

2.0

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Introduction and Project Overview

The proposed Project is located within the Port, near the San Pedro Community in the City. LAHD administers development within the Port and overall Port operations, and is charged with preparing this Draft EIR to assess the potential significant physical effects of the proposed Project. The City Dock No. 1 Project involves the development of an urban marine research center within a 28-acre portion of the 400-acre San Pedro Waterfront Master Plan area along the west side of the Los Angeles Harbor's Main Channel. The proposed Project would be built out in two phases and involves the following major elements:

- adaptive reuse of the transit sheds at Berths 57–60 to accommodate marine research laboratory, classroom, and meeting spaces within a collaborative environment to create research synergies among universities, colleges, government agencies, and business ventures;
- wharf retrofits of Berths 57–60 and related infrastructure, including a seawater circulation system and berthing facilities for large research vessels as well as street improvements;
- construction of a new building at Berth 56 with classrooms and a lecture hall/auditorium;
- relocation of SCMI from its existing location at Berth 260 on Terminal Island to Berths 56 and 57;
- development of an interpretive center open to the public;
- establishment of a marine science business park/incubator space with offices and research laboratory space within Berths 58–60 transit sheds;
- installation of floating docks in the East Channel to accommodate smaller research vessels;
- integration with and development of the waterfront promenade along the water's edge, consistent with the approved San Pedro Waterfront Project while not impacting the health and safety of the visiting public; and
- development of Berths 70 and 71, following the planned demolition and remediation of the existing Westway Terminal site. This development would include the construction of a new building for NOAA operations, the use of

1 existing berthing space for research vessels, and the construction of a new
2 building to host a natural seawater wave tank facility.

3 Each of these key proposed project elements is described in further detail in this
4 chapter.

5 **2.2 Existing Environmental Setting**

6 **2.2.1 Regional Setting**

7 The Port is located at the southernmost portion of the City and comprises 43 miles of
8 waterfront and 7,500 acres of land and water, with approximately 300 commercial
9 berths. The Port is approximately 23 miles south of downtown Los Angeles and is
10 surrounded by the community of San Pedro to the west, the Wilmington community
11 to the north, the Port of Long Beach to the east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south.
12 Figure 2-1 shows the regional location of the proposed project area.

13 The Port is an area of mixed uses, supporting various maritime-themed activities.
14 Port operations are predominantly centered on shipping activities, including
15 containerized, break-bulk, dry-bulk, liquid-bulk, auto, and intermodal rail shipping.
16 In addition to the large shipping industry at the Port, there is also a cruise ship
17 industry and a commercial fishing fleet. The Port also accommodates boat repair
18 yards and provides slips for approximately 3,950 recreational vessels, 150
19 commercial fishing boats, 35 miscellaneous small service crafts, and 15 charter
20 vessels that handle sportfishing and harbor cruises. The Port has retail shops and
21 restaurants, primarily along the west side of the Main Channel. It also has recreation,
22 community, and educational facilities, such as a public swimming beach, Cabrillo
23 Beach Youth Waterfront Sports Center, the Cabrillo Marine Aquarium, and the Los
24 Angeles Maritime Museum, 22nd Street Park, and the Wilmington Waterfront Park.

25 **2.2.2 Proposed Project Setting**

26 City Dock No.1 consists of approximately 28 acres within the Port near the San
27 Pedro Community and includes Berths 56 through 60 and Berths 70 and 71 within
28 the San Pedro Waterfront area. The proposed project site also includes a 4.5-acre
29 parking lot adjacent to the 28-acre site across 22nd Street and 1.3-acre site at Berth
30 260, the current location of SCMI, for a total of 33.8 acres. At the local level, the
31 proposed project site is bounded by the East Channel to the west, the Main Channel
32 to the east, 22nd Street to the north, and the open water of the San Pedro Bay to the
33 south. Local access to the site is provided by 22nd Street and Sampson Way. Figure
34 2-2 shows the proposed Project's local setting.

35 **2.2.3 Existing Site Conditions**

36 The existing site comprises eight berths, including Berths 56 through 60, 70 and 71
37 (former Westway Terminal Site), and 260 (the existing SCMI facility). The existing
38 Berths 56 through 60, 70, and 71 were constructed between the 1910s and 1930s, and
39 several buildings within Berths 56, 57, 58–60, and 70–71 are considered eligible for

1 listing as historically significant resources (see Section 3.4, “Cultural Resources”).
2 Figure 2-3 shows the existing conditions on the proposed project site.

3 **2.2.3.1 Berth 56 (Pan-Am Terminal Facility Site)**

4 Berth 56 is located along the southern edge of 22nd Street in the northwestern portion
5 of the proposed project site. Berth 56 contains the Pan-Am Terminal Facility
6 Building, an approximately 1,600-square-foot building operated as a field office for
7 CDFG. The field office is immediately adjacent to the proposed project boundary
8 and is served by a 16-space parking lot and a vessel berth. The portion of Berth 56
9 within the proposed project boundary is a vacant area of approximately 0.65 acres.

10 **2.2.3.2 Berth 57 (Transit Shed)**

11 Berth 57 is occupied by one tenant: the San Pedro Bait Company (SP Bait Company).
12 The second tenant, Crescent Warehouse Company, Ltd. (Crescent), recently moved
13 to the Port of Long Beach.¹ The SP Bait Company occupies 14,240 square feet on
14 the Berth 57 wharf, which is used for general bait barge maintenance (e.g., welding,
15 steel cutting, manual painting) as well as storage. Of the 14,240 square feet, 8,240
16 square feet is for ingress and egress only. The SP Bait Company also occupies 2,280
17 square feet of water adjacent to the wharf, which is used for docking commercial
18 fishing boats and the occasional docking of the bait barge during routine
19 maintenance. In addition, there are also some surface parking spaces reserved for the
20 SP Bait Company.

21 Crescent occupied a portion of the transit shed located at Berth 57. The transit shed
22 at Berth 57 is a single-story steel-frame structure built in the mid-1920s, which
23 Crescent used to store hay. This 46,000-square-foot wood-framed rectangular
24 building is approximately 500 feet long by 93 feet wide and 25 feet high. Clad in
25 corrugated metal, the transit shed includes a loading dock that spans the full
26 horizontal length of the north side of the building. Attached to the shed is an
27 additional 3,640-square-foot wood frame façade on its north side (facing East 22nd
28 Street) that was added in 1933 and which most recently housed Crescent
29 administrative operations. A structural assessment conducted by LAHD for the
30 building concluded that the roof and siding appear to be in good condition with some
31 corrosion (Port of Los Angeles 2002). However, the steel rolling doors that provide
32 access to the loading dock are unstable to lateral forces due to the absence of bracing
33 elements. In addition, the building lacks solid connections between some of its
34 columns and the roof trusses, and there is some evidence of corrosion in some of the
35 steel columns. The building has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and
36 the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and as a City of Los
37 Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008).

¹ The environmental impacts associated with the relocation of Crescent operations were considered by the Port of Long Beach and determined exempt from CEQA (Cameron pers. comm.).

2.2.3.3 Berths 58–60 (Transit Shed)

The transit shed at Berths 58 through 60 is a single-story steel-frame structure built in the 1910s. This 180,000-square-foot rectangular building measures 1,800 feet long by 100 feet wide and is approximately 35 feet high, and includes a loading dock that spans the full horizontal length of the building. The transit shed is clad with corrugated metal siding. A structural assessment for the building concluded that it is in good-to-fair condition with signs of deterioration similar to those noted for the transit shed at Berth 57. The building has been determined eligible for listing in the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008).

A water taxi service provided by US Water Taxi is located at the southwestern corner of Berth 60 and includes an office, which is outside of the proposed project boundary. A small maintenance shed, some storage areas for supplies, and a fleet of approximately five vessels is maintained by the taxi service within the proposed project boundary. This service transports supplies and materials to ships anchored outside the breakwater.

2.2.3.4 Berths 57–60 Wharf

The original wharf structure was built in 1913 with an apron wharf added in 1938. Both structures are potentially historic, and a historic resources assessment of the wharves has been conducted to support this Draft EIR.

Recent Port engineering studies have shown that the slope and wharf structure over which the transit sheds at Berth 57 and Berths 58–60 are built are badly deteriorated with widespread damage to the piles, caps, beams, and deck soffit noted in the inspections.

2.2.3.5 Berths 70–71 (Westway Terminal Site)

The Westway Terminal site encompasses approximately 14.3 acres in the northeastern portion of the proposed project site, between the Main Channel and Signal Street, and occupies a large portion of the south side of the dock at Berths 70–71. The Westway Terminal site includes 134 aboveground storage tanks, associated pipelines and infrastructure, a historic pumping station, the Westway Terminal Building (also known as the Pan American Petroleum Company Marine Loading Station Facility and the Pan American Oil Company Pump House), and an office building that was recently in use by Crescent. The Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House within Berth 70 is eligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, and as a City of Los Angeles Historic-Cultural Monument (ICF Jones & Stokes 2008). Historic site operations were served by rail, truck, and vessel, and involved the use of oils, lubricants, fuels, and other hazardous materials. Considered a hazardous cargo facility under the Port's Risk Management Plan (RMP), this facility closed in 2009. A demolition and remediation strategy is being developed in

1 coordination with the RWQCB.² Completion of a full site characterization study and
2 remedial action design, and an evaluation of future land use restrictions would occur
3 after demolition of the aboveground storage tanks.

4 **2.2.3.6 Sampson Way and 22nd Street Parking Lot**

5 The existing 4.5-acre surface parking lot located north of 22nd Street and east of
6 Sampson Way is located within the proposed project boundary. The parking lot has
7 spaces for 409 vehicles but is currently underused.

8 **2.2.3.7 Berth 260 (Existing SCMI Facility Site)**

9 Berth 260 is located less than 1 mile northeast of the proposed project site on
10 Terminal Island, and contains SCMI's existing operations, which are proposed to be
11 relocated to the proposed project site. SCMI occupies a 1.32-acre site at 820 South
12 Seaside Avenue and consists of two noncontiguous parcels separated by a building
13 operated by the Los Angeles Port Police. The northern side of the site includes a
14 19,000-square-foot building that contains offices, laboratories, classrooms, a
15 circulating seawater system, and storage, meeting, and warehouse space. The site
16 also includes a small parking lot, seawater storage tanks, and dock space at which
17 approximately seven vessels are docked. The southern side of the site is occupied by
18 a machine shop, warehouse space, and an open storage yard. The current SCMI
19 facility accommodates approximately 25 researchers and staff, and operates as the
20 shoreside support facility for the University of Southern California's Wrigley Marine
21 Science Center on Catalina Island.

22 **2.2.4 Surrounding Uses**

23 The Port includes a variety of uses supporting various maritime-themed activities, as
24 well as retail shops and restaurants, recreation, community, and educational facilities,
25 as identified in Figure 2-4. Port operations are predominantly centered on shipping
26 activities, including containerized, break-bulk, dry-bulk, liquid-bulk, auto, and
27 intermodal rail shipping. In addition to the large shipping industry at the Port, there
28 is also a cruise ship industry and a commercial fishing fleet.

