The project would result in a total of 1,466.74 $MTCO_2eq/yr$. Project construction and transport of the ship represent a substantial portion of the total emissions, resulting in 996.52 $MTCO_2eq$. Short-term (transport of the USS *Iowa*) and construction GHG emissions are typically summed and amortized over the lifetime of the project (assumed to be 30 years), then added to the operational emissions.

Once the USS *Iowa* arrives to the Port, the tugboats used to place the ship at Berth 87

would be required to comply with Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which would reduce tugboat-related emissions, and also reducing cumulative GHG emissions in the project area.

Rationale for Finding

It is generally the case that an individual project of this size and nature is of insufficient magnitude by itself to influence climate change or result in a substantial contribution to the global GHG inventory.[1] GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts; there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective.[2] The additive effect of the project's GHG emissions would not result in a reasonably foreseeable cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. In addition, the proposed project as well as other cumulative related projects would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the GHG emissions of the project. Therefore, the project's cumulative GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact on the environment.

Public comments

No public comments were received on the draft EIR regarding mitigation measures related to Cumulative Impact GHG-1.

Traffic

Cumulative Impact TRA-1: Would the proposed project result in cumulative impacts relative to traffic?

Cumulative Impact TRA-1 represents the potential of the proposed project in combination with other cumulative projects to result in impacts to roadways, intersections, level of service, public transit, and non-motorized traffic.

Finding

The proposed project would have a less than significant impact related to traffic with incorporation of mitigation measures discussed in draft EIR Section 3.3, Traffic and Circulation. As a result, impacts are considered to be less than significant. Implementation of intersection improvements at the Gaffey Street/1st Street intersection including reconfiguration of the westbound approach of 1st Street with provision of an

[1] California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, *CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act*, 2008.

[2] Ibid.

exclusive right-turn lane along the westbound approach would reduce long-term operational impacts to V/C ratios and levels of service for this intersection.

Rationale for Finding

Increased traffic is expected to result in the short-term, as the proposed project is constructed, and in the long-term, as visitors to the USS *Iowa* utilize the roadways, bikeways and walkways to get to the Port area. Short-term construction traffic impacts may result in traffic congestion and delays; however, this would be temporary in nature, would be mitigated with implementation of a Traffic Management Plan, and would cease upon project completion. Long-term operational traffic impacts would result in increased vehicular traffic and degraded levels of service on adjacent roadways; however, these would be mitigated through intersection improvements at the Gaffey Street/1st Street intersection, and review and approval of project plans by the local transportation authorities including LADOT, in coordination with the Port.

As discussed in Section 3.3, Traffic and Circulation, the future base traffic forecasts include the effects of specific cumulative development projects, also called related projects, expected to be built in the vicinity of the proposed project site prior to the proposed project's future years of 2024 and 2042. Regional background (ambient) traffic growth was estimated using data from a computerized traffic analysis tool known as the Port Area Travel Demand Model, which includes traffic growth for the port and the local area. Background traffic growth occurs as a result of regional growth in employment, population, schools, and other activities. Related projects are covered by the growth forecasts of the Port Travel Demand Model. Local projects not included in the SCAG Regional Travel Demand Forecasting Model were separately accounted for in the Port Travel Demand Model, such as detailed Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles projected container and non-container terminal growth and the Wilmington Waterfront.

Given the size of the proposed project relative to anticipated future development in the Port, the project's impact on cumulative traffic would be perceived as a minimal part of the overall, cumulative changes that would occur at Master Plan build out of the Port. Each project proposed within the harbor area, and particularly along the San Pedro Waterfront, would need to be individually evaluated to ensure that the existing and proposed roadways, bikeways and walkways within the area would be sufficient to accommodate the proposed developments and projected traffic increases. Based on the above considerations, this project would not have substantial cumulative impacts.

Public Comments

No public comments were received on the draft EIR regarding mitigation measures related to Cumulative Impact GHG-1.

Finding Regarding Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

The Board of Harbor Commissioners finds that all information added to the EIR after public notice of the availability of the draft EIR for public review but before certification merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR and does not require recirculation.

After careful consideration of all comments, the Board recognizes that disagreements among experts remain with respect to environmental impacts identified in the final EIR. Very few comments were received relative to the adequacy of the assessment of environmental impacts. Comments are addressed in the final Responses to Comments section of the final EIR.

