Executive Summary

ES.1 Introduction

The Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD), which is also referred to as the Port of Los Angeles (Port), is the lead agency responsible for the preparation of this Recirculated Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR), and Westrec Marinas is the project applicant for the proposed development of the West Channel/Cabrillo Marina Phase II Development Project (Cabrillo Way Marina). This summary includes the required contents set forth by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines, identifies the purpose of this Recirculated Draft SEIR, provides an overview of the proposed project and alternatives, and summarizes the potential impacts and mitigation measures associated with the proposed project.

ES.2 Purpose of this Recirculated Draft SEIR

CEQA requires all state and local government agencies to consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority. CEQA also requires each public agency to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects resulting from proposed projects and to identify alternatives to the proposed project that could reduce or avoid those environmental effects.

Under CEQA, a project EIR analyzes the impacts of an individual activity or specific project and focuses primarily on changes in the environment that would result from that activity or project. The EIR must include the contents required by CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, and it must examine all phases of the project, including planning, construction, operation, and any reasonably foreseeable future phases.

The Board of Harbor Commissioners originally certified a Final EIR in 1980 for the *West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex* (LAHD 1980a). That document assessed the West Channel/Cabrillo Marina Phase I Development Project (now called Cabrillo Marina Phase I), which was subsequently constructed and has been in operation since 1986. The document also discussed the Phase II Development at a programmatic level. In 1998, the Phase II Development component changed substantially from that which was described in the 1980 Final EIR. Consequently, a Draft SEIR was prepared and circulated for public review in November 1998 (LAHD 1998). That Draft SEIR evaluated the changes between the 1980 EIR project and the 1998 Cabrillo Way Marina development plans. However, for various reasons, the project was placed on hold and the Final EIR was not completed.

The LAHD decided to revise and recirculate the Draft SEIR because the proposed project scenario meets the criteria set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. The following summarizes the changes that have occurred since the previous circulation of the 1998 Draft SEIR. The details of the current project description are included Chapter 2 of this Recirculated Draft SEIR.

- The changes to the proposed project description include:
  - changes in dredge and fill quantities;
  - addition of more boat storage capacity in the dry stack boat storage;
  - minor changes to the number, configuration, and size of proposed boat slips;
  - addition of boat launch facility options to the proposed project as a result of public comments received during the previous review of the 1998 Draft SEIR;
  - institution of a boat launch reservation system at the existing Cabrillo Beach Launch Ramp and the opening of Shoshonean Road to incoming boat trailers only;
  - changes to site access configuration and modifications to the 22nd Street/Miner Street intersection, and widening and realignment of Miner Street;
  - substitution of yacht club facilities in place of the youth activity center;
- comprehensive reformatting to update the environmental setting and impact analyses;
- revisions to significance criteria and thresholds of significance to be consistent with the *Draft Los Angeles CEQA Thresholds Guide*;
- new analyses for the following environmental issues:
  - light and glare and
  - environmental justice;

- new environmental analyses related to the new boat launch options; and
- analysis of new alternatives, including analysis of the proposed project from the 1998 Draft SEIR.

Thus, the revised project description is the subject of this current Recirculated Draft SEIR, which evaluates the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the proposed project in accordance with the provisions set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines. It will be used to address potentially significant environmental issues and to recommend adequate and feasible mitigation measures, where possible, that could reduce or eliminate significant environmental impacts.

ES.3 Project Overview

ES.3.1 Location

The Cabrillo Way Marina project site is located at the southern end of the City of Los Angeles (Figure ES-1). The project site is located in the southwestern portion of the Port of Los Angeles (Port) in the San Pedro District (Port Master Planning [PMP] Planning Area 1 and four smaller, adjacent parcels in PMP Planning Area 2) (Figure ES-2).

The proposed Cabrillo Way Marina site is currently occupied by existing marina boat slips, parking areas, lifeguard and fire stations, and warehouses for storage, cargo handling, and transshipment activities, and is adjacent to San Pedro Boat Works. Marina boat slips located at the Watchorn Basin area, in particular, do not have sufficient parking capacity available or parking facilities conveniently located for waterside dependent uses. About 550 boat slips presently exist on the east side of the West Channel within the project site.

There are a number of commercial and residential uses in the vicinity of the project area. Figure ES-3 shows the existing uses on the project site and surrounding areas. Commercial uses are at 22nd Street Landing Sportfishing and across the West Channel at Cabrillo Marina Phase I. The nearest residential uses are located along Crescent Avenue to the north and at Fort MacArthur to the west. It should be noted that there are also non-permanent residential uses by "liveaboards" (boat occupants) on the project site.

The proposed project also includes the potential for a new public boat launch facility within the Port. This SEIR examines 9 possible sites that are under consideration for a boat launch facility, of which the Board of Harbor Commissioners may select one or more for ultimate development. The locations of these potential sites include the following:

- Alternative Site A (Berth 56)
- Alternative Site B (Southern Pacific [SP] Slip)
- Alternative Site C (Berth 95 Area)

- Alternative Site D (Berth 161 Area)
- Alternative Site E (Berth 183-184 Area)
- Alternative Site F (Berth 200 G-H)
- Alternative Site G (Berth 200Z Area)
- Alternative Site H (Berth 204 Colonial Boat Works)
- Alternative Site I (Berth 193-194 Area)

ES.3.2 Project Description

The proposed project involves the second phase of improvements within the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex to provide a unified continuous waterfront within the West Channel Development Area (WCDA). The proposed Phase II project, the Cabrillo Way Marina, has a total of 49 acres of land and 37 acres of water located within PMP Planning Areas 1 and 2. Figure ES-4 shows the conceptual site plan for the land and water improvements. Westrec Marinas was selected by the LAHD from a Request for Proposals to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the exclusive rights to planned development of the project.