29 The Port also accommodates boat repair yards and provides slips for approximately
30 3,950 recreational vessels, 150 commercial fishing boats, 35 miscellaneous small
31 service crafts, and 15 charter vessels that handle sportfishing and harbor cruises.
32 Two businesses related to recreational vessels and small service crafts, Pacific
33 Performance Racing and RS Marine Engine Services, are located just north of the
34 proposed project site near the intersection of 22nd Street and Signal Street. Other uses
35 include Cabrillo Beach Park and Cabrillo Beach Youth Waterfront Sports Center,
36 with a public recreation area used for swimming and other beach activities and which
37 is operated by the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks. This area also
38 features a public boat launch and the Cabrillo Marine Aquarium. The aquarium is

² Demolition of the existing tanks and remediation of the Westway Terminal site was analyzed under the SPW EIR/EIS and will occur independently of the City Dock No. 1 Project. Therefore, these actions are not part of the proposed Project.

1 used for educational purposes and frequently hosts large school groups. Other
2 recreational areas include the 22nd Street Park and the YMCA's Bloch Field.

3 Berths 87–93, located about a mile north of the proposed project site, are currently
4 used by the World Cruise Center, which has been active at the Port for over 30 years.
5 In 2002, the Port renovated Berth 93 at the World Cruise Center to update the Berth
6 93 Cruise Terminal to meet current cruise ports standards for security features and
7 the ability to handle the current class of cruise vessels. The World Cruise Center
8 currently operates out of two existing terminals (Berths 91–92 Terminal and Berth 93
9 Terminal), with two permanent berths (91–92 and 93) and use of a temporary third
10 berth on occasion at Berth 87. Cargo-handling operations occurred at Berths 87–90
11 until August 2006, after which they permanently ceased.

12 There are a variety of land and water uses to the south of the World Cruise Center.
13 Anchored by the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, other existing land and water uses
14 within the proposed project area between 3rd and 6th Streets include tug vessel
15 services, Fire Station #112, Port police dock, and John S. Gibson, Jr. Park along the
16 east side of Harbor Boulevard just north of 6th Street.

17 One of the main draws of the surrounding area is Ports O'Call Village, located
18 between the harbor's Main Channel and Sampson Way from 7th Street to 13th Street.
19 Ports O'Call Village is a faux New England fishing village that was established in
20 1963. This approximately 10-acre commercial retail site also is used as a staging
21 area for various annual events, including the Lobster Festival and the Tall Ship
22 Festival. Just south of Ports O'Call Village in the Southern Pacific Slip (SP Slip) is
23 an active commercial fishing fleet.

24 For over 100 years, Los Angeles Harbor has been a premier location for fishing. The
25 commercial fishing industry in Los Angeles Harbor saw its peak in the 1940s during
26 World War II but declined substantially after the depletion of the sardine and
27 mackerel populations. Today, although smaller than it once was, the commercial
28 fishing fleet at the Port is intact, providing fresh fish to customers throughout the
29 U.S. A fish market, located south of the SP Slip and just north of the proposed
30 project site, includes a number of local seafood retailers at the eastern terminus of
31 22nd Street, including J&D Seafood, Star Fisheries, Standard Seafood, Deluca J Fish,
32 and the Los Angeles Fish & Oyster Company.

33 The Port of Los Angeles Pilot Station and Warehouse No. 1 are located south of the
34 proposed project site, adjacent to the Westway Terminal but outside of the proposed
35 project boundary. Warehouse No.1 is a six-story building completed in 1917 and is
36 listed on the NHRP. The building is occasionally used as warehouse space for the
37 Port, and provides filming locations for television shows and other media.

38 Across the East Channel from City Dock No. 1 are additional transit sheds at Berths
39 54 and 55 (which includes fruit storage space for Stevedoring Services of America
40 [SSA]), future cruise facilities at Berths 45 through 47 and 49 through 50, Cabrillo
41 Way Marina Phase II, and public park space. As discussed above, Berth 56 contains
42 the Pan-Am Terminal Facility Building, an approximately 1,600-square-foot building
43 operated as a field office for CDFG. The field office is immediately adjacent to the
44 proposed project boundary. The building was built in 1930 before being moved to its

1 current location in 1940, and has been determined eligible for listing on the NRHP
2 and CRHR.

3 **2.3 Proposed Project**

4 **2.3.1 Proposed Project Purpose**

5 The overall purpose of the proposed Project is to adaptively reuse the transit sheds at
6 Berths 57–60 and the adjacent Berths 70-71 proposed project site and existing
7 buildings (e.g., transit centers) to provide world-class marine research facilities and
8 space to bring together leading researchers and entrepreneurs, including SCMI,
9 Southern California universities and colleges, government research agencies, such as
10 NOAA, and businesses to conduct cutting-edge urban marine research and education,
11 and develop technologies to address the most pressing marine-related problems of the
12 day. The proposed Project seeks to achieve this purpose through the rehabilitation of
13 the existing buildings and wharves to house state-of-the-art marine research and
14 educational facilities and provide deep draft berthing space for research vessels, and
15 by providing for a cluster of university researchers, educational programs, and spin-
16 off marine science technology ventures.

17 **2.3.2 Proposed Project Objectives**

18 State CEQA Guidelines (Section 15124[b]) require that a project description contain
19 a statement of objectives, including the underlying purpose of the proposed project.
20 The proposed Project is intended to fulfill the overall project purpose of the LAHD.
21 The proposed Project would provide a world-class urban marine research center and
22 support the research needs of the Southern California region's universities, research
23 and education institutions, and government agencies, as well as provide an incubator
24 for marine-related business venues. Specifically, the proposed Project would achieve
25 the following objectives.

- 26 ■ Adaptively reuse Berths 56–60 and 70–71 to provide marine researchers in
27 Southern California with world-class marine research facilities including
28 laboratories, a seawater circulation system, offices, classrooms, a lecture
29 hall/auditorium, and storage space to study the most pressing marine-related
30 problems of the day.
- 31 ■ Construct a natural seawater wave tank to allow scientists from around the world
32 to study tsunamis, rogue waves, and the generation of wave energy; conduct
33 vessel and platform studies; and conduct coastal engineering studies.
- 34 ■ Provide space within Los Angeles Harbor to relocate, upgrade, and expand
35 SCMI's operations, which are currently located at Berth 260 in Fish Harbor.
- 36 ■ Provide an opportunity for SCMI and its members, government and other
37 institutional researchers and research organizations with multiple deep draft
38 berths to accommodate vessels ranging in size from small to large 300-foot
39 vessels adjacent to landside facilities.

- 1 ■ Provide a location for a marine-related business incubator park for synergy
2 among research and commercial interests, and develop commercial technologies
3 to address marine environmental problems.
- 4 ■ Provide public amenities, including public education classroom space and
5 interpretive exhibits related to marine studies and a cafe, along with a waterfront
6 promenade, consistent with the San Pedro Waterfront Project while not
7 impacting the health and safety of the visiting public.

8 **2.3.3 Proposed Project Background**

9 The proposed Project was devised in concept during the planning for the SPWP.
10 However, at the time, details for programming the site were not known, and,
11 therefore, as part of the SPWP, the proposed project site was programmatically
12 analyzed for future “institutional/research and development” use in the SPWP 2009
13 certified Final EIR/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

14 The LAHD and SCMI, with support from the Annenberg Foundation, and advice and
15 input from area academic and research institutions, local aquariums, business leaders,
16 environmental organizations, and community groups in San Pedro and Wilmington,
17 joined together to develop a City Dock No. 1 urban marine research center vision, as
18 detailed in the resulting March 2009 visioning study (SCMI 2009). This “visioning
19 study” compiles and organizes a diverse body of material from academic marine
20 researchers at various campuses, community stakeholders, non-university educators,
21 public officials, and designers into a single volume to envision the outlines of what
22 has the potential to become a major center for marine research on the West Coast.
23 Since completion of the visioning study, the Port, SCMI, and other City Dock No. 1
24 stakeholders have been working together to further expand upon that conceptual plan.
25 The proposed Project is a result of this joint effort.

26 **2.3.4 Proposed Project Elements**

27 The proposed Project involves a comprehensive plan for the reuse of City Dock No. 1
28 that would be built out in two phases. Phase I, which is anticipated to begin in late
29 2012 and conclude in 2016, would include the conversion of Berths 56 and 57 into a
30 new SCMI facility and development of an interpretive center open to the public. The
31 majority of the remaining proposed project elements would be constructed under
32 Phase II, which is anticipated to commence construction in 2013 and conclude
33 around 2024. Table 2-1 provides a summary of the two phases of development by
34 each element and the total area each major element would contribute to the overall
35 proposed Project. The proposed site plan is illustrated in Figure 2-5.

36 All construction staging and material laydown would occur within the proposed
37 project site at Berths 70-71 and the Sampson Way and 22nd Street Parking Lot during
38 Phase I, with the majority of the staging and laydown occurring at the parking lot as
39 Phase II progresses toward completion. In addition, prior to commencement of the
40 proposed Project, the existing occupant (San Pedro Bait Company) would relocate its
41 operations from the proposed project site.

1 **Table 2-1.** Elements of the Proposed Project

<i>Element/Phase</i>	<i>Area</i>
PHASE I (2012–2016)	
Berth 56	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construct 2-Story Learning Center at Berth 56 (150-seat lecture hall/auditorium and classrooms) 	11,500 sf
Berth 57	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convert Berth 57 Transit Shed into SCMI Research Facility and Develop Marine Research- and Education-Related Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office-Related Space (12,000 sf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty Office Space ○ Administrative Suite ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) □ Laboratory Related Space (34,500 sf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teaching Laboratories ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous waste, scuba gear, instrument support, etc.) □ Outdoor Space (8,200 sf)¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outdoor Teaching/Outreach Classroom ○ Outside Storage Space 	46,500 sf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace Berth 57 Entrance (3,640 sf) with New Addition (Public Interpretive Center) 	3,600 sf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Install Seawater Circulation and Life Support System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berths 57 and Seawater Intake/Discharge Infrastructure to Serve City Dock No.1 Research Laboratory Buildout 	New utility
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construct Floating Docks Adjacent to Berth 57 (12 vessel slips) 	18,500 sf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berth 57 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf for Crane 	625 lf ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construct Public Plaza at Berth 57 	7,500 sf ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relocate SCMI from Berth 260 to new Berth 57 Facilities 	--