3.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Alternatives Considered

Several sites within the Port were considered for year-round mooring of the USS *Iowa*. The Port conducted a site alternatives analysis to explore the feasibility of a range of potential project site locations. Some of the sites considered were rejected as infeasible; these alternatives, and the reasons for their infeasibility, are discussed in Section 6.2.1 below. Three project scenarios were selected that were considered to be feasible, to be carried forward for detailed analysis in this document: the proposed project (Section 2.0) and the three alternatives listed below and described in Section 6.2.

- Alternative 1 – Southern Pacific (SP) Slip
- Alternative 2 – Berths 45-47
- Alternative 3 – No Project

Reasonable Range of Alternatives

The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 mandates that an EIR include a comparative evaluation of the proposed project with a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while simultaneously avoiding or substantially lessening any of the significant effects of the project. Pursuant to Section 15126.6 (f)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, "among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent)." Although these factors do not present a strict limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives to be considered, they help establish the context against which "the rule of reason" is measured when determining an appropriate range of alternatives sufficient to establish and foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

The State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) mandates that an EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an

EIR are: (i) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (ii) infeasibility, or (iii) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

Berths 180-181 or 187-190

Berths 180-181 and 187-190 are located in the North Harbor near the east basin of the main channel. These berths are currently leased from the Port and are being used to ship cargo. These alternative site locations were rejected due to conflicts with cargo operations because a cargo shipping facility would need to be closed in order to implement the project at this location. Therefore, this alternative is not economically viable. Losses in revenue resulting from the closure of a cargo shipping facility would greatly exceed the revenue generated by the USS *Iowa*.

Berths 180-181 are located near the intersection of Pier A Street and S Fries Avenue, and currently occupied by the Pasha Stevedoring & Terminals (PST). PST's breakbulk and container terminal in the Port has become the preferred terminal for general, project, heavy lift and specialized cargo of all shapes and sizes. This facility operates three, 40-ton capacity cranes, contains on-dock warehouses and specializes in on-dock rail service.

Berths 187-190 are located in Slip No. 5 near the intersection of Canal Street and Yacht Street, and are currently leased by Vopak, whose lease does not expire until 2023. Vopak is a liquid bulk facility that stores and transports chemicals and refined petroleum products through a 37-acre (10.3 ha) site. This facility contains 66 storage tanks with total capacity of 700,000 barrels and an additional 22 storage tanks with 1,700,000 barrels capacity. In addition, the facility contains a bulk cement distribution facility with a 86,000 sq. ft. warehouse.

Initial Site Preparation (Phase 1)

Existing landside structures would need to be removed/demolished for placement of the temporary structures listed in Alternative 1. Building reuse would be possible at both sites; however, this site and the adjacent sites are very industrialized and not visitor-friendly. Locating the tourist attraction in this part of the Harbor would make for less accessibility and visitor traffic could interfere with other existing uses within the Harbor.

Construction of Permanent Landside Structures (Phase 2)

The construction of permanent landside structures is dependent on if the existing structures are demolished.

Berths 52-53 or 61

Berths 52-53 and 61 are located in the east channel of the southern portion of the San Pedro Waterfront project area, which leads to the Outer Harbor area. These alternative site locations were rejected due to navigational impacts.

Berths 70-71 or Ports O'Call

Berths 70-71 are located adjacent to the Westway Terminal on the Main Channel, in the southern portion of the San Pedro Waterfront project area. Westway Terminal, located on Signal Street on approximately 14.3 acres, was formerly used as liquid bulk storage facility, and contains the Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House, which has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Considered a hazardous cargo facility under the Port's Risk Management Plan (RMP), this facility closed in 2009. Berths 70 and 71 are included in existing redevelopment project boundaries for the Marine Research Center Project, which is currently in the planning phase. Just south of the Westway Terminal are the Port of Los Angeles Pilot Station and Warehouse No. 1. Warehouse No. 1 is listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and is currently used by LAHD and the Crescent Warehouse Company for warehouse storage and periodically for filming.