The proposed project is conceptualized to include a variety of commercial and recreational land uses. Figure ES-5 shows the illustrative site plan and Figure ES-6 shows a close view of the proposed Village Center. Figure ES-7 shows an aerial perspective view in the vicinity of the dry stack boat storage building. The various components of the project are briefly described below.

Demolition

Existing buildings, paving, substructure, docks, berths, and piers will be partially or wholly demolished and removed to accommodate the construction of the new facilities. The major structural features affected by the various development components include Warehouse 6 (southwest of Miner and 22nd Street), Crescent Warehouse at Berths 54–55, the former Shelter Point Yachting Service building, and various boat repair and service buildings along the Watchorn Basin waterfront. Additionally, some existing railroad track would be removed and/or relocated.

Infrastructure

Landside infrastructure improvements generally include street and intersection improvements, landscaping, utilities, and signage improvements. The site will be improved as necessary to accommodate the proposed development. The site improvements are envisioned to include, but are not limited to, the following:

- grading,
- storm drains,
- utility systems,
- site landscaping and irrigation,
- fencing,
- retaining walls (if needed), and
- soil stabilization (if needed).

Several waterside infrastructure improvements would also be required to accommodate the proposed project, including dredging, excavation, and landfilling, and construction of bank riprap revetment along the West Channel and the perimeter of the revised Watchorn Basin. The general area of the Watchorn Basin is going to be dredged up to -15 feet Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW). The total area to be dredged is estimated at 6.9 acres, with an estimated total volume of 75,000 cubic yards of sediment material. Some land areas will be excavated and removed in order to obtain a waterside configuration that would allow more capacity for marina slips, comprising approximately 1.1 acres (0.6 and 0.5 acres at or near Berths 40 and 41a, respectively) and 40,000 cubic yards of material. To create an efficient basin perimeter and to create needed land areas adjacent to the marina basin, 3 landfill areas are proposed; these would comprise approximately 3.5 acres (or a 2.4 acre net landfill area) and a total estimated fill volume of 120,000 cubic yards of material.

Revetted slopes are required to protect the marina perimeter and the slope along the main channel. Vertical bulkheads are required for the effective launch and retrieval of boats handled in the dry stack storage operation. Also, a vertical bulkhead wall is required in the south end of the marina basin to accommodate the launch and retrieval of boats for the storage activities in this area. The south-end launch area will include four small boat lifts/hoists.

Site Access and Circulation

The West Channel Development Area Access and Circulation structure consists of three interdependent systems: vehicular, pedestrian, and water craft components. Vehicular access and circulation would be provided by Harbor Boulevard as the primary entry corridor to the project site, in keeping with the overall intent of developing the western areas of the Main Channel frontage to the Southern Pacific Slip (SP Slip) and the West Channel area for visitor/tourism-serving and recreational uses.

Primary access to the site is proposed at the north end of the project via Harbor Boulevard, south of 22nd Street. An enhanced or realigned Miner Street will be renamed Harbor Boulevard (See Chapter 2, "Project Description" for more detail regarding the intersection configuration options). This intersection's design, signage, and landscape will serve as the project gateway. Cabrillo Way Village

will function as the primary entrance to restaurants, dry stack parking, and the retail village.

The realignment of Miner Street would provide for new boat delivery and public access to the dry stack facility, marina parking, slip access, marina complex operator, Administration Building, small boat (less than 35 feet) maintenance yard, personal boat storage, and launching. In addition to accommodating passenger vehicles, the circulation system is designed to allow functional access and circulation for commercial trucks, boat deliveries, and private boat trailers.

Parking throughout the project is located for convenience in proportion to the specific and mixed uses being served. The project proposes approximately 19 acres of parking among three primary parking lots. An estimated 1,664 parking spaces will be required, and the project proposes 1,696 spaces distributed among the various lots.

Equal attention has been given to the water components of the proposed marina operations. Primary water considerations are incorporated in the design of the vessel access and circulation system. These include the location of large recreational/commercial boating activities with direct West Channel access, large "mega-yacht" slips fronting on the West Channel, direct fairway channel access from the sheltered dry stack launch/retrieval staging area to the West Channel, Cabrillo Way Marina Fairways connecting slips to the West Channel, and strategically located dinghy docks proposed at locations such as the channel retail complex and Marina Club to encourage and facilitate boater usage of the water as an alternative to vehicle access to the project's activities and services.

Pedestrian circulation will consist of perimeter pedestrian access and circulation along Harbor Boulevard and 22nd Street via a landscaped pedestrian pathway with enhancements at key locations that afford opportunities for viewing the Cabrillo Way Marina; major pedestrian gateways into the Cabrillo Way Marina at the "circle" on 22nd Street at the new plaza area; and a waterside pedestrian promenade that will include various passive and active uses along its path on both the water and land sides. The promenade would include approximately 6,500 linear feet to accommodate pedestrian access around and throughout the development. The promenade is envisioned to include special pavement treatments, handrails (where appropriate), and miscellaneous site furnishings, such as benches and landscaping, to complement the pedestrian promenade in the existing Cabrillo Marina Phase I.