<i>Element/Phase</i>	<i>Area</i>
Berth 260	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Demolish Existing SCMI Facility (demolition of existing 19,000-sf building, 2,700-sf warehouse, and 2,400-sf shop storage) 	(24,100 sf)
<i>Total Structure Square Feet in Phase I</i>	<i>80,100 sf²</i>
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Repair/Repave/Restripe 	625 lf ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add Surface Parking Adjacent to Berth 56 	15 spaces
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add Surface Parking Adjacent to Berth 57 	40 spaces
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilize Sampson Way and 22nd Street (existing parking lot; 4.5 acres) 	409 spaces
<i>Total Parking Added in Phase I</i>	<i>55 spaces</i>
<i>Total Available Parking in Phase I</i>	<i>464 spaces</i>
<i>Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase I</i>	<i>8.8 acres</i>
PHASE II (2013–2024)	
Berths 58–60	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Covert Transit Sheds into Marine Research Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office Related Space (50,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office/Administrative Space3 ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) ○ Hallways, Walkways □ Laboratory Related Space (70,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels) ○ Marine Research Vessel Support Facilities (crew quarters, showers, etc.) ○ Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous waste, scuba gear support, etc.) □ Outdoor Space (16,400 sf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outside Storage Space 	120,000 sf
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convert Transit Shed to Marine Business Incubator Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office Related Space (20,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office/Administrative Space3 ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) □ Laboratory Related Space (40,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels) 	60,000 sf

<i>Element/Phase</i>	<i>Area</i>
▪ Develop Waterfront Promenade including Public Plaza/Viewing Platform at Berth 60	6,000 lf ¹
▪ Construct Waterfront Café	1,000 sf
▪ Install Seawater Circulation System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berths 58–60	New utility
▪ Relocate Items Stored by Water Taxi Service (to within the general vicinity)	--
▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berths 58–60 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements	1,875 lf ¹
□ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf ³	--
Berths 70-71 (Westways)⁴	
▪ Construct 2-Story NOAA Administration and Research Facility	50,000 sf
▪ Implement Wharf Maintenance	--
▪ Construct 5-story Building (to house an 80,000 sf wave tank), including Seawater Intake	100,000 sf
▪ Opportunity Site. Options could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Support Facilities for Berth 57–60 Operations such as Seawater Storage Tanks, Life Support Facilities, Discharge Treatment Facilities, and Storage Space. □ Outside Research Tanks □ Additional Marine Research/Business Laboratory Space 	
<i>Total Structure Square Feet in Phase II</i>	<i>331,000 sf</i>
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
▪ Implement Repaving and Restriping	1,875 lf ¹
▪ Install New Diagonal Parking	155 spaces
▪ Remove Existing Heavy Rail Line from Street	8,000 lf ¹
<i>Total Parking Added in Phase II</i>	<i>155 spaces</i>
<i>Total Parking Available in Phase II</i>	<i>619 spaces⁵</i>
<i>Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase II</i>	<i>25.00 acres</i>
PROPOSED PROJECT TOTALS	
Total Proposed Project Area Structures	411,100
Total Parking Spaces Available for Proposed Project	619
Total Proposed Project Area Redeveloped and Enhanced	33.8 acres
¹ Not a structure and is therefore not counted in total structure sf. ² Excludes demolition of existing SCMI Facility at Berth 260. ³ NOAA facilities, including office and research space within Berths 58–60 Transit Shed and berthing space at Berths 58–60 to be relocated to Berths 70–71 when remediation and development of those berths has been completed. ⁴ Demolition of the Westway tanks, piping, and related structures at Berths 70–71 as well as the remediation following has been analyzed under the San Pedro Waterfront EIS/EIR and is not considered a component of the proposed Project. ⁵ In addition to the 155 new parking spaces provided under Phase II, visitors and employees would have access to the 464 parking spaces identified under Phase I for a total of 619 spaces for the proposed Project. sf = square feet; lf = linear feet	

2.3.4.1 Learning Center Building (Berth 56)

Berth 56 improvements under Phase I would include construction of a Learning Center building. This building would include three classrooms and a 150-seat auditorium that would feature theater-style seating and related facilities. The Learning Center would be designed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary's Standards) to ensure architectural compatibility with adjacent historic resources, including plan review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary's Standards.

2.3.4.2 Transit Shed Upgrades for SCMI (Berth 57)

In order to achieve the conversion of Berth 57, construction would first involve wharf upgrades and landside improvement to meet current seismic code (see Section 2.3.4.4, below). Upon completion of the wharf retrofit and ground improvements, work would begin on upgrading the existing Berth 57 transit shed to current seismic and occupancy codes. Phase I would also include the demolition of an existing 1933 wood-frame structure to allow construction of a new glazed entryway to potentially house the public interpretive center. The new structure would introduce a contemporary, neutral, and visually prominent entrance into the SCMI facility, distinct from the existing historic transit shed façade. This new façade may include large glass aquaria at the entrance way. The façade would reflect the same general shape and profile as the transit shed in height and massing and could include an area for public education and outreach.

The existing Berth 57 transit shed would require extensive renovations prior to occupancy, by SCMI. The SCMI research facility would include office space for faculty, staff, and administration; laboratory space for teaching and research laboratories; lab support and building support spaces; and outdoor space for outdoor teaching, classrooms, and storage space. A seawater circulation and life support system would be installed at Berth 57, including exterior storage tanks, and seawater intake/discharge infrastructure adequate to serve City Dock No. 1 urban marine research center build-out. Additional description of this system is provided in Section 2.3.4.8.

Repair, retrofit, and rehabilitation of the transit shed to address structural deficiencies would be facilitated by the exposed condition of all structural elements. These include repairing rusted exterior corrugated metal siding with new panels, upgrading structural connections to meet established seismic and wind load resistance, retrofitting large openings (east and west façades) to ensure stability and water tight openings, sandblasting and repainting corroded steel members and gusset plates, and replacing deteriorated and damaged steel members, as required. In addition, it is anticipated that new traverse and longitudinal frames would be added, interior steel columns repaired, and new concrete encasements around the base of each column constructed. Installation of a continuous perimeter foundation wall, limited to shallow (2 to 3 feet maximum) excavations to inhibit water intrusion at the building perimeter and utility placement may be required. However, as noted under Section 2.3.4.4, to gain access to the wharf underlying the transit sheds, the roof and western

1 façade of the transit sheds would be temporarily removed to provide direct access to
2 the wharf for pile driving purposes.

3 All renovations would be required to conform to the Secretary’s Standards) for
4 buildings eligible for listing or listed on the NRHP and would undergo a plan review
5 by a qualified consulting architectural historian to ensure compliance. Due to the
6 minimal nature of the existing structure (without insulation), the existing transit sheds
7 would primarily serve as an “outer shell building” to provide basic shelter from water
8 and wind and sun. The proposed marine laboratory, classroom, and office SCMI
9 facility facilities would be within the existing envelope of the transit shed and be
10 constructed by the tenant, SCMI. Therefore, the historic integrity of Berth 57 would
11 be maintained and, at the same time, it would be adaptively re-used to integrate state
12 of the art fire/life safety protection, seismic resistance, security features, and utility
13 infrastructure as required by its change in use. The exterior of the transit sheds
14 would largely be maintained with the exception of necessary improvements to the
15 siding, roof, cornices, etc. There is a potential that a few of the current loading doors
16 would be replaced with windows, to provide for public viewing/research interpretive
17 opportunities. The following discussion provides a summary of how this project
18 element would generally meet the guidance provided in the Secretary’s Standards.

- 19 ■ Existing metal roll-up-style doors would be replaced with new glazed openings
20 to provide more light, air, and egress into the interior spaces. This modification
21 would be consistent with the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards
22 because it would maintain the repetitive punched openings along the structure’s
23 elevations, and most of the roll-up doors are non-original replacements. The
24 design of the new glazing systems would reference the industrial maritime
25 character of the building, with industrial metal sashes and clear glazing, as
26 opposed to vinyl or wood sashes and reflective or opaque glazing.
- 27 ■ Deteriorated historic features would be repaired rather than replaced whenever
28 feasible. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive
29 feature, the new feature would match the old in design, color, texture, and other
30 visual qualities and, where possible, materials. In the case of the Berth 57 transit
31 shed, rusting corrugated metal siding, steel members, and gusset plates would be
32 repaired, and those materials that cannot be repaired due to advanced
33 deterioration would be replaced in-kind with similar metal materials.
- 34 ■ Correcting structural deficiencies in preparation for the new use is allowable by
35 the Secretary’s Standards assuming that the improvements are completed in a
36 manner that preserves the structural system and individual character-defining
37 features. In the case of the interior of the transit shed at Berth 57, the open
38 trusses are character-defining features of the building’s interior. Upgrading the
39 structural connections would not obscure, remove, or otherwise significantly alter
40 in an adverse manner the metal truss system.
- 41 ■ Removal and replacement of portions of the roof and western façade to
42 accommodate the wharf improvements and associated ground improvements at
43 the Berths 57–60 transit shed would reuse the existing materials (corrugated
44 metal roofing and siding) to the extent feasible. Where the severity of
45 deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would

1 match the old in design, color, texture, and, where feasible, materials). Please
2 also see discussion below under Section 2.3.4.4.

- 3 ■ In the case of the Berth 57 transit shed, the new interior “buildings” would not
4 obscure or destroy the interior truss work, allowing these features to read as
5 original features of the building. The new interior structures would not reach the
6 ceiling, thus allowing the open, floor-to-ceiling height of the interior spaces to
7 read visually as they do today (i.e., not obscure the clerestories). The new
8 construction would also retain a significant amount of open interior space,
9 particularly in the center of the building, where long interior vistas are possible
10 (i.e., new construction will be relegated to the side aisles of the structure). The
11 buildings would be differentiated from the old but also compatible with the
12 massing and scale of the building. Therefore, industrial shed-like architecture
13 with exposed steel structures and metal siding would be an appropriate
14 architectural motif for the new construction.
- 15 ■ New additions and adjacent or related new construction would be undertaken in
16 such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of
17 the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

18 **2.3.4.3 Floating Docks (Berth 57)**

19 Phase I would also develop an 18,500-square-foot, 12-slip floating dock in the East
20 Channel adjacent to Berth 57 to accommodate existing small SCMI research vessels
21 and to allow sufficient capacity for additional small research vessels.

22 **2.3.4.4 Wharf Improvements and Associated Ground 23 Improvements (Berths 57–60)**

24 In order to accommodate the proposed project elements at Berths 57–60, construction
25 would involve first upgrading the adjacent wharf and the existing retaining wall to
26 current seismic code. There are two potential options for the wharf improvements
27 and associated ground improvements.

28 The first option involves installing 127 new 72-inch diameter steel pipe piles
29 (superpiles) with 20 feet of spacing along the footprint of the existing building. The
30 superpiles would be installed in-water and would carry virtually all of the seismic
31 loads, leaving the existing structure to carry only gravity loads. In addition, to retain
32 the existing aesthetic appearance, the new superpiles would be set back from view
33 and the existing viewable rows of piles would be replaced with new concrete piles
34 that would be indistinguishable from the existing condition, which would allow the
35 new wharf to retain the same general appearance. Similar to the existing wharf
36 design, the first row of concrete piles, end caps, and decking along the westernmost
37 edge of the wharf would be reconstructed using approximately 16-inch-square
38 concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart with a concrete deck resting directly above.
39 As such, these new features would match the old in design, color, texture, and
40 materials, and would conform to the guidance provided by the Secretary’s Standards.
41 When detailed plans of the replacement piles are available, they would be reviewed
42 by a qualified consulting architectural historian to ensure compliance with the

1 Secretary's Standards. Work would include removing the roof of the existing transit
2 sheds, demolishing 18,288 square feet of existing concrete slab, installing silt
3 curtains, driving the piles, pouring new pile caps and deck slab, and replacing the
4 roof. Exterior façade removal and reinstallation along the entire length of Berths 58–
5 60 would be required.