The Ports O'Call area is located slightly south of berths 70-71, between the harbor's Main Channel and Sampson Way from Berths 75 to 83. This approximately 10-acre commercial/retail complex contains approximately 150,000 square feet of restaurant and retail space, and is used as a staging area for various annual festivals, including the Lobster Festival and the Tall Ship Festival. In addition to commercial retail and restaurant uses, existing uses within the Ports O'Call area include sport fishing at Berth 79, helicopter site seeing operations, marina, and harbor cruise operations at Berths 79 and 77.

At the southern end of Ports O'Call is the Jankovich fueling station at Berth 74. This facility currently contains six aboveground storage tanks, including a 100,000-gallon fixed-roof tank within an approximately 2,500-square-foot diked area that is used to store diesel fuel. The other five tanks are located within a separate diked area, and include four 25,000-gallon fixed-roof tanks that are used to store diesel fuel and one 15,000-gallon tank used to store gasoline.

These alternative site locations were rejected due to conflicts with existing Port plans for redevelopment within the area.

Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR

Chapter 6 of the draft EIR contains a detailed comparative analysis of the alternatives that were found to achieve the project objectives, are considered seemingly feasible, and may reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. The tables that follow provide a summary of the project components within each alternative, and a summary of the cruise activities associated with the proposed Project and the alternatives, respectively.

Table 6.0-1. Summary of CEQA Significance Analysis by Alternative

Environmental Resource Area	*Proposed Project*	*Alt.1*	*Alt.2*	*Alt.3 No Project*
Aesthetics	L	M	L	N
Air Quality/GHG	S	S	S	N
Traffic and Circulation[1]	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 proposed project are assumed to be similar to those of each alternative.

As discussed in Section 3.2, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, short-term emissions from the transport of USS *Iowa* would result in significant and unavoidable impacts. Transport emissions would exceed thresholds for NOX in the Bay Area AQMD, San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD), Ventura County APCD, and the SCAQMD. Emissions would also exceed the San Luis Obispo APCD thresholds for PM. The tug operations associated with arrival activities (transporting the USS *Iowa* within the Port and placing the ship at Berth 87) would be subject to Mitigation Measure AQ-1, which requires the project to comply with CAAP Control Measure HC1. Therefore, emissions resulting from arrival activities within the Port (and within the SCAQMD's jurisdiction) would be reduced; however, NOX emissions would still exceed SCAQMD's daily NOX threshold. This is reflected in Table 6.0-1 above.

Table 6.0-2, Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project (CEQA Impacts with Mitigation), summarizes the environmental impacts of each alternative compared to the proposed project, and Table 6.0-3, Comparison of Alternatives to the CEQA Baseline (CEQA Impacts with Mitigation), provides a summary of the impacts of each alternative compared to the CEQA baseline.

Table 6.0-2. Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project
(CEQA Impacts with Mitigation)

Environmental Resource Area	*Proposed Project*	*Alt.1*	*Alt.2*	*Alt.3 No Project*
Aesthetics	0	0	-2	-3
Air Quality/GHG	0	0	0	-3
Traffic and Circulation[1]	0	+1	+1	-3

Notes:
(-3) = Impacts considered to be substantially reduced when compared with the proposed project.
(-2) = Impacts considered to be moderately reduced when compared with the proposed project.
(-1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat reduced when compared with the proposed project.
(0) = Impacts considered to be equal to the proposed project.
(+1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat increased when compared with the proposed project.
(+2) = Impacts considered to be moderately increased when compared with the proposed project.
(+3) = Impacts considered to be substantially increased when compared with the proposed project.
[1] = Traffic impacts were analyzed for the proposed project only; therefore, the results of the proposed project are assumed to be similar to those of each alternative.

Table 6.0-3 ranks the alternatives by comparing their environmental impacts with those of the CEQA baseline. The ranking is based on the significance determinations for each resource area, as discussed in Chapter 3, 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, and the number of impacts that remain significant after mitigation. Because Alternative 3, the No Project Alternative, represents no action on behalf of LAHD and therefore would not require discretionary approvals triggering CEQA compliance, there would be no impact under CEQA.