Retail and visitor tourist-serving uses will be established around the promenade. The proposed Cabrillo Way Village center, with its marine retail and restaurants, in addition to the existing 22nd Street Landing will provide a gathering place for boaters, slip tenants, and visitors. The plaza will be the hub connecting the existing Cabrillo Marina Phase I and future Cabrillo Way Marina waterfront promenades. The new promenade will connect to the existing 22nd Street Landing, continue along the westerly side of the project site to the village retail/waterfront restaurant and Marina Club site, and connect to the point restaurant. From there the promenade will proceed between the parkway area and the dry stack building toward 22nd Street. From there it will extend along the realigned Miner Street and

the water's edge to its termination at the Yacht Club facilities. The promenade is envisioned as the central feature of the small retail plaza. Decorative paving, lighting, benches, trellises, and landscape features are proposed along the walkways, which will provide access and linkage to the project's amenities and services.

Cabrillo Way Marina Improvements

The Cabrillo Way Marina improvements include the demolition and replacement of the marina facilities with new, modern floating dock systems. Replacement docks are also contemplated for the fire department/lifeguard facility at the south end of the project site. The major components include slips and shoreside support accessible from the south end of the peninsula point, dry stack staging and overnight slips, slips and shoreside support accessible from the Miner Street realignment, pedestrian linkages, and waterfront promenade.

The marina is envisioned to accommodate approximately 675 boat slips, ranging in size from 28–130 feet. A dry stack boat storage building will be situated on 9 acres at the east side of the project, at the corner of Harbor Boulevard and 22nd Street. The dry stack development will include a large enclosed 200,000-square-foot storage building (about 65 feet high) and staging area for stacked storage of approximately 1,000 boats in its ultimate configuration. The building may also temporarily be used for maritime repair activities in conjunction with stacked boat storage until market demand is met.

To facilitate the marine repair activities, a marine travel-lift facility will be installed to haul and launch boats for repair activities. The travel-lift will require two reinforced concrete piers for access to the boats being repaired. The travel-lift access will work in conjunction with the dry stack storage operation.

Fuel dock and sewage pumpout facilities and other boater service-related amenities will be located adjacent to the bulkhead wall at the dry stack area and the travel-lift pier. The fuel dock will have related infrastructure, such as pipelines, pumps, and fuel (gasoline and diesel) storage tanks. The sewage pumpout facility will receive the contents of holding tanks (from on-board boats); these tanks are designed to hold sewage, which must be emptied from time to time.

Future Retail Components

Future retail uses are proposed at the project entrance from Harbor Boulevard and 22nd Street, which may include a market/delicatessen or other boater retail on about 0.5 acre, and a 2.4-acre boat mall, which would accommodate approximately eight dealership pavilions and boat display. Parking and trailer storage would be provided, as well as parking for 22nd Street Landing.

Opposite the dry stack facilities and fronting on the west channel, the project proposes a Marina Village Retail Center, which will comprise a mixture of interactive water and land uses. The new retail commercial complex will be anchored on the north by 42,000 square feet of retail space, and will include small shops and 25,000 square feet of office space, clustered around the pedestrian-oriented plaza. This plaza will also serve as a connection to the waterfront promenade and to a 10,000-square-foot theme restaurant. The project may also include dinner cruise and excursion boat docks at a point midway between the 22nd Street retail and channel retail/restaurants, large "mega-yacht" slips with state-of-the-art dockside amenities, and short-term docking for visitor use.

A Marina Club will be constructed along the waterfront adjacent to the village center, for those slip-holders interested in a shoreside gathering place. Amenities and activities will include a clubhouse with lockers, showers, restrooms, fitness facilities, and snack bar. Outdoor facilities will include a swimming pool, barbecue area, and garden patio for club members' festivities or private parties.

The southern portion of the site will be occupied by a yacht club and various storage and boater service facilities. These uses will encompass approximately 7.2 acres adjacent to the existing San Pedro Boat Works. Inclusive on the site will be yacht club facilities, dry stand boat storage for year-round operation, a launch area, and other boater-related services. A 20,000-square-foot marine self-storage facility will provide boaters with secure and convenient storage.

ES.4 Environmental Impacts

The LAHD determined that an EIR should be prepared for the proposed project. In addition, pursuant to Section 15065 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the EIR should identify any potentially significant adverse impacts and recommend mitigation that would reduce or eliminate these impacts to less-than-significant levels. This Recirculated Draft SEIR has been prepared to evaluate both potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project and how this project may cumulatively interact with other development projects in the surrounding area. Mitigation measures have been proposed to either reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts. A summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the proposed project is provided in Table ES-1.

ES.4.1 Impacts Not Considered in This Recirculated Draft SEIR

The scope of this Recirculated Draft SEIR was established based on the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation (IS/NOP) for the 1998 Draft SEIR (LAHD 1998), the analysis in the 1998 Draft SEIR, the original Draft EIR for the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex (LAHD 1980a), and comments received on these documents. In accordance with CEQA, issues found in the IS/NOP to have less-than-significant impacts, or no impact, do not require further

evaluation and are not addressed in this SEIR. Therefore, this Recirculated Draft SEIR does not address impacts to agricultural resources, mineral resources, or population and housing.

ES.4.2 Impacts of the Proposed Project

Based on the scoping process for the SEIR, the following issues have been determined to be potentially significant and are therefore evaluated in this Recirculated Draft SEIR:

- land use,
- transportation and circulation,
- meteorology and air quality,
- noise,
- aesthetics,
- light and glare,
- geology,
- groundwater, soils, and sediments
- water quality and oceanography,
- biota and habitats,
- cultural resources,
- public services and utilities,
- recreation, and
- risk of upset.