6 The second option involves the installation of 252 new 60-inch-diameter steel pipes
7 (in groups of four), which would be located along the back face of the existing
8 seawall, outside of the water, spaced 40 feet apart. The four-pile groups would be
9 installed with a 5-foot-thick concrete pile cap to minimize the displacement of the
10 wharf structure during a seismic event. A 6-inch-thick topping slab acting as a “drag-
11 slab” would extend across the existing deck to tie in the existing wharf structure to
12 the new pile clusters. The existing viewable rows of piles would be replaced with
13 new concrete piles that would be indistinguishable from the existing condition, which
14 would allow the new wharf to retain the same general appearance. Similar to the
15 existing wharf design, the first row of concrete piles, end caps, and decking along the
16 westernmost edge of the wharf would be reconstructed using approximately 16-inch-
17 square concrete piles spaced about 15 feet apart with a concrete deck resting directly
18 above. As such, these new features would match the old in design, color, texture, and
19 materials, and would conform to the guidance provided by the Secretary's Standards.
20 When detailed plans of the replacement piles are available, they would also be
21 reviewed by a qualified consulting architectural historian to ensure compliance with
22 the Secretary's Standards. Work would include removing the roof of the existing
23 transit sheds, demolishing 6,300 square feet of existing concrete slab, installing silt
24 curtains, driving the piles, pouring new pile caps and deck slab, and replacing the
25 roof.

26 Both options would require removal and replacement of the transit shed's roof and
27 western façade, which are considered character-defining features of these historic
28 buildings. In order to comply with the Secretary's Standards, the existing corrugated
29 metal siding and roofing would be removed, stored, and reinstalled to the extent
30 feasible and where such materials and features are currently in good condition, or
31 would be replaced in-kind if such materials are deteriorated beyond repair.

32 Prior to initiating the wharf improvements, the SP Bait Company would relocate
33 operations either across the East Channel or to Fish Harbor. However, the barge
34 would remain in its current location as permitted under the current lease.

35 **2.3.4.5 Demolition of SCMI Facilities (Berth 260)**

36 Upon completion of the conversion of Berth 57 into new SCMI marine research and
37 educational space, SCMI would be relocated from its Berth 260 location to Berth 57.
38 The existing SCMI building and parking lot at Berth 260 in Fish Harbor on Terminal
39 Island would be vacated. The facilities to be demolished include an existing office
40 and research building, a storage warehouse, a workshop, and shop storage. The
41 floating docks would remain. After structure demolition, the site would be graded
42 and restored as required by LAHD's agreement with SCMI. Any future development
43 associated with this site would be subject to separate environmental review in
44 accordance with CEQA.

2.3.4.6 Transit Shed Upgrades for Marine Research Facility and Business Incubator Space (Berths 58–60)

Under Phase II, Berths 58–60 would be converted to provide approximately 120,000 square feet for marine research facilities and approximately 60,000 square feet of marine business incubator space. These facilities would include office space, which could be utilized for temporary office space for NOAA, until Berths 70–71 are developed. The storage areas at the end of Berth 60 utilized by the water taxi service would be relocated within the general vicinity of Berth 60 to better accommodate the proposed Project.

The seawater circulation and life support system would be expanded to Berths 58–60 during Phase II, as described further in Section 2.3.4.8. In order to achieve the conversion of Berths 58–60, construction would first involve wharf upgrades and ground improvement to meet current seismic code (see Section 2.3.4.4, above). Upon completion of the wharf and ground improvements, the next steps would involve upgrading the existing transit shed at Berths 58–60 to meet current seismic code, as well as renovating the building in conformance with the Secretary’s Standards for buildings eligible for listing or listed on the NRHP. Conversion of Berths 58–60 would occur much as it would for Berth 57 in that tenant improvements would be constructed within the envelope of the existing transit shed.

The repairs and upgrades to the transit shed at Berths 58–60 would be designed to meet the Secretary’s Standards’ requirement for new work to be compatible with, yet architecturally differentiated from, the old, including plan review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards. The building parameters discussed above for the Berth 57 transit shed would be applicable to the Berth 58–60 transit shed repairs.

2.3.4.7 Berths 70 and 71 (Westway Terminal)

Once remediation and restoration activities at Berths 70–71 are completed, the proposed Project would develop Berths 70–71 with a 50,000-square-foot facility for NOAA that would include office and laboratory space. The NOAA building would be designed in accordance with the Secretary’s Standards, including plan review by a qualified consulting architectural historian for compliance with the Secretary’s Standards.

The two-story building would be subordinate to the six-story Municipal Warehouse No. 1 primary historical resource. The building design would reference the adjacent building’s maritime industrial character, materials, and massing. As an example, appropriate design cues would be taken from the adjacent Municipal Warehouse No. 1 building, such as a rectilinear form with flat roof or monitor roof shapes, exposed exterior walls painted a light color, expressed pilasters, repetitively punched openings, and symmetrically arranged elevation. The use of overly elaborate architectural styles that purposely depart from the simple, maritime industrial character of the area would be avoided, as would large amounts of landscaping, because landscaping is not characteristic of the area.

1 The Westway Terminal Administration Building (also known as the Pan-American
2 Oil Company Pump House) would be adaptively reused by a future occupant. The
3 Mission Revival style character of the Westway Terminal Building would be retained
4 and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces
5 that characterize this building, stucco wall cladding, or stepped Mission parapet,
6 would be avoided.

7 Deteriorated historic features of the Westway Terminal Building would be repaired
8 rather than replaced, to the extent feasible. Where the severity of deterioration
9 requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature would match the old in
10 design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials.
11 Replacement of missing features would be substantiated by documentary, physical,
12 or pictorial evidence, to the extent available.

13 In addition, Berths 70–71 along the Main Channel would be made available for
14 berthing of research vessels, with a maximize vessel length of approximately 250
15 feet. There are no plans to relocate current vessels in the NOAA fleet to the proposed
16 project site, but there is a possibility that future built vessels could be home ported at
17 City Dock No.1. Furthermore, full functioning of the site would include the regular
18 docking of NOAA vessels home-ported in other locations but passing through Los
19 Angeles as part of research expeditions.

20 Redevelopment of Berths 70–71 would also involve development of an 80,000-
21 square-foot steel-reinforced concrete wave tank on the land side, which would be
22 enclosed within its own five-story, 100,000-square-foot building. The wave tank
23 would be constructed to allow the study of tsunamis, rouge waves, and the generation
24 of wave energy, as well as vessel and platform, and coastal engineering studies. The
25 wave tank building would include an internal crane mechanism for moving tank
26 baffles and actuators and equipment within the building.

27 The base of the building would be above the mean high tide mark, which would
28 allow for a depth of approximately 10 feet below the existing grade elevation. The
29 first story would comprise the foundation, the next two stories would house the wave
30 tank, the fourth story would include walkways and view platforms, and the final story
31 would provide clearance for cranes to maneuver the wave tank baffles.

32 The building would be designed to be compatible with the historic materials and
33 features of nearby historic structures to the extent feasible given its required size. For
34 example, the design of the wave tank would reference motifs, massing, and materials
35 of other large-scale buildings in the immediate vicinity to help maintain the industrial
36 maritime character of the district.

37 **2.3.4.8 Marine Research Facility Support Structures**

38 The proposed urban marine research center is intended to support marine research
39 and entrepreneurial business development to address the next generation of ocean-
40 driven challenges and opportunities such as tidal, wind, and biomass energy;
41 aquaculture and sustainable fisheries; shoreline dynamics; and tsunamis, rouge waves,
42 remote sensing, coastal resource management, marine pollution, marine biochemistry
43 and pharmacology, underwater robotics, and climate change and sea-level rise. The

1 proposed Project would not only support marine research being conducted by
2 Southern California universities and colleges and state and national marine-related
3 agencies, but is also intended to accommodate visiting researchers from around the
4 nation and world.

5 Research would be selected, undertaken, and managed by the tenants/subtenants of
6 City Dock No. 1. Research topics are anticipated to evolve and change over time, as
7 new information and environmental concerns are identified. Similarly, equipment
8 storage needs, seawater circulation system, life support system, and seawater volume
9 needs are anticipated to fluctuate over time based on research being conducted.

10 **2.3.4.8.1 Marine Research Seawater In-Take, Life Support, and** 11 **Treatment Systems**

12 Initially, the seawater system, and associated life support and water treatment
13 systems, and water would only serve Berth 57, but the intake/discharge infrastructure
14 would be designed with enough capacity to eventually serve Berths 58–60 and 70–71
15 once those upgrades and new construction are completed in Phase II. The current
16 combined volume of all Berths 57–60 and 71 marine research tanks is estimated at
17 approximately 1,000,000 gallons.

18 Seawater storage tanks necessary for Berth 57 marine research operations would be
19 installed as part of Phase I. Additional seawater storage tanks would be added as
20 additional research and business incubator facilities are developed in Phase II in
21 order to address the needs of those additional operations. Life support systems, such
22 as water filtration, protein skimmers, and ozone treatment systems would also be
23 constructed and installed, as applicable, to all City Dock No. 1 facilities, with space
24 reserved for additional components to be added as build out of the center proceeds.
25 Chillers and heaters would be installed for seawater systems that require specific
26 temperature requirement.

27 The exact seawater system(s), life support, and treatment systems to be utilized at the
28 facilities would be designed to meet the needs of the research planned to be
29 conducted within each section of the proposed City Dock No. 1 facility, for which
30 specific detailed needs are currently unknown. However, it is anticipated that the
31 seawater systems would comprise a combination of both flow-through and
32 recirculating capabilities. Depending on the system that is ultimately developed, the
33 quantity of discharge, and the types of activities that occur and species handled in the
34 research laboratories, different discharge and filtration requirements may be needed
35 for either ocean or sewer discharge. Conservative intake and discharge estimates for
36 each type of seawater system are included to ensure potential impacts of both
37 potential marine research facility seawater systems are evaluated and addressed in
38 this Draft EIR.

