SECTION SUMMARY

This section characterizes the existing parks and recreational resources in the proposed Project area and assesses how the construction and operation of the proposed Project or alternatives would potentially impact those resources and services.

Section 3.12, Recreation, provides the following:

- A description of existing recreational facilities and services serving the Port;
- A description of existing recreational regulations and policies;
- A discussion on the methodology used to determine whether the proposed Project or alternatives would result in an impact to recreational resources;
- An impact analysis of both the proposed Project and alternatives; and,
- A description of any mitigation measures proposed to reduce any potential impacts, as applicable.

Key Points of Section 3.12:

The proposed Project or alternatives would increase operations of the existing container terminal, consistent with other container terminals and land uses in the proposed Project area. The proposed Project or alternatives would not increase population or employees within the Project area that would increase the demand for recreational services. The proposed Project would result in an increase in annual vessel calls from approximately 247 in the CEQA baseline year (July 2008 through June 2009) and 286 in the NEPA baseline to 390 in year 2027; however, this increase would not affect recreational marine activities because vessel travel lanes in the Main Channel would remain open for use by recreational vessels. Access of unpermitted recreational vessels in the Pier 300 Channel is currently restricted and would remain so with the proposed Project or alternatives. Accordingly, the proposed Project or alternatives would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing parks or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities. Consequently, neither the proposed Project nor any of the alternatives would result in a significant impact to recreational resources under CEQA or NEPA.

The noise impact analysis in Section 3.11, Noise, identified the Al Larson Marina (nearest recreational resource) as a sensitive receptor that could potentially be impacted by construction-related noise. Nighttime dredging of Berth 306 would result in a noise level increase by less than 2 dBA, which is below the significance criteria. Although construction-related noise would indirectly impact the
recreational activities at the Al Larson Marina, MM NOI-1 (which requires the contractor to use a pile
driving system with a sound insulation system) and MM NOI-2 (which requires the contractor to erect
temporary noise attenuation barriers suitable for pile driving equipment, as necessary), would be
implemented for the proposed Project and Alternatives 5 and 6. Consequently, it is not anticipated that
construction activities would cause a substantial loss or diminish the quality of recreational facilities.
3.12.1 Introduction

This section addresses the environmental and regulatory setting for recreational resources within the Port area and Project vicinity. This section also evaluates potential impacts to parks or recreational facilities that could occur as a result of implementing the proposed Project or an alternative.

3.12.2 Environmental Setting

3.12.2.1 Port of Los Angeles

The Port offers recreational opportunities to the public in many different areas. Within the Port there are 17 marinas, providing approximately 6,000 slips for pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels. Sailing, boating, scuba diving, fishing, water skiing, swimming, sightseeing, and waterside entertainment are common recreational activities inside the San Pedro Breakwater and Middle Breakwater. Continued leisure-time use of Port waters is an important component in the continuing development of the Port. Community facilities include a waterfront youth center, a small-boat launch ramp, and a public swimming beach (Cabrillo Beach). The youth center serves nonprofit organizations and provides aquatic activities, overnight camping facilities, and educational programs. Recreational facilities within the immediate vicinity of the Port include open-water, the Main and West Channel Marinas, Cabrillo and Cabrillo Way Marina, Cabrillo Marine Aquarium, Los Angeles Maritime Institute, the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, the S.S. Lane Victory, the Ralph J. Scott Fireboat Museum, and Catalina Express facilities among others (POLA, 2010). Approximately 0.5 mile of waterfront along the Main Channel is devoted exclusively to commercial tourist-oriented activities, including the Ports O' Call Village, located at Berths 75-83, offering specialty shopping and dining. All of these recreational resources are located along the San Pedro waterfront, which, according to the San Pedro Waterfront Project Final EIS/EIR, is expected to be redeveloped during the next 5-7 years (USACE and LAHD, 2009).

The Port also contains cruise ship docking and loading/unloading facilities (approximately one mile north west of the Project area) at the Berth 86-95, which are expected to be upgraded through implementation of the San Pedro Waterfront project (USACE and LAHD, 2009). The cruise ship terminal is strictly utilitarian in nature, in which all passenger-oriented vessels embark for a major recreational destination primarily outside of the Port. Therefore, the cruise ship terminal is not considered a recreational resource due to its utilitarian means of transport. The proposed Project would not have an effect on cruise ship activity (i.e., it would not affect cruise ship terminals or block cruise ship travel in the Harbor, or affect cruise ship activities outside the Harbor).