Chapters 3.1 through 3.14 discuss the issues found to have the potential to be significantly affected by the proposed project. These issues are discussed within each chapter, and mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level are proposed whenever possible. A summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts for the proposed project is provided in Table ES-1. Chapter 4 discusses "Environmental Justice" as an informational item.

Summary of Less-than-Significant Impacts

This Recirculated Draft SEIR addresses all potentially significant environmental impacts that were identified by the LAHD during the NOP, scoping process, and public review period for the 1998 Draft SEIR. After further study and environmental review, the following environmental impacts were determined to be less than significant in this Recirculated Draft SEIR:

- land use;
- light and glare;
- groundwater, soils, and sediments;
- public services and utilities;
- recreation; and
- risk of upset.

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

After further study and environmental review in the Recirculated Draft SEIR, the following environmental impacts were determined to be significant unless mitigation is incorporated into the proposed project. Mitigation measures were identified for the following environmental impacts, which reduced the magnitude to less-than-significant levels:

- transportation and circulation;
- noise;
- water quality and oceanography;
- biota and habitats; and
- cultural resources.

The mitigation measures that were identified to reduce these impacts are discussed in Chapter 3, and are summarized in Table ES-1.

Unavoidable Significant Adverse Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would result in significant impacts to:

- geology, from potential exposure to seismic hazards, and
- air quality, from generation of significant construction and operational emissions.

No feasible mitigation measures are available that would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Therefore, these impacts are considered significant and unavoidable.

Table ES-1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation for the Cabrillo Way Marina Project

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Land Use						
LU-1:	Project is Consistent with General Plan Land Use and Zoning Regulations	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
LU-2:	Project is Consistent with General Plan Goals and Policies, and the Broader Context of the General Plan and its Elements	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
LU-3:	Project Would Not Divide, Disrupt, or Isolate an Established Community, Neighborhood, or Land Uses	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
LU-4:	Project Would Not Result in Substantial Secondary Impacts Resulting in Land Use Incompatibility	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Transportation and Circulation					
TRANS-1: The Project Will Cause a Significant Increase in the V/C Ratio on Intersection Operating Conditions After the Addition of Project Traffic	Significant	MM TRANS-1: Implement Eastbound Intersection Improvement Measures for Harbor Boulevard and SR-47 ramps/Swinford Street To improve the intersection operation and to reduce the left-turn congestion on the northbound approach, a second left-turn lane shall be added to the northbound approach. The resulting lane configuration shall be two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one shared through/right-turn lane. This change shall include removing the raised median and re-striping the intersection.	Timing: Prior to or concurrent with the third phase of project construction. Methods: These measures shall be implemented by the Port in consultation with the LADOT and Caltrans. Assurance of implementation shall be provided to LADOT prior to commencement of the third phase of project construction, and shall consist of improvement plans and a construction schedule meeting the criteria set forth by LADOT and Caltrans.	LAHD Staff, LADOT, Caltrans	Less Than Significant
TRANS-2: The Project Would Not Result in Significant Freeway Capacity Impacts	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
TRANS-3: The Project Would Not Have a Significant Project Access Impact at the Intersections Nearest the Primary Site Access, Nor Would It Cause an Increase in the V/C Ratio On Intersection Operating Conditions After the Addition of Project Traffic, As Determined by Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Vehicular Safety Factors	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
TRANS-4: The Project Would Not Result in a Significant Transit Impact Since It Will Not Exceed Projected Available Transit Capacity	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
TRANS-5: The Project Would Not Result in a Significant Parking Impact Since the Project Provides More Parking than Needed, as Determined Through a Parking Demand Analysis	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
TRANS-6: The Project Would Not Result in Significant In-Street Construction Impacts Since it Would Not Cause Substantial Temporary Traffic Impacts, Temporary Loss of Access, or Temporary Loss of Bus Stops or Rerouting of Bus Lines	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
TRANS-7: The Project Would Not Result in Significant Maritime Traffic Impacts Since it Would Not Reduce Current Safety Levels for Vessels Navigating the Main Channel Area and/or the Project Vicinity	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Meteorology and Air Quality						
AQ-1:	The Project Would Result in Construction-Related Emissions that Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds	Significant	MM AQ-1 CARB-approved aqueous diesel fuels shall be used in lieu of diesel in all diesel-powered construction equipment where it is deemed feasible by the LAHD.	Timing: Throughout construction phases. Methods: These measures shall be incorporated into contract specifications for all construction work to reduce the impact of construction diesel emissions. The contractor shall adhere to these specifications throughout construction phases. Enforcement shall include oversight by the Port project manager or designated building inspectors to ensure compliance with contract specifications.	LAHD Staff, Contractor	Implementation of MM AQ-1 would reduce impacts of PM_{10} and NOx, but impacts from emissions of ROG and CO are not able to be reduced. Even with this mitigation measure, NOx emissions, along with ROG and CO are considered significant and unavoidable.
AQ-2:	Operational Emissions Would Exceed the SCAQMD Thresholds	Significant	No mitigation is available	N/A	N/A	Significant and Unavoidable
AQ-3:	The Project Would Not Result in an Exceedance or Incremental Increase of CO Standards	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AQ-4:	The Project Would Not Create an Objectionable Odor at the Nearest Sensitive Receptor	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
AQ-5:	The Project Would Not Expose Receptors to Significant Levels of Toxic Air Contaminants	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Noise						
NOI-1:	Construction Activities Lasting More Than One Day Would Exceed Existing Ambient Exterior Noise Levels by 10 dBA or More at Noise-Sensitive Land Uses	Significant	MM NOI-1: Employ Noise-Reducing Construction Practices. The following measures shall be incorporated into contract specifications for all construction work to reduce the impact of construction noise. ■ Noise-generating construction equipment operated at the project site should be equipped with effective noise control devices, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment should be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise (due to worn or improperly maintained parts) would be generated. ■ Effective temporary noise barriers should be used and relocated, as needed and whenever possible, to block line-of-sight between the construction equipment and the noise-sensitive receptors. Acoustic barriers will be installed around stationary construction noise sources.	Timing: Throughout construction phases. Methods: These measures shall be incorporated into contract specifications for all construction work to reduce the impact of construction noise. The contractor shall adhere to these specifications throughout construction phases. Enforcement shall include oversight by the LAHD project manager or designated building inspectors to ensure compliance with contract specifications.	LAHD Staff, Contractor	Less Than Significant