39 **Seawater In-Take and Discharge**

40 The seawater intake and discharge locations for the Berths 57–60 and 70–71 research
41 facilities are proposed to be located at the southern end of City Dock No.1, slightly
42 extending out past the rip-rap, or under the Berths 57–60 wharves, as deemed most

1 appropriate for the final seawater system design. It is anticipated that the seawater
2 systems would comprise a combination of both flow-through and recirculating
3 capabilities. The intake flows would be limited to 0.5 feet per second or less, which
4 is the velocity identified in the EPA guidelines as a rate that generally allows fish to
5 pull away from the intake structure and results in de minimus impingement levels.
6 The intake pipe size would be designed to acquire the volume of water needed, while
7 ensuring a velocity of 0.5 feet/second or less. The in-take would be located in an
8 area without nearby sensitive habitat, would operate at low flows and velocities, and
9 would be screened to minimize entrainment and impingement. Should a combination
10 of recirculation and flow-through system be used, seawater in-take volume would be
11 significantly less.

12 The discharge rate for flow-through systems would use the same rate as the in-take.
13 The discharge location would be to the west of the proposed in-take location at the
14 southern end of City Dock No.1, or under the Berths 57–58 wharves, as deemed most
15 appropriate for the final seawater system design.

16 **Flow-Through Seawater Systems**

17 Flow-through seawater systems would take in seawater and circulate it through the
18 marine tanks. After circulation through the tanks, the seawater would be filtered and
19 treated for discharge back to the harbor. This type of system minimizes the need for:
20 (1) seawater storage tanks; (2) life support treatment systems, such as protein
21 skimmers and ozone treatment; (3) seawater discharge to the sewer; and (4)
22 electricity usage. Based on the experience of the existing SCMI operation, it is
23 currently anticipated that filtering systems would be adequate to treat seawater from
24 the flow-through system for ocean discharge.

25 To ensure a healthy environment for marine life, it is anticipated that the water in all
26 tanks would need to be turned over twice daily. This would result in the need to in-
27 take and discharge 2,000,000 gallons per day, twice the volume of the City Dock No.
28 1 research facility tanks, every 24-hour period.

29 In-take seawater may be chilled, or heated, as appropriate for the tanks and research
30 being conducted. Water that is higher or lower than ambient harbor water
31 temperatures would be managed during discharge to achieve ambient water
32 temperatures prior to discharge to the harbor. Seawater used in tanks that house
33 nonnative species would either be discharged to the sewer or processed through
34 enhanced treatment systems, as necessary to eradicate any nonnative species and
35 prevent their introduction into harbor waters.

36 **Recirculating Seawater Systems**

37 Recirculating seawater systems would take in seawater, circulate it through tanks,
38 and then filter and treat the water to remove biological waste created by marine
39 organisms maintained in the tanks through filtration, protein skimmers, and ozone
40 treatment. The water would then be recirculated through the tanks. New seawater
41 would be introduced on an ongoing basis as needed to maintain the appropriate water
42 quality, and re-used seawater would be discharged. The turnover rate of seawater for

1 recirculation systems vary based on the treatment systems used and marine organisms
2 maintained. Based on the experience of local aquariums an annual turnover rate of
3 between 6 and 10 is anticipated, resulting in daily intake and discharge volumes of
4 between 16,438 and 27,397 gallons, respectively. Maximum marine research facility
5 sanitary seawater discharge, based on a 100% recirculating seawater system with a 10
6 times per year turnover rate would be 27,397 gallons/day. However, should a
7 combination of recirculation be used, seawater discharge volume would be
8 significantly less.

9 Used seawater would require treatment prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer or
10 harbor. Should sanitary sewer discharge be involved, discharges would need to be
11 scheduled to avoid negative impacts on the Terminal Island Treatment Plant, and
12 would be sampled and monitored to ensure compliance with industrial waste
13 discharge requirements for sanitary sewer discharge. In addition, filters used in the
14 recirculated seawater cleansing process must be backwashed to maintain the
15 cleansing ability. The backwash would require discharge to the sanitary sewer.
16 Recirculation systems minimize water in-take and are able to better control
17 fluctuations in water quality. However, recirculation systems are space intensive,
18 requiring a large footprint for storage tanks and life support/treatment systems, and
19 are energy intensive. In addition, due to the re-use of water, biological wastes are
20 concentrated, and discharged water requires a greater level of treatment than flow-
21 through systems for harbor discharge, resulting in additional space needs and energy
22 resources.

23 As in the case of the flow-through system, in-take seawater may be chilled, or heated,
24 as appropriate for the tanks and research being conducted. However, water
25 temperature would not be a consideration for seawater discharged to the sanitary
26 sewer.

27 **2.3.4.8.2 Wave Tank Seawater In-Take and Discharge**

28 A separate seawater intake and treatment system would be developed for the wave
29 tank during Phase II. As mentioned previously, the proposed wave tank has a total
30 proposed volume of approximately 14,361,600 gallons and the in-take is proposed to
31 be located along the Berths 70–71 wharf in the main channel.

32 The gallon per day seawater in-take for filling the proposed wave tank would largely
33 be dependent upon the time allocated to initially fill the tank. A 90-day tank fill time
34 would require 159,574 gallons/day. The in-take flows would be limited to 0.5 feet
35 per second or less. After the initial filling of the wave tank, ongoing seawater in-take
36 needs would be minimal because discharges from the wave tank would be infrequent
37 and intermittent.

38 Once filled, the seawater in the wave tank would be chemically treated to eliminate
39 marine growth within the tank and retained in stasis except on rare occasions when
40 lower water levels would be needed for a study. On such occasions water may be
41 discharged from the tank. Upon completion of the study, seawater would be needed
42 to again fill the tank. Prior to discharge, chemically treated water would be filtered to
43 ensure that chemicals used to treat the water are removed prior to discharge to the

1 harbor or would be discharged to the sanitary sewer. Discharges would be tested and
2 monitored to ensure compliance with all applicable discharge requirements. The
3 wave tank harbor discharge location would be adjacent to the in-take location located
4 along the Berths 70–71 wharf in the main channel.

5 **2.3.4.9 Waterfront Promenade**

6 The SPWP EIS/EIR (POLA 2009) assessed the construction of a continuous
7 waterfront pedestrian promenade throughout the waterfront project site. Extending
8 the promenade through a marine laboratory facility could pose special challenges
9 because the waterfront would be utilized for vessel loading on a routine basis by
10 forklifts, cranes, and other heavy equipment at unpredictable intervals. The
11 approximately 6,000-linear-foot promenade would be constructed along the edge of
12 the wharf in such a manner as to maintain public access without creating a safety
13 hazard or otherwise unduly impeding the work that is necessary at a marine
14 laboratory. As such, as part of the proposed Project, the proposed location of the
15 promenade would be along East 22nd Street and Signal Street, and along the existing
16 wharf that runs the perimeter of City Dock No. 1, to the extent feasible. The south
17 end of Berth 60 would be developed to accommodate a public viewing area and
18 platform.

19 **2.3.4.10 Signal Street Improvements**

20 Signal Street would be repaved and realigned as part of the proposed Project. As part
21 of the realignment, a total of approximately 195 diagonal parking spaces would be
22 provided along one side of the street. The proposed Project would add 15 spaces
23 adjacent to the Berth 56 Learning Center building, 40 new spaces adjacent to the
24 Berth 57 transit shed, and 155 spaces adjacent to Berths 58–60. In addition, the
25 existing heavy rail tracks that are embedded within Signal Street would be removed
26 (approximately 8,000 lineal feet), and the area that is disturbed during the rail
27 removal would be repaved.

28 **2.3.4.11 Utility Improvements**

29 The proposed Project would provide new utility connections to the proposed
30 buildings as well as the existing buildings to allow for the proposed project elements
31 described above. All connections would be located within the proposed project site
32 and would connect with the existing infrastructure located under Signal Street. In
33 addition to the general utility connections, the proposed Project would potentially
34 upgrade the existing sewer pump servicing the proposed project site. This upgrade to
35 the sewer pump would provide additional capacity to accommodate the proposed
36 Project under full buildout as well as additional future projects if needed.

37 **2.3.5 Sustainable Design Project Features**

38 The proposed Project is intended to showcase LAHD's commitment to sustainability.
39 The proposed Project would incorporate a number of sustainable elements focusing
40 on the effort of LAHD to create a green Port. These are analyzed as part of the

1 proposed Project within this Draft EIR. Additionally, the proposed Project would
2 incorporate several features to enhance the final design of the proposed Project.
3 Although not required to mitigate a significant impact, these design measures would
4 further minimize the proposed Project's effect on surrounding uses and
5 environmental resources. The following proposed Project elements and design
6 measures are consistent with LAHD's Sustainability Program and policies.

- 7 ■ Use recycled water if available for all landscaping and water feature purposes to
8 decrease the proposed Project's use of potable water.
- 9 ■ Include drought-tolerant plants and shade trees in the planting palette.
- 10 ■ Require LEED™ certification for all new buildings as feasible by implementing
11 and ensuring consistency with LAHD's Green Building Policy; LEED
12 Certification (minimum Silver) is required for all new development over 7,500
13 square feet.
- 14 ■ Follow LAHD sustainable engineering design guidelines in the siting and design
15 of new development.
- 16 ■ Employ LAHD sustainability measures during construction and operation and
17 use recycled and locally derived materials for proposed project construction,
18 while achieving recycling goals for construction and demolition debris.
- 19 ■ Implement energy efficient design features in the final design to help ensure
20 energy needs are minimized to the extent feasible during construction and
21 operation of the proposed Project.
- 22 ■ Implement water quality and conservation design features in the final design to
23 help ensure water quality impacts are minimized during construction at the
24 water's edge and in the water and operationally through the use of construction
25 BMPs and bioswales.
- 26 ■ Implement aesthetic design features. Public art would be integrated into the
27 proposed project area and would include sculptural pieces. Views of the
28 waterfront would be created through the construction of the waterfront
29 promenade around the edge of the site. The proposed Project would also
30 implement the San Pedro Waterfront Development Design Guidelines to improve
31 efficiency and reduce glare.
- 32 ■ Implement pedestrian access features. Pedestrian access to the waterfront and
33 throughout the proposed project site would be improved through development of
34 a waterfront promenade. The proposed Project would also be designed to
35 accommodate the extension of the Waterfront Red Car Line, which was
36 previously approved under the SPWP in 2009.

37 2.4 Alternatives

38 2.4.1 CEQA Requirements for Alternatives

39 CEQA's evaluation criteria for alternatives are described fully in Chapter 1,
40 "Introduction," Section 1.6. Briefly, State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6,

1 require that an EIR present a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project,
2 or to the location of the project, that could feasibly attain a majority of the basic
3 project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant
4 environmental impacts of the project. The range of alternatives required in an EIR is
5 governed by a “rule of reason” that requires an EIR to set forth only those
6 alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. An EIR need not consider every
7 conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, the alternatives must be limited to ones
8 that meet the project objectives, are ostensibly feasible, and would avoid or
9 substantially lessen at least one of the significant environmental effects of the project
10 (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[f]). The EIR must also identify the
11 environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative.
12 Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to
13 meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant
14 environmental effects (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]).