Table 6.0-3. Comparison of Alternatives to the CEQA Baseline
(CEQA Impacts with Mitigation)

Environmental Resource Area	*Proposed Project*	*Alt.1*	*Alt.2*	*Alt.3 No Project*
Aesthetics	+2	+1	+2	0
Air Quality/GHG	+1	+1	+1	0
Traffic and Circulation[1]	+1	+1	+1	0

Notes:
(-3) = Impacts considered to be substantially reduced when compared with the CEQA baseline.
(-2) = Impacts considered to be moderately reduced when compared with the CEQA baseline.
(-1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat reduced when compared with the CEQA baseline.
(0) = Impacts considered to be equal to the CEQA baseline.
(+1) = Impacts considered to be somewhat increased when compared with the CEQA baseline.
(+2) = Impacts considered to be moderately increased when compared with the CEQA baseline.
(+3) = Impacts considered to be substantially increased when compared with the CEQA baseline.
[1] = Traffic impacts were analyzed for the proposed project only; therefore, the results of the proposed project are assumed to be similar to those of each alternative.
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).

As shown in Table 6.0-2, when compared with the proposed project, impacts under CEQA would be slightly increased under Alternative 1. Also, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas emissions would remain the same as the project would not change, just the location would change. Variations in traffic impacts mirror the number of impacted intersections and existing parking conditions.

As shown in Table 6.0-3, Alternatives 1 and 2 would have a slight increase in impacts, however, also have the smallest increase in impacts when compared to the CEQA baseline, and these alternatives would be ranked 1st and 2nd. The proposed project would have the greatest increase in impacts when compared with the CEQA baseline, and would be ranked 3rd. Since Alternative 3 is the No Project alternative, it would have the fewest impacts and is not ranked.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires identification of the environmentally superior alternative. The environmentally superior alternative was determined based on a ranking system that assigned numerical scores comparing the impacts under each resource area for each alternative with the proposed Project CEQA baseline. The scoring system ranged from -3 if impacts are considered to be substantially reduced when compared to the CEQA baseline, to +3 if impacts are considered to be

substantially increased when compared with the CEQA baseline. Tables 6.0-2 and 6.0-3 present the scoring system and rankings for each alternative under CEQA.

Alternative 3 is the Environmentally Superior Alternative because it has the lowest impact score or classification. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, if the No Project alternative is deemed to be environmentally superior, then the lead agency must identify an alternative other than the No Project alternative as environmentally superior. Alternative 2 has the lowest impact score among the remaining alternatives when compared to the CEQA Baseline. This alternative would result in the least impacts on aesthetic resources when compared to the other alternatives.

Alternatives Suggested as a Part of Public Comment on the Draft EIR

No project alternatives were suggested as a part of public comments on the draft EIR.

CEQA Findings for Alternatives Analyzed

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.

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.

Initial Site Preparation (Phase 1)

Parking lots are adjacent to both sides of the SP Slip. The parking area to the north is used by visitors of the Ports O' Call Waterfront and Village dining and shopping areas. Several existing uses would need to be shut down and little to no structures would be demolished or reused.

Construction of Permanent Landside Structures (Phase 2)

The construction of a permanent landside structure would be possible, however, space is limited and some of the existing parking area may need to be repurposed.

Finding

The failure of Alternative 1 to relocate the commercial fishing fleet as the SP Slip would cause significant impacts to the local economy. Additionally, the parking demand of the proposed project would exceed the available existing parking in the adjacent lot. The parking lot is also currently used by the Ports O'Call shops and restaurants. Significant traffic mitigation would be required at this site.

Facts in Support of Finding

The proposed project would require more than 300 parking spaces. The Ports O'Call commercial area currently has sufficient parking for existing uses only.

Alternative 2 – Berths 45-47

Berths 45-47 is a 15-acre site located in the Outer Harbor of the Port 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.

Initial Site Preparation (Phase 1)

The site would require grading and asphalt paving for the necessary parking spaces. Two of the adjacent uses are associated with railroad.

Construction of Permanent Landside Structures (Phase 2)

The site has two small existing structures that would be demolished for the new landside Visitor Center, unless they are reused.

Finding

This alternative location would limit access to the USS *Iowa* as this location is far from the freeways and public transportation in comparison to Berth 87. This site would also require more initial construction for Phase1 of the project with preparation the site for the pre-assembled structures and paving/striping the parking lot. The surrounds uses of this site are not hospitable for visitors.