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
		■ Truck deliveries and haul-offs should only be permitted between the hours of 7 a.m. and 7 p.m., and should use approved haul routes that are away from noise-sensitive locations. ■ Noisier construction activities should be scheduled during midday so that quiet periods can be provided. ■ As directed by the City, the contractor shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to, changing the location of stationary construction equipment, shutting off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and temporarily relocating liveaboards. ■ A construction relations officer should be appointed by the applicant to act as a liaison with neighbors and residents concerning construction activity. The construction relations officer should notify the surrounding communities in advance of any and all construction activities. The liaison's			

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
		telephone number should also be provided with the notification so that community concerns can be communicated.			
NOI-2: Construction Activities Lasting More Than 10 Days in a 3-Month Period Would Exceed Existing Ambient Exterior Noise Levels by 5 dBA or More At Noise-Sensitive Uses	Significant	Implement Mitigation Measure MM NOI-1	See above.	See above.	Less Than Significant
NOI-3: Construction Activities Would Not Exceed the Ambient Noise Level by 5 dBA at a Noise-Sensitive Uses between the Hours of 9 p.m. and 7 a.m., Monday Through Friday, before 8 a.m. or after 6 p.m. on Saturday, or Any Time on Sunday	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
NOI-4: The Project Would Not Cause the Ambient Noise Level Measured at the Property Line of Affected Uses to Increase by 3 dBA in CNEL to a Level at or Above 70 dBA-CNEL at Single Family Residences	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
NOI-5: The Project Would Not Cause the Ambient Noise Level in CNEL Measured at the Property Line of Affected Uses to Increase by 5 dBA or More	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Light and Glare					
L&G-1: The Project Would Not Result in a Substantial Perceptible Change in Ambient Illumination Levels at Adjacent and Nearby Receptors	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
L&G-2: The Project Would Not Result in Substantial Spill Lighting to Adjacent or Nearby Properties	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
L&G-3: The Project Would Not Cause Shade-or Shadow-Sensitive Uses to be Shaded by Project-Related Structures for More Than Three Hours Between the Hours Of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time (between Late October And Early April), or for More Than Four Hours Between the Hours Of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (between Early April And Late October)	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Aesthetics					
AES-1: The Project would not Remove, Alter, or Demolish a Significant Proportion of Existing Features or Elements That Substantially Contribute to the Valued Visual or Image of a Neighborhood, Community, or Localized Area	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-2: The Project Would Not Grade or Develop a Substantial Amount of Natural Open Space	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	No Impact

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
AES-3: The Project Does Not Involve the Integration of Structures in Natural Open Space Areas	No Impact	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	No Impact
AES-4: The Project Would Not Substantially Contrast with Existing Features That Represent the Area's Valued Aesthetic Image	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-5: The Project Would Not Result in Buildings That Would Detract from the Existing Style or Image of the Area Due to Density, Height, Bulk, Setbacks, Signage, or Other Physical Elements	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-6: The Project Would Not Substantially Degrade the Area's Aesthetic Value	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-7: The Project Would Be Consistent with Applicable Guidelines and Regulations	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-8: The Project Would Not Degrade or Interfere with Recognized or Valued Views	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
AES-9: The Project Would Not Adversely Affect Views from a Designated Scenic Highway, Corridor, or Parkway	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-10: The Project Would Not Block, Interrupt, or Substantially Diminish Important Views That Are Available to the Community	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
AES-11: The Project Would Not Adversely Affect Recognized Views Available from a Length of Public Roadways, Bike Paths, or Trails	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Geology					
GEO-1: The Project Would Not Cause or Accelerate Geologic Hazards Which Would Result in Substantial Damage to Structures or Infrastructure	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
GEO-2: The Project Could Expose People to Substantial Risk or Injury	Significant	No mitigation is available.	N/A	N/A	Significant and unavoidable
GEO-3: The Project Would Not Constitute a Geologic Hazard to Properties by Causing or Accelerating Instability from Erosion	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
GEO-4: The Project Would Not Result in the Destruction, Permanent Covering, or Material and Adverse Modification of One or More Distinct and Prominent Geologic or Topographic Features	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Groundwater, Soils, and Sediments					
SOIL-1: The Project Would Not Change Potable Groundwater Levels Sufficiently to Reduce the Ability of a Water Utility to Use the Groundwater Basin for Public Water Supplies, Conjunctive Use Purposes, Storage of Imported Water, Summer/Winter Peaking, or to Respond to Emergencies and Drought; Reduce Yields of Adjacent Wells or Well Fields (Public or Private); or Adversely Change the Rate or Direction of Flow of Groundwater	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
SOIL-2: The Project Would Not Result in Demonstrable and Sustained Reduction of Groundwater Recharge Capacity	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
SOIL-3: The Project Would Not Affect the Rate or Change the Direction of Movement of Existing Contaminants; Expand the Area Affected by Contaminants; Result in an Increased Level of Groundwater Contamination (Including that from Direct Percolation, Injection, or Saltwater Intrusion); or Cause Regulatory Water Quality Standards at an Existing Production Well to be Violated, as Defined in the CCR, Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 15 and in the Safe Drinking Water Act	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
SOIL-4: The Project Would Not Increase the Frequency or Severity of an Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
SOIL-5: The Project Would Not Accelerate Natural Processes of Wind and Water Erosion and Sedimentation, Resulting in Sediment Runoff or Deposition Which Would Not be Contained or Controlled On site	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Water Quality and Oceanography					
WQ-1: The Project Would not Cause Discharges That Create a Pollution, Contamination, or Nuisance as Defined in Section 13050 of the California Water Code	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
WQ-2: The Project Would not Result in Discharges That Violate Standards Defined in the Applicable NPDES Permit or Water Quality Control Plan for the Receiving Water Body	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
WQ-3: The Project Could Potentially Release Toxic Substances That Would Be Deleterious to Human, Fish, Bird, or Plant Life	Significant	MM WQ-3.1: Obtain certification under the Non-Point Source (NPS) Pollution Control Program The project applicant shall design above ground fuel tanks in accordance with the Marina and Recreational Boating Management Measures defined under the State Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).	Timing: Prior to construction. Methods: The project applicant shall design above ground fuel tanks in accordance with the Marina and Recreational Boating Management Measures defined under the State Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program administered by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).	LAHD, SWRCB	Less Than Significant