15 **2.4.2 Alternatives Evaluated in this Draft EIR**

16 This document presents a reasonable range of alternatives pursuant to the
17 requirements of CEQA. LAHD must define alternatives in light of the requirements
18 of the Los Angeles City Charter, the Los Angeles Tidelands Trust Grant, the Public
19 Trust Doctrine, and the California Coastal Act. These legal mandates demand that
20 LAHD use the Port for the purposes of promoting and accommodating waterborne
21 commerce, navigation, fishery, and related purposes. In developing alternatives, the
22 starting point is the proposed Project’s objectives.

23 Five alternatives, including the No Project Alternative, were considered and
24 evaluated in regards to how well each met the objectives for the proposed Project.
25 Three of these alternatives were eliminated from detailed consideration for various
26 reasons. Two of the alternatives met most of the proposed Project’s objectives and
27 are presented in Chapter 5, “Project Alternatives,” and summarized below. Chapter 5
28 provides the complete comparison between the proposed Project and the alternatives,
29 and identifies the environmentally superior alternative.

30 The following alternatives are evaluated:

- 31 ■ Alternative 1—No Project
- 32 ■ Alternative 2—Reduced Project

33 **2.4.2.1 Alternative 1—No Project**

34 Under this alternative, the proposed Project would not be constructed. Berths 57–60
35 would continue to be used for SP Bait company operations; these berths would not be
36 converted to a marine research center, and wharf repair and transit shed repairs would
37 not occur. SCMI would continue to operate the 19,000-square-foot office building in
38 Fish Harbor and continue to face the inadequate space and conditions required for
39 their research. Berth 56 would continue with existing uses, which include the use of
40 a small building by CDFG and surface parking.

As part of the SPWP action (and not part of the proposed Project), the Westway Terminal liquid bulk storage tanks would be removed and Berths 70–71 would subsequently be remediated. With the exception of the existing historic Westway/Pan-American Oil Company Pump House, which would remain, and the existing office building, Berths 70–71 would remain vacant indefinitely after remediation until new development plans could be established and evaluated.

2.4.2.2 Alternative 2—Reduced Project

Under this alternative, only Berths 57–60 would be developed into marine research space to be occupied by SCMI, and repairs, rehabilitation, and upgrades would be made to Berth 57 and Berth 58–60 transit sheds and wharves as specified under Section 2.3, above. SCMI would be relocated to Berth 57, and SCMI facilities at Berth 260 would be demolished as specified in Section 2.3, above.

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

Table 2-2. Reduced Project Alternative Elements

<i>Phase/Element</i>	<i>Area</i>
PHASE I (2012–2016)	
Berth 57	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Convert Berth 57 Transit Shed into SCMI Research Facility and Develop Marine Research- and Education-Related Facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office-Related Space (12,000 sf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Faculty Office Space ○ Administrative Suite ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) □ Laboratory Related Space (34,500 sf) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teaching Laboratories ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous 	46,500 sf

<i>Phase/Element</i>	<i>Area</i>
waste, scuba gear, instrument support, etc.)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Outdoor Space (8,200 sf)¹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outdoor Teaching/Outreach Classroom ○ Outside Storage Space 	
▪ Replace Berth 57 Entrance (3,640 sf) with New Addition (Public Interpretive Center)	3,600 sf
▪ Install Seawater Circulation and Life Support System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berth 57 and Seawater Intake/Discharge Infrastructure to Serve City Dock No.1 Research Laboratory Buildout	New utility
▪ Construct Floating Docks Adjacent to Berth 57 (12 vessel slips)	18,500 sf
▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berth 57 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements	625 lf ¹
□ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf for Crane	--
▪ Construct Public Plaza at Berth 57	7,500 sf ¹
▪ Relocate SCMI from Berth 260 to new Berth 57 Facilities	--
Berth 260	
▪ Demolish Existing SCMI Facility (demolition of existing 19,000-sf building, 2,700-sf warehouse, and 2,400-sf shop storage)	(24,100 sf)
<i>Total Structure Square Feet in Phase I</i>	<i>80,100 sf²</i>
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
▪ Repair/Repave/Restripe	625 lf ¹
▪ Add Surface Parking Adjacent to Berth 57	40 spaces
▪ Utilize Sampson Way and 22 nd Street (existing parking lot)	409 spaces
<i>Total Parking Added in Phase I</i>	<i>40 spaces</i>
<i>Total Available Parking in Phase I</i>	<i>449 spaces</i>
<i>Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase I</i>	<i>7.35 acres³</i>
PHASE II (2013–2024)	
Berths 58–60	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Covert Transit Sheds into Marine Research Facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office Related Space (50,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office/Administrative Space ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) ○ Hallways, Walkways □ Laboratory Related Space (70,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels) ○ Marine Research Vessel Support Facilities (crew quarters, showers, etc.) 	120,000 sf

<i>Phase/Element</i>	<i>Area</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building Support Facilities (machine shop, storeroom, chemical storage, hazardous waste, scuba gear support, etc.) □ Outdoor Space (16,400 sf) ○ Outside Storage Space 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convert Transit Shed to Marine Business Incubator Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Office Related Space (20,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Office/Administrative Space ○ Staff Support Facilities (toilets, showers, and lockers) □ Laboratory Related Space (40,000) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Research Laboratories and Facilities ○ Lab Support Space ○ Storage Facilities (robotics, instruments, etc. deployed on marine research vessels) 	60,000 sf
▪ Develop Waterfront Promenade including Public Plaza/Viewing Platform at Berth 60	6,000 lf ¹
▪ Construct Waterfront Café	1,000 sf
▪ Install Seawater Circulation System including Exterior Storage Tanks for Berths 58–60	New utility
▪ Relocate Items Stored by Water Taxi Service (to within the general vicinity)	--
▪ Rehabilitate/Repair Berth 58–60 Wharf and Associated Ground Improvements	1,875 lf ¹
□ Create Berthing for Research Vessels and Loading Space on the Wharf	--
Signal Street Improvements/Parking Facilities	
▪ Implement Repaving and Restriping	1,875 lf ¹
▪ Install New Diagonal Parking	155 spaces
▪ Remove Existing Heavy Rail Line from Street	8,000 lf ¹
<i>Total Parking Added in Phase II</i>	<i>155 spaces</i>
<i>Total Parking Available in Phase II</i>	<i>604 spaces⁴</i>
<i>Total Area Redeveloped and Enhanced in Phase II</i>	<i>10.70 acres⁵</i>

<i>Phase/Element</i>	<i>Area</i>
PROPOSED PROJECT TOTALS	
Total Project Area Structures	249,600 sf
Total Parking Spaces Available for Proposed Project	604
Total Project Area Redeveloped and Enhanced	18.85 acres ⁵
¹ Not a structure and is therefore not counted in total structure sf. ² Excludes demolition of existing SCMI Facility at Berth 260. ³ Acreage was calculated by taking the 8.00 acres of Phase I minus the 0.65 acres at Berth 56 for the auditorium and parking. ⁴ In addition to the 155 new parking spaces provided under Phase II, visitors and employees would have access to the 449 parking spaces identified under Phase I for a total of 604 spaces for the proposed Project. ⁵ Acreage was calculated by taking the Phase II total of 25.00 acres from the proposed Project and subtracting 14.3 for Berths 70–71. ⁶ Acreage was calculated by taking the total 33.8 acres from the proposed Project and subtracting 0.65 for Berth 56 and 14.3 for Berths 70–71. sf=square feet; lf = linear feet	

1

2.4.3 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

As discussed in Chapter 5, “Project Alternatives,” CEQA requires an EIR to present a range of reasonable alternatives to a proposed project, or to the location of the project, that could feasibly attain a majority of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant environmental impacts of the project. CEQA also requires an evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives that would be infeasible, would not reduce any identified significant impact, or would not meet a majority of the project objectives.

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

- determined infeasible due to physical, legal, or technical factors;
- inability to meet a majority of the project objectives; or
- inability to reduce one or more identified significant impact(s).

The alternatives below were considered, but eliminated from further analysis:

- New Construction at Berths 57–60
- Alternative Site

Additional details regarding these alternatives and the reasons for rejecting them are included in Chapter 5, “Project Alternatives.”

2.5 Proposed Project Baseline

CEQA’s requirements for establishing a baseline are discussed in Chapter 1, “Introduction,” Section 1.6.5, “CEQA Baseline.” Section 15125 (a) of the State CEQA Guidelines provides the following:

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

Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a proposed project that exist at the time of the issuance of the NOP. For some resource areas, such as aesthetics or geology, the baseline conditions are defined by what was present at the time the NOP was circulated for review (December 2010). Assessment of other resource areas such as air quality, biology, or water quality may also include information from prior years up to December 2010 in order to provide the most accurate and representative characterization of baseline conditions by accounting for fluctuations at any point in time. When special circumstances are present, details are provided in the respective sections of Chapter 3, “Environmental Analysis,” prior to the impact analysis. These environmental conditions constitute the baseline physical conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines whether an impact would be significant.

The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time, with no project growth over time, and differs from the No Project Alternative in that the No Project Alternative addresses what is likely to happen at the site over time without discretionary approvals, starting from the existing conditions. The No Project Alternative allows for growth at the proposed project site that would occur without additional discretionary approvals.

2.6 Intended Uses of this Draft EIR

This Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with applicable state environmental regulations, policies, and laws to inform federal, state, and local decision-makers regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project and its alternatives. As an informational document, an EIR does not recommend approval or denial of a project. This Draft EIR is being provided to the public for review, comment, and participation in the planning process. After public review and comment, a Final EIR will be prepared. The Final EIR will include responses to comments on the Draft EIR received from agencies, organizations, and individuals. It will be distributed to provide the basis for decision making by the lead agency, as described below, and other concerned agencies.

2.6.1 Lead Agency Use—LAHD

LAHD has jurisdictional authority over the proposed Project pursuant to the Port of Los Angeles Tidelands Trust, the California Coastal Act, and CEQA. This EIR will be used by LAHD, as the lead agency under CEQA, in making a decision with regard to the construction and operation of the proposed Project and to inform agencies considering permit applications and other actions required to construct, lease, and operate the proposed Project. LAHD's certification of the EIR, notice of completion, findings of fact, and statement of overriding considerations (if necessary) will document LAHD's decision as to the adequacy of the EIR and inform subsequent decisions by LAHD whether to approve and construct the proposed Project.

Actions that could be undertaken by LAHD following preparation of the Final EIR include the following:

- Certification of the EIR
- Project Approval
- Lease Approvals
- Issuance of Coastal Development Permits
- Completion of Final Design
- Approval of Engineering Permits
- Obtaining other Agency Permits and Approvals (e.g., dredge and fill, grading, construction, occupancy, and fire safety, etc.)
- Approval of Construction Contracts

2.6.2 Other Uses

Other agencies (federal, state, regional, and local) that have jurisdiction over some part of the proposed Project or a resource area affected by the proposed Project are expected to use this EIR as part of their approval or permit process as set forth in Table 2-3. Specific approvals that could be required for this proposed Project include but are not limited to:

- City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Permits
- USACE permit—pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA, and Section 10 of the RHA
- Water quality permits (CWA Section 401 water quality certification and NPDES permits)
- Construction contracts
- City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation Industrial Waste Discharge Permit

2.7 Agencies Expected to Use this EIR

Table 2-3 lists responsible and trustee federal, state, and local agencies that may rely on this Draft EIR in a review capacity or as a basis for issuance of a permit for the proposed Project or for related actions.