The Port and the areas surrounding the Port have recreational facilities accessible by land and water. The on-land recreational opportunities include the red car trolley, parks, and museums. The Waterfront Red Car line is a 1.5 mile historic trolley line that serves the attractions along the San Pedro waterfront, including stops at the LA Cruise Terminal, 6th Street Downtown, Ports O' Call, and 22nd Street Marina. San Pedro Plaza Park is a long, narrow park, which occurs along the east side of Beacon Street Bluff, extending along the central San Pedro waterfront. John S. Gibson Jr. Park is located on Harbor Boulevard between 5th and 6th Streets on the east side of Harbor Boulevard in San Pedro. This
landscaped park is unstaffed and contains a number of memorials including the Fishermen’s Memorial and the Merchant Marine Memorial (City of Los Angeles, 2010). Bloch Field is located on the east side of Harbor Boulevard, by 16th Street and Crescent Avenue. It includes a lawn area and a baseball field, and is used by the Los Angeles YMCA to host public sporting events, including baseball league tryouts in March, and baseball games from April through June (YMCA, 2008). Knoll Hill, located near the Vincent Thomas Bridge on Front Street, also includes three baseball fields and an off-leash dog park. The immediate Project area, which includes Berths 302-305, has been developed for Port-related industrial uses and is not used for recreational purposes. The closest educational/recreational facilities are the Cabrillo Aquarium, which is located approximately 1.8 miles southwest of the backland area behind Berth 301, and the Maritime Museum, which is located approximately one mile west of the proposed Project (measured at the nearest improvement, which is the modified Earle Street Gate). See Figure 3.12-1 for the location of on-land park and recreational facilities.

Much of the Port’s recreational activities occur at the Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex, which is a 370-acre area located along the southwestern boundary of the Port. The beach has a unique configuration that gives it two distinct sides: Outer Cabrillo Beach and Inner Cabrillo Beach. The Outer Beach, which is not protected by the harbor breakwater and is exposed to the open ocean, is used for swimming, scuba diving, windsurfing, fishing, whale watching, and kite surfing. The Inner Beach, which occurs within the San Pedro Breakwater, is used for sunbathing, beachcombing, windsurfing, swimming, volleyball, and wading.

Recreational fishing is an important activity within the Outer Harbor area of the Port and San Pedro Bay. Fishing occurs most frequently at the Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier along the San Pedro Breakwater, near the Los Angeles side of the Middle Breakwater and the area at the bottom of Point Fermin Park, and offshore. Offshore sportfishing and charter opportunities are available through the Los Angeles Harbor. Sportfishing within the Los Angeles Harbor is located at Berth 79 and offers a variety of deep-sea and barge fishing opportunities (SanPedro.com, 2010). The 22nd Street Landing is the major commercial sportfishing facility, offering year-round services and operating with a fleet of approximately seven vessels.

Pleasure craft slips in the Harbor are located within several marinas: Al Larson Marina in Fish Harbor and several marinas in the West Channel and East Basin area. The West Channel marinas include: Cabrillo Marina – 885 slips; Cabrillo Way Marina – 515 slips; Cabrillo Beach Yacht Club – 200+ slips; and Holiday Harbor Marina – 300 slips. These facilities are located approximately one mile southwest of the backland area behind Berth 301 and are hereafter referred to as “West Channel marinas”. The Cabrillo Way Marina slips are being upgraded under both the Cabrillo Way Marina Project, documented in the Final Supplemental EIR (LAHD, 2003) and the San Pedro Waterfront Project documented in Final EIS/EIR (USACE and LAHD, 2009). Specifically, slips would be eliminated along the west side of the Main Channel and replaced in Cabrillo Way Marina under the San Pedro Waterfront Project. Details regarding facilities available at the Al Larson Marina are discussed in the next section.

Figure 3.12-2 identifies existing water-related recreational areas and facilities within the Port and proposed Project vicinity.
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3.12.2.2 Proposed Project Vicinity

As shown in Figure 3.12-2, the nearest facility to the proposed Project site associated with recreation is the Al Larson Marina, which is located in Fish Harbor, adjacent to and between 300 and 900 ft west of the proposed Project site. The Al Larson Marina consists of a network of floating docks and fingers, which form mooring slips for recreational powerboats, sailboats, and yachts. There are a total of 128 rental slips and 17 rental moorings/anchorages for liveaboard and guest slips. The marina currently accommodates a mix of commercial and pleasure craft up to 50 ft in length, both power and sail.

3.12.3 Applicable Regulations

The proposed Project area is governed by federal, state, and city land use regulations. All proposed Project activities would be conducted in designated industrial areas located within the jurisdiction of the Port. The Port Master Plan (PMP), the California Coastal Act of 1976, and the City of Los Angeles General Plan (including community plans) include recreation-related goals, objectives, and policies that are applicable to the proposed Project.

3.12.3.1 Port Master Plan and California Coastal Act

Written to guide development within the Port, the PMP was certified in 1979, and was most recently revised in November 2009 (POLA, 1979 with amendments).

1. Information available at: http://www.portoflosangeles.org/planning/masterplan.asp
The zoning designation is heavy industrial use ([Q] M3) (City of Los Angeles, 2001). The land uses for this area are container transport, storage, and repacking. Therefore, future land uses within the PA would be consistent with those prescribed by the PMP. The PMP defines recreation as uses that “include water-oriented parks, marinas, and related facilities, small craft launching ramps, museums, youth camping and water oriented facilities, public beaches, public fishing piers, and sportfishing”. The PMP also provides development areas for recreational uses in PA 6 of the Port (near the East Basin). One of the principles of the Port-wide Transportation Master Plan is to Conserve Open Space, Natural