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
		MM WQ-3.2: Develop an approved Source Control Program Prior to their construction, Westrec Marinas will develop an approved Source Control Program (SCP) for the aboveground fuel tanks in accordance with LAHD guidelines established in the General Marine Oil Terminal Lease Renewal Program (Appendix J). The SCP will address immediate leak detection, tank inspection, and tank repair.			
WQ-4: The Project Would not Cause Creation of Site Conditions Which May Result in Soil Erosion and Sediment Runoff During Construction or Following Project Completion	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
WQ-5: The Project Would not Result in Permanent Adverse Impacts to Water Circulation as a Result of the Project	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
WQ-6: The Project Would not Substantially Reduce or Increase the Amount of Surface Water in Los Angeles Harbor	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Biota and Habitats					
BIO-1: The Project Would Not Result in the Loss of Individuals, or the Reduction of Existing Habitat, of a State or Federal Listed Endangered, Threatened, Rare, Protected, Candidate, or Sensitive Species or a Species of Special Concern	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
BIO-2. The Project Would Not Result in the Loss of Individuals or the Reduction of Existing Habitat of a Locally Designated Species or a Reduction in a Locally Designated Natural Habitat or Plant Community	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
BIO-3. The Project Would Not Interfere with Wildlife Movement/Migration Corridors That May Diminish the Chances for Long-Term Survival of a Sensitive Species	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
BIO-4. The Project Would Not Alter an Existing Wetland Habitat	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
BIO-5. The Project Would Not Interfere with Habitat Such That Normal Species Behaviors are Disturbed (e.g., from the Introduction of Noise or Light) to a Degree That May Diminish the Chances for Long-Term Survival of a Sensitive Species	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
BIO-6: The Project Would Not Result in Permanent Deterioration or Contamination of the Aquatic Habitat Such That the Aquatic Ecosystem of the Harbor is Substantially Disrupted	Significant	MM BIO-6: Offset Habitat Loss with the LAHD Inner Harbor Mitigation Bank The LAHD shall replace the loss of 2.4 acres of habitat by deducting 2.4 acres from the Inner Harbor Mitigation Bank (or the Bolsa Chica mitigation Bank).	Timing: Prior to construction. Methods: Deduction of habitat from the Inner Harbor Mitigation Bank or Bolsa Chica Mitigation Bank would constitute replacement of habitat. The LAHD shall provide the administrative functions to accomplish this mitigation.	LAHD	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Cultural Resources					
CULT-1. The Project Would Not Involve the Physical Demolition, Destruction, Relocation, or Alteration of a Significant Historic Resource or Its Immediate Surroundings Such That the Significance o an Historical Resource Would be Materially Impaired	Significant	MM CULT-1: Stop Work if Cultural Resources are Encountered as a Result of Project Construction If any artifact or an unusual amount of bone, shell, or nonnative stone is uncovered during project activities, work should be halted in that area so that a professionally qualified archaeologist can determine the significance of the find. If human bone is uncovered, the Los Angeles County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento should be contacted immediately. If human remains are discovered in any location other than a designated cemetery, there should be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: ■ the county coroner has been informed and has determined that no investigation of the cause of death is required; and ■ if the remains are of Native American origin, ❑ the descendants of the deceased Native	Timing: During project construction Methodology: The project contractor shall stop work if any potential archaeological resources are encountered. The LAHD shall retain a qualified archaeologist to determine the nature and sensitivity of the find. Work shall not resume until the find is properly evaluated, and if necessary, recorded and property archived. In the event that human remains are discovered, the contractor shall immediately contact the County Coroner to determine the proper course of action. Work shall not resume until the site receives proper clearance from the County Coroner.	LAHD Staff, Project Contractor	Less Than Significant

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
			Americans have made a recommendation to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work regarding the means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, or ❑ the NAHC was unable to identify a descendant or the descendant failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the NAHC.			
Public Services and Utilities						
PS-1:	The Project Would Not Result in a Land Use That Would Exceed the Service Capacity and Require the Construction of New Facilities or Hiring of New Personnel Within the LAPD or Port Police	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
PS-2:	The Project Would Not Result in a Land Use That Would Exceed the Service Capacity and Require the Construction of New Facilities or Hiring of New Personnel Within the LAFD	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-3:	The Project Would Not Result in a Land Use That Would Exceed the Service Capacity and Require the Construction of New Facilities or Hiring of New Personnel Within the USCG	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-4:	The Project Would Not Create a Demand for Water Resources that Would Exceed the Existing Capacity of the LADWP to Serve the Proposed Project	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-5:	The Project Would Not Require the Construction and Installation of New Water Infrastructure Such as Water Purification Plants or Large Pump Stations Needed to Serve the Project	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact		Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
PS-6:	The Project Would Not Result in the Production of Waste Water Flows That Would Exceed the Capacity of Any Wastewater Treatment Plant That Would Serve the Proposed Project	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-7:	The Project Would not Result in the Production of Solid Waste in Volumes That Would Exceed the Protected Capacity of Any Landfills, Dump Truck Route, or Recycling Facility That Would Serve the Proposed Project	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-8:	The Project Would Comply With All Applicable Policies or Regulations Pertaining to Solid Waste Set Forth in Any Pertinent Document	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-9:	The Project Would Not Result in a Demand for Natural Gas, Electrical Services, or Fossil Fuels That is Greater Than Existing Supply, or Require the Construction of New Off site Facilities	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
PS-10: The Project Would Not Result in the Construction of Needed Infrastructure Not Anticipated By Adopted Plan	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
PS-11: The Project Will Result in a Project Design That Incorporates Energy Conservation Measures That Meet or Exceed City Requirements	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
Recreation					
REC-1: The Project Would Not Increase the Use of Existing Neighborhood and Regional Parks or Other Recreational Facilities Such That Substantial Physical Deterioration of the Facility Would Occur or Be Accelerated	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
REC-2: The Project Would Not Include Recreational Facilities or Require the Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities That Might Have an Adverse Physical Effect on the Environment	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
Risk of Upset					
UPSET-1: The Proposed Project Would Comply with Applicable Regulations and Policies Guiding Development Within the Port	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
UPSET-2: The Proposed Project Would Not Increase the Probable Frequency and Severity of Consequences to People or Property from Exposure to Health Hazards as a Result of a Potential Accidental Release or Explosion of a Hazardous Substance	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant
UPSET-3: Construction or Operation Activities Would Not Substantially Interfere with Emergency Response Plans or Emergency Evacuation Plans, Thereby Increasing Risk of Injury or Death	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Table ES-1. Continued

Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measure	Timing and Method of Mitigation	Responsible Parties	Residual Impacts
UPSET-4: The Project Would Not Increase the Frequency or Severity of an Accidental Release or Explosion of Hazardous Materials, Thereby Increasing Risk of Injury or Death	Less Than Significant	No mitigation is required.	N/A	N/A	Less Than Significant

Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project was analyzed in conjunction with other projects in the area. The proposed project was found to result in cumulatively considerable impacts to air quality and traffic.

Growth-Inducing Impacts

The proposed project would not have a growth-inducing impact on surrounding areas. Although the project would lead to more intensive development of an area currently underutilized, this would not stimulate significant economic or population growth, remove obstacles to population growth, or necessitate the construction of new community facilities that would lead to additional growth in the surrounding area.

Significant Irreversible Changes to the Environment

The proposed project would require the use of non-renewable resources, such as lumber, metal alloys, and aggregate resources, for the physical construction components of the project. However, the project does not represent an uncommon construction project that uses an extraordinary amount of raw materials in comparison to other urban development projects of a similar scope and magnitude.

The proposed project would develop the site for recreational/commercial activities. Resources that are committed irreversibly and irretrievably are those that would be used by a project on a long-term or permanent basis. Resources committed to this project include habitats, air quality, fossil fuels, capital, labor, and construction materials such as rock, concrete, and gravel.

Fossil fuels and energy would be consumed during construction and operation activities. Fossil fuels in the forms of diesel oil and gasoline would be used for construction equipment and vehicles. During operations, diesel oil and gasoline would be used by vehicles and recreational boaters. Electrical energy and natural gas would be consumed during construction and operation. These energy resources would be irretrievable and irreversible.

Commitments of other resources that could occur include loss of habitat for marine life and degradation of air quality during construction and operation of the project. Construction materials such as rock and gravel, which would be required to construct the facilities, would be irretrievably committed for the life of the project.

Non-recoverable materials and energy would be used during construction and operational activities, but the amounts needed are easily accommodated by existing supplies. Although the increase in the amount of materials and energy

used would be insignificant, they would nevertheless be unavailable for other uses.

ES.5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

CEQA states that an EIR must address "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which are ostensibly feasible and could attain the basic objectives of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." Based on the project objectives, several alternatives were initially considered; some were eliminated and others were analyzed in this Recirculated Draft SEIR.