Table 2-3. Agencies Expected to Use this EIR

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Responsibilities, Permits, and Approvals</i>
FEDERAL AGENCIES	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Responsible for navigational improvements in waters of the United States. Permitting authority for work and structures in navigable waters and the discharge of dredged or fill material in waters of the United States.
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) Fisheries/National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)	Reviews and submits recommendations to USACE related to federal construction actions and issuance of permits in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. Also responsible for Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) under the Magnuson Stevens Act. Provides EFH information, reviews federal action potential effects on EFH, and provides conservation recommendations to USACE through consultation.
U.S. Coast Guard (USCG)	Has jurisdiction over marine facilities, bridges, and vessel transportation in harbor waters. Responsible for ensuring safe navigation and for preventing and responding to oil or hazardous materials releases in the marine environment. Responsible for enforcement of the MTSA and the ISPS Code standards for security at cruise terminals.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Reviews and submits recommendations to USACE related to federal construction actions and issuance of permits.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Reviews and submits recommendations to USACE related to federal construction actions and issuance of permits in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and consultations pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA.
STATE AGENCIES	
California Coastal Commission (CCC)	Reviews environmental document to ensure compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act and consistency with the California Coastal Act. Performs a federal consistency determination. Reviews and must approve CDP applications and Port Master Plan Amendments (PMPA).
California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG)	Reviews and submits recommendations in accordance with CEQA. Consultation in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.
California Office of Historic Preservation	Consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) regarding impacts on cultural resources (i.e., demolition of buildings and structures) that are either listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP.
The California Waste Management Board	Statutory and regulatory authority to control the handling and disposal of solid nonhazardous waste in a manner that protects public safety, health, and the environment. State law assigns responsibility for solid waste management to local governments.

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Responsibilities, Permits, and Approvals</i>
California State Lands Commission (CSLC)	Has oversight responsibility for tidal and submerged lands legislatively granted in trust to local jurisdictions and has adopted regulations for the inspection and monitoring of marine terminals. The CSLC inspects and monitors all marine facilities for effects on public health, safety, and the environment.
California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC)	Regulatory jurisdiction over underground tanks containing hazardous materials. Implements groundwater monitoring provision of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. Responsible for general site cleanup outside of underground storage tanks (state superfund sites, etc.).
REGIONAL AGENCIES	
Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), Los Angeles Region	Permitting authority for Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 401 water quality certifications subject to Section 404 of the CWA. Permitting authority for California waste discharge requirements pursuant to the state Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Responsible for issuance of both construction and industrial NPDES stormwater permits.
Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD)	Licensing and inspection authority for all hazardous waste generation in the City. Provides regulation and oversight of site remediation projects involving hazardous waste generators where surface and subsurface soils are contaminated with hazardous substances.
South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD)	Permitting authority for construction of landfill and operation of pump stations, storage tanks, and terminal facilities; activities involving hydrocarbon-containing soils (Rule 1166); and new or modified sources of air emissions (new source review).
Southern California Association of Government (SCAG)	Responsible for developing regional plans for transportation and federal conformity as well as developing the growth factors used in forecasting air emissions in the SCAB.
LOCAL AGENCIES	
City of Los Angeles City Council	City Council legislative body that would review any appeal to certification of the EIR by LAHD; reviews and approves leases, permits, and other approvals.
City of Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD)	Lead agency for CEQA and the California Coastal Act (via the certified PMP). Other City departments have various approval and permitting responsibilities, and are listed separately below for the sake of clarity. Pursuant to its authority, LAHD may approve permits and other approvals (e.g., coastal development permits; leases for occupancy; and approval of operating, joint venture, or other types of agreements for the operation of the facilities) for the projects evaluated in this EIR. Leasing authority for the Port's land. Permitting authority for engineering construction. Responsible for general regulatory compliance. Responsible for master plan amendment and map change and issuance of coastal development permits. Responsible for activities of other City departments for the proposed Project.
City of Los Angeles Building and Safety Department	Responsible agency with permitting authority for building and grading permits.
City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering	Responsible agency with permitting authority for storm drain connections and stormwater discharges, permits for water discharges to the wastewater collection system, and approval of street vacations.

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Responsibilities, Permits, and Approvals</i>
City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation	Responsible agency with permitting authority for industrial waste permit for discharges of industrial wastewater to the City sewer system and sanitary sewer connections.
City of Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD)	Responsible agency that reviews facilities' Hazardous Materials Business Plan and Inventory and Risk Management and Prevention Programs. Reviews and submits recommendations regarding design for building permit.
City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)	Responsible agency that reviews and approves changes in City street design, construction, signalization, signage, traffic counts, as well as traffic impact analysis methodology and the study area.
City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	Responsible agency that provides a water supply assessment and approves the facilities' new water service connection and meters.
City of Los Angeles Planning Department	Responsible agency that reviews zone changes or amendments, general plan amendments, variances for zoning or parking code requirements.

1

2

2.8 Relationship to Existing Plans

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

One of the primary objectives of the CEQA process is to ensure that the proposed Project is consistent with applicable statutes, plans, policies, and other regulatory requirements. Table 2-4 lists the statutes, plans, policies, and other regulatory requirements applicable to the proposed Project and its alternatives. Additional analysis of plan consistency is contained in individual resource sections of Chapter 3, "Environmental Analysis," and, in particular, in Section 3.8, "Land Use and Planning."

10

Table 2-4. Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
California Tidelands Trust Act, 1911	Submerged lands and tidelands within the Port, which are under the Common Law Public Trust, were legislatively granted to the City pursuant to Chapter 656, Statutes of 1911, as amended. Those properties are held in trust by the City and administered by LAHD to promote and develop commerce, navigation, and fisheries, and other uses of statewide interest and benefit, including commercial, industrial, and transportation uses; public buildings and public recreational facilities; wildlife habitat; and open space. LAHD would fund the proposed Project with trust revenues. All property and improvements included in the proposed Project would be dedicated to maritime-related uses and would, therefore, be consistent with the trust.
California Coastal Act of 1976	The California Coastal Act (20 PRC 30700 et seq.) identifies the Port and its facilities as "one of the state's primary economic and coastal resources and...an essential element of the national maritime industry" (PRC Section 30701). LAHD is responsible for the modernizing and construction of necessary facilities to accommodate deep-draft vessels and to accommodate the demands of foreign and domestic waterborne commerce and other traditional and water-dependent and related facilities

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	<p>in order to preclude the necessity for developing new ports elsewhere in the state (Sections 30007.5 and 30701(b)). The act also establishes that the highest priority for any water or land area use within LAHD's jurisdiction will be for developments that are completely dependent on such harbor water areas and/or harbor land areas for their operations (Sections 30001.5(d), 30255, and 31260). The act further provides that LAHD should "[g]ive highest priority to the use of existing land space within harbors for port purposes, including, but not limited to, navigational facilities, shipping industries, and necessary support and access facilities" (Section 30708 (c)).</p> <p>Under the California Coastal Act, water areas may be diked, filled, or dredged when consistent with a certified PMP only for specific purposes, including: (1) construction, deepening, widening, lengthening, or maintenance of ship channel approaches, ship channels, turning basins, berthing areas, and facilities that are required for the safety and the accommodation of commerce and vessels to be served by port facilities; and (2) new or expanded facilities or waterfront land for port-related facilities.</p> <p>In accordance with provisions of the California Coastal Act, LAHD has a certified master plan that provides LAHD with coastal development permit authority for actions/developments consistent with that master plan. Inconsistent items, such as new fills in water, would require a master plan amendment through the CCC. The proposed Project is consistent with the master plan's provisions, as amended under the San Pedro Waterfront Project.</p>
Coastal Zone Management Act	<p>Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act requires that all federal agencies with activities directly affecting the coastal zone, or with development projects within that zone, comply with the state coastal acts (in this case, the California Coastal Act of 1976) to ensure that those activities or projects are consistent to the maximum extent practicable. The CCC will use this EIR when considering whether to find the proposed Project consistent with the California Coastal Act, and the USACE will use that approval as a demonstration that the proposed Project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>
Port Master Plan with Amendments (2009)	<p>The PMP (LAHD 1980) provides for the development, expansion, and alteration of the Port (both short-term and long-term) for commerce, navigation, fisheries, Port-dependent activities, and general public access. Those objectives are consistent with the provisions of the California Coastal Act (1976); the Charter of the City of Los Angeles; and applicable federal, state, and municipal laws and regulations. The proposed Project's proposed uses are consistent with the plan.</p>
California Coastal Plan	<p>Under provisions of the California Coastal Act, the PMP is incorporated into the City's Local Coastal Program. LAHD has coastal development permit authority for activities throughout the Port. Therefore, if the proposed Project would be consistent with the PMP, the proposed Project would also be considered consistent with the Local Coastal Program.</p>
San Pedro Bay Clean Air Action Plan	<p>LAHD, in conjunction with the Port of Long Beach and with guidance from SCAQMD, CARB, and EPA, has developed the CAAP, which was approved by the Los Angeles and Long Beach Boards of Harbor</p>

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	<p>Commissioners on November 20, 2006. The CAAP focuses on reducing diesel PM, NO_x, and SO_x, with two main goals: (1) to reduce Port-related air emissions in the interest of public health, and (2) to disconnect cargo growth from emissions increases. The CAAP includes near-term measures implemented largely through the CEQA/NEPA process and new leases at both ports. The proposed Project includes air quality control measures outlined in the CAAP, both as mitigation that would be imposed via permits and lease provisions and as standard measures that would be implemented through the lease, agreements with other agencies and business entities, and LAHD contracting policies. On April 7, 2010, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach released for public review a proposed, updated document, the 2010 San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP Update) that includes new, far-reaching goals for curbing port-related air pollution over the next decade.</p>
Port of Los Angeles Real Estate Leasing Policy	<p>The purpose of the Port of Los Angeles Real Estate Leasing Policy is to provide a framework governing leasing and rental decisions as they relate to tenant retention, new tenant selection, development of new agreements, and, as appropriate, modifications to existing agreements by amendments. The proposed Project would be consistent with the leasing policy in that it would incorporate CAAP provisions that would be implemented through the leases with new and existing tenants.</p>
Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan	<p>The Port of Los Angeles Strategic Plan (LAHD 2010) identifies LAHD's mission and provides 11 strategic objectives for the next 5 years. The mission includes promotion of "grow green" philosophy, combined with fiduciary responsibility and promotion of global trade. The 11 strategic objectives are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) implement development strategies to ensure the Port maintains and efficiently manages a diversity of cargo and land uses while maximizing land use compatibility and minimizing land use conflicts; (2) deliver cost-effective facilities and infrastructure in a timely manner consistent with the land use plan; (3) promote, develop, and provide a safe and efficient transportation system for the movement of goods and people in the Port vicinity and throughout the region, state, and nation in a cost-effective and environmentally sensitive and sustainable manner; (4) maintain financial strength and flexibility to implement strategic and policy priorities; (5) be the greenest port in the world; (6) be the leading port for new, emerging, and environmentally-friendly cargo movement technology and energy sources; (7) maintain the Port as a world-class model for crime prevention, counter-terrorism detection, maritime security training, and emergency incident response and mitigation; (8) maintain the Port as a world-class model for efficient operations and outstanding customer service; (9) strengthen relations with all internal and external stakeholders through education, advocacy, meaningful interaction, and engaging events initiatives that benefit the community;