Facts in Support of Finding

The surrounding uses include rail yards and dirt/sand/gravel storage piles. The parking area would require paving in addition to striping. The nearest bus stop is located 1.4 miles northwest (traveling my land) near the intersection of S. Pacific Avenue and W 22nd Street.

Alternative 3 – No Project

The No Project alternative would assume that the USS *Iowa* does not get relocated by tugboat to the Port. 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. The USS *Iowa* may be disposed of as most of the ships in the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet are slated for disposal.

Finding

This project alternative would not meet the goals and objectives of the proposed project. The USS *Iowa* battleship may not find another home and may be discarded. Another port may welcome the USS *Iowa* and benefit from the increase in economic activity.

Facts in Support of Finding

Other ships stored in the Suisun Bay Reserve Fleet have been donated or discarded. The USS *Iowa* has attracted crowds while being repaired in the Port of Richmond.

Summary

Based on the alternatives discussion provided in the EIR and the information above, the Board determines that the proposed Project is the only feasible alternative that best meets project objectives while taking into account environmental and economic factors.

4.0 Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, the Board must balance the benefits of the proposed Project against unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the proposed Project. The proposed Project would result in significant unavoidable impacts to air quality. After mitigation, the proposed Project would result in no significant or unavoidable impacts to traffic. The proposed project would have no significant unavoidable impacts to aesthetics.

Aesthetics

No unavoidable and significant impacts are anticipated.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The proposed project would result in significant unavoidable air quality impacts from the transport of the USS *Iowa* from San Francisco Bay to Berth 87 in the Port. The Port finds that although this impact would exceed thresholds for NOx in four of the six air basins, and PM, ROG, and NOx in the San Louis Obispo APCD; the emissions would only occur one time as the battleship is towed to its new home. The transport would take approximately 3 days to complete. The emissions would be generated by ocean going tug boats off the coast and smaller harbor tug boats within the Port.

Traffic

No unavoidable and significant impacts are anticipated.

Project Benefits

The proposed Project offers several benefits that outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects. The Board of Harbor Commissioners adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The Board recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the proposed Project, as discussed above. Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures, (ii) rejected as infeasible alternatives to the proposed Project discussed above, (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts, and (iv) balanced the benefits of the proposed Project against the proposed Project's significant and unavoidable impacts, the Board hereby finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable impacts for the reasons stated below.

The below stated reasons summarize benefits, goals, and objectives of the proposed Project and provide the rationale for the benefits of the proposed Project. These overriding considerations justify adoptions of the proposed Project and certification of the completed final EIR. Many of

these overriding considerations individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental impacts proposed. These benefits include the following:

Provides New Employment

- *Provides new employment opportunities in the San Pedro Waterfront Area*. The proposed Project would provide new employment opportunities for the San Pedro area. In addition to the temporary employment opportunities of project construction (approximately 30-40 workers), new full-time jobs (for project operation) would include the numerous maintenance positions listed in the Project Description, and staff for the ticketing, office, and visitor center.

  The PBC plans to employ the following staff to support the maintenance of the battleship:

  - Maintenance Supervisor/ Ship's Engineer
  - Electrician 1
  - Electrician 2*
  - Pipe Fitter 1
  - Pipe Fitter 2*
  - Ship Fitter 1
  - Ship Fitter 2
  - Carpenter 1
  - Carpenter 2*
  - HVAC Tech 1
  - HVAC Tech 2
  - Painter 1
  - Painter 2*

  (* - position after stabilized revenue)

Stimulates the Local Economy

- *Stimulates the local economy by attracting tourism.* The USS *Iowa*, moored at Berth 87 will attract many visitors each year. Visitors to the USS *Iowa* are likely to spend money at the commercial areas in the vicinity of the project site dining and shopping.

Enhances the San Pedro Waterfront

- *Enhances the San Pedro Waterfront Area.* This new attraction would enhance the San Pedro Waterfront area. The overall purposes of the San Pedro Waterfront Plan are to increase public access to the waterfront, allow additional visitor-serving commercial development within the Port, respond to increased demand in the cruise industry, and improve vehicular access to and within the waterfront area. The USS *Iowa* project is in line with these goals.

This page was intentionally left blank.