ES.5.1 Alternatives Considered

During the preparation of the Recirculated Draft SEIR, the LAHD developed several alternatives to the proposed project for consideration. These included the following:

- **Alternative 1. No-Project Alternative**
  - **Alternative 1A. No-Project/No-Build Alternative.** No construction would take place and the project site would remain in its current condition.
  - **Alternative 1B. No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative.** The proposed project would not be constructed, and the project area would be developed with commercial, industrial, and recreational uses associated with the marina.
- **Alternative 2. Mirror Image Marina Development with Limited Retail.** The Phase II Precise Plan for the West Channel/Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex originally proposed in 1987 would be implemented.
- **Alternative 3. 1998 Cabrillo Marina Phase II Proposal.** Development would proceed as envisioned and analyzed in the 1998 Draft SEIR, including commercial, retail, and waterside components.
- **Alternative 4. Modified 1998 Proposal.** This alternative is nearly the same as the Cabrillo Marina Phase II development proposed in 1998, and also very similar to the proposed project. However, this alternative retains the existing fruit warehouse east of the project site, along the East Channel, and includes minor reconfiguration of the site plan.
- **Alternative 5. Alternative Location.** This alternative would include development of the project facilities at an alternative location to the West Channel area, including other coastal sites throughout southern California.

ES.5.2 Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration

As discussed above, the EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible and, therefore, merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible. Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or the effects of which cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126[f][2]). Alternatives may be eliminated from detailed consideration in the EIR if they fail to meet most of the project objectives, are infeasible, or do not avoid any significant environmental effects (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]). The following alternatives were determined to be infeasible and were eliminated from further consideration in this Recirculated Draft EIR (additional details regarding reasons for rejection are included in Chapter 6):

- **Alternative 3. 1998 Cabrillo Marina Phase II Proposal.** Development would proceed as envisioned and analyzed in the 1998 Draft SEIR, including commercial, retail, and waterside components.
- **Alternative 5. Alternative Location.** This alternative would include development of the project facilities at an alternative location to the West Channel area, including other coastal sites throughout southern California.

ES.5.3 Alternatives Analyzed in This EIR

Chapter 6 of this Recirculated Draft SEIR contains a more detailed comparative analysis of the alternatives that were found to achieve the project objectives, are considered ostensibly feasible, and may reduce environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. Table ES-2 provides a summary of the impact analysis of the alternatives.

Table ES-2. Comparison of Alternatives* to the Proposed Project

Environmental Issue Area	Alt 1A	Alt. 1B	Alt. 2	Alt. 4
Geology	-1	0	0	0
Groundwater, Soil, and Sediments	+1	0	+1	0
Air Quality	-1	+1	-1	0
Water Quality and Oceanography	+1	+1	0	0
Biota and Habitats	-1	0	-1	+1
Noise	-1	+1	-1	0
Land Use	0	0	+1	0
Risk of Upset	0	+1	0	0
Transportation and Circulation	-1	+1	-1	0
Public Services and Utilities	-1	0	0	0
Light and Glare	-1	+1	0	0
Visual Resources and Aesthetics	+1	+1	-1	0
Recreation	+1	+1	+1	0
Cultural Resources	-1	0	0	0
Total	-4	+8	-2	+1

Notes:
* Alternatives Eliminated from Further Consideration are not included.
(-1) = Impact considered to be less when compared with the proposed project.
(0) = Impact considered to be equal to the proposed project.
(+1) = Impact considered to be greater when compared with the proposed project.

ES.5.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

An EIR must identify the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project. The No-Project Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project on the basis of the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. The CEQA Guidelines require that, if the No-Project Alternative is found to be environmentally superior, "the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives" (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6[c]).

Based on the assessment included in Chapter 6, Alternative 2 (Mirror Image Marina Development With Limited Retail) would be considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative. As shown in Table ES-2 above, this alternative would result in some impacts that are greater than and some impacts that are less than those of the proposed project. This alternative represents an overall net decrease in impacts when compared to the proposed project. All other alternatives would result in a net increase in total environmental impacts when compared to the proposed project.

ES.6 Areas of Controversy

A number of issues were raised by agencies and the public during the public comment period for the original 1998 Draft SEIR.

A primary issue raised by the public pertains to the boat launch project components. Though unrelated to the need for redevelopment of the existing Cabrillo Way Marina, these aspects of the project are being considered as a result of several requests from the public constituency to address the need for a public boat-launching site.

The public has, on several occasions, expressed a desire to have the LAHD provide a public boat launching facility in order to allow members of the community the opportunity to launch trailered boats, and to alleviate traffic and overcrowding around the existing Cabrillo Beach boat launch ramp. Primarily on weekend mornings, vehicle queuing at the entrance to Cabrillo Beach often inhibits residential access and circulation along Stephen M. White Drive.

Therefore, in order to address the boaters' contribution to local congestion at the existing ramp, the LAHD is proposing to work with the Department of Recreation and Parks to develop a dedicated access for all incoming boater traffic, as well as a launch reservation system to distribute vehicle trips throughout the peak demand hours. The new boat launch siting study is intended as a first step toward addressing the demand for additional launch capacity.

ES.7 Issues to be Resolved

Section 15123(b)(3) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain issues to be resolved; this includes the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. The major issues to be resolved within the proposed project include decisions by the lead agency as to whether:

1. this Recirculated Draft SEIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the project;
2. the benefits of the project override its environmental impacts;
3. the size and scope of the proposed project is compatible with the character of the surrounding area;
4. the recommended mitigation measures should be adopted or modified;
5. additional mitigation measures need to be applied to the project;
6. the project should or should not be approved for construction; or
7. one project alternative is clearly preferable both to the proposed project and the other alternatives.