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	<p>(10) realize the potential of the diversity of Los Angeles’ population by expanding opportunity; retain and develop more high-quality jobs with an emphasis on green technology; and</p> <p>(11) ensure Port leadership, staff, and facilities are in place to meet current and future workforce needs.</p> <p>The proposed Project is consistent with the strategic plan because it would help to minimize land use conflicts, maximize the efficiency of existing facilities, strengthen local community relations, and develop more and higher quality jobs. The proposed Project would also raise environmental standards through the incorporation of Port environmental and alternative energy policies into lease agreements for existing and new tenants.</p>
<p>Port of Los Angeles Sustainability Program</p>	<p>On July 18, 2007, Mayor Villaraigosa issued Executive Directive No. 10, Sustainable Practices in the City of Los Angeles. This directive sets forth his vision to transform Los Angeles into the most sustainable large city in the country and includes goals in the areas of energy and water, procurement, contracting, waste diversion, non-toxic product selection, air quality, training, and public outreach. The Port of Los Angeles has evaluated its existing programs and policies against the eight goals identified in the executive directive. There are currently over 32 specific programs already in place that support each of the eight goals in varying degrees. Some highlights of existing programs as they relate to the proposed Project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a Green Building Policy requiring LEED certification (minimum Silver) for new developments as part of the proposed waterfront redevelopment, including implementation of water conservation measures, such as the use of recycled water; ▪ integration of the San Pedro Bay CAAP elements for construction and operations to reduce air emissions; and ▪ implementation of a Climate Action Plan (CAP) for municipally controlled services with the goal of reducing GHG emissions to 35% below 1990 levels by 2030 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050, including the following select accomplishments: ▪ purchase of 25% of the Port’s power (approximately 20 million kilowatts) from renewable energy sources, ▪ construction of 1 MW of solar panels on the roof of the World Port’s Cruise Terminal, and ▪ expansion of recycling services at LAHD and for tenants; and ▪ the WRAP, which was adopted in 2009, addresses both water and related sediment quality issues in Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors and has resulted in the following accomplishments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ compilation of existing water quality and sediment data and collection of additional information to fill data gaps in order to create water quality and sediment baseline databases for use in WRAP implementation, CEQA/NEPA document preparation, and the harbor-wide hydrodynamic and water quality models; □ completion and distribution of a vessel guidance manual outlining allowable and prohibited vessel maintenance activities and

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	<p>discharges;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ development and evaluation of BMPs for piling use in the harbor; and □ ongoing participation in various watershed activities and supporting efforts to reduce upstream pollutant loadings into the harbor.
Port Risk Management Plan	<p>The Port RMP, an amendment to the PMP, was adopted in 1983, in accordance with requirements of the CCC. The purpose of the Port RMP is to provide siting criteria relative to vulnerable resources and the handling and storage of potentially hazardous cargo such as crude oil, petroleum products, and chemicals. The plan provides guidance for future development of the Port to minimize or eliminate the hazards to vulnerable resources from accidental releases (LAHD 1983). The proposed Project is consistent with the Port RMP, and does not pose significant risks.</p>
General Plan of the City of Los Angeles—Port of Los Angeles Plan	<p>The Port of Los Angeles Plan is one of 35 community plans that make up the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles 1982). This plan provides a 20-year official guide to the continued development and operation of the Port. It is designed to be consistent with the PMP discussed above. The proposed Project would be consistent with allowable land uses and the goals and policies of the General Plan—Port of Los Angeles Plan.</p>
City of Los Angeles—San Pedro Community Plan	<p>The San Pedro Community Plan (City of Los Angeles 1989) serves as a basis for future development of the community. It is also the land use plan portion of the City’s Local Coastal Program for San Pedro. The Port is not part of the San Pedro Community Plan area. However, the San Pedro Community Plan does make recommendations regarding the Port, particularly for areas adjacent to commercial and residential areas of San Pedro. The proposed Project would be consistent with these recommendations, as LAHD has taken into consideration the residential and commercial communities of San Pedro during project development through the scoping process.</p>
City of Los Angeles—Wilmington Harbor City District Plan	<p>The Wilmington Harbor City District Plan is part of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles (City of Los Angeles 1990). The proposed Project is not located near the Wilmington Harbor City District and would, therefore, not conflict with the recommendations in the Wilmington Harbor City District Plan.</p>
River Basin	<p>The Water Quality Control Plan for the Los Angeles River Basin (Region 4) (Basin Plan) was adopted by the Los Angeles RWQCB in 1978 and updated in 1994 (RWQCB 1994), with amendments through November 2007.</p>
Water Quality Control Policy—Enclosed Bays and Estuaries of California	<p>In 1974, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) adopted a water quality control policy that provides principles and guidelines to prevent degradation and to protect the beneficial uses of waters of enclosed bays and estuaries (SWRCB 1974). Los Angeles Harbor is considered to be an enclosed bay under this policy. The policy addresses activities such as the discharge of effluent, thermal wastes, radiological waste, dredge materials, and other materials that adversely affect</p>

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	beneficial uses of the bay and estuarine waters. Among other requirements, waste discharge requirements developed by the RWQCB must be consistent with this policy. The proposed Project would be constructed and operated in conformance with objectives of the water quality control policy through controls on construction activities (e.g., dredging and fill, wharf construction) and on operations (stormwater and other discharges).
South Coast Air Basin Air Quality Management Plan	The CAA and its subsequent amendments establish the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and delegate the enforcement of these standards to the states. In areas that exceed the NAAQS, the CAA requires states to prepare a State Implementation Plan that details how the NAAQS would be met within mandated timeframes. The CAA identifies emission reduction goals and compliance dates based on the severity of the ambient air quality standard violation within an area. The California Clean Air Act (CCAA) outlines a program to attain the more stringent California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for ozone (O ₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂), sulfur dioxide (SO ₂), and carbon monoxide (CO) by the earliest practical date. The Lewis Air Quality Act of 1976 established the SCAQMD, created SCAQMD's jurisdiction over the four-county SCAB, and mandated a planning process requiring preparation of an air quality management plan (AQMP). The 2007 AQMP proposes emission reduction strategies that would enable the SCAB to achieve the national and most state ambient air quality standards within the mandated timeframes. Refer to Section 3.2, "Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases," for a consistency analysis.
Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and Goods Movements in California	CARB approved the Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and Goods Movement (CARB 2006) on April 20, 2006. All of the proposed air quality mitigation measures in this Draft EIR were developed as part of the CAAP (Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach 2006; see Chapter 1, "Introduction," Section 1.7, "Port of Los Angeles Environmental Initiatives"). Therefore, LAHD's air quality plan complies with CARB's goals and meets and/or exceeds all reduction strategies
SCAG Regional Comprehensive Plan	<p>SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) integrates SCAG's planning policy for land use and housing, solid waste, energy, air quality, open space and habitat, economy and education, water, transportation, security and emergency preparedness, and finance. The RCPG is built around the Compass Growth Vision and 2% Strategy adopted by the Regional Council in April 2004, which are based on four key principles: mobility—getting where we want to go; livability—creating positive communities; prosperity—long-term health for the region; and sustainability—preserving natural surroundings.</p> <p>The Draft 2008 Regional Comprehensive Plan (RCP) has been released for public review and has not yet been adopted. The 2008 RCP will present a vision of how Southern California can balance resource conservation, economic vitality, and quality of life. It will serve as a blueprint to approach growth and infrastructure challenges in an integrated and comprehensive way. Ultimately, the RCP will be an action plan that will spell out measurable objectives and targets to measure progress toward meeting ambitious goals for a sustainable region. The RCP Guiding Principles include:</p>

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve mobility for all residents. Improve the efficiency of the transportation system by strategically adding new travel choices to enhance system connectivity in concert with land use decisions and environmental objectives. ▪ Foster livability in all communities. Foster safe, healthy, walkable communities with diverse services, strong civic participation, affordable housing, and equal distribution of environmental benefits. ▪ Enable prosperity for all people. Promote economic vitality and new economies by providing housing, education, and job training opportunities for all people. ▪ Promote sustainability for future generations. Promote a region where quality of life and economic prosperity for future generations are supported by the sustainable use of natural resources. <p>The project would not conflict with the RCP.</p>
SCAG Regional Transportation Plan	<p>On May 8, 2008, SCAG adopted the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Making the Connections. The 2008 RTP is a \$531.5 billion plan (nominal, or year-of-expenditure, dollars) that emphasizes the importance of system management, goods movement, and innovative transportation financing. It strives to provide a regional investment framework to address the region's transportation and related challenges, and looks to strategies that preserve and enhance the existing transportation system and integrate land use into transportation planning. The RTP does not apply to the proposed Project elements.</p>
Congestion Management Program	<p>The Congestion Management Program (CMP) is a state-mandated program intended as the analytical basis for transportation decisions made through the State Transportation Improvement Program process (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority 2004). The CMP was developed to: (1) link land use, transportation, and air quality decisions; (2) develop a partnership among transportation decision makers on devising appropriate transportation solutions that include all modes of travel; and (3) propose transportation projects that are eligible to compete for state gas tax funds. The CMP includes a Land Use Analysis Program, which requires local jurisdictions to analyze the impacts of land use decisions on the regional transportation system. For development projects, an EIR is required based on local determination and must incorporate a transportation impact analysis into the EIR. This Draft EIR does include a transportation impact analysis and thus is consistent with the CMP.</p>
City of Los Angeles Integrated Resources Plan	<p>The Integrated Resources Plan (IRP) incorporates the values of Los Angeles communities into infrastructure planning and integrates planning for the three interdependent water systems: wastewater, recycled water, and stormwater. Los Angeles is facing many challenges, including a growing population, an aging infrastructure for wastewater and stormwater, polluted waters at beaches and waterways, a shortage of parks and open space, a dependence on imported water, and a shortage of necessary funding. The IRP is the solution for these challenges that will meet 20% projected increase in wastewater flow over the next 20 years while maximizing the beneficial reuse of recycled water and urban runoff, optimizing the use of existing facilities and water resources, reducing</p>

<i>Applicable Statutes, Plans, Policies, and Other Regulatory Requirements</i>	<i>Description</i>
	pollution, and reducing dependency on imported water. Greater Los Angeles County regions are also currently collaborating to develop an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) that focuses on water resource management while creating a platform for future funding.

1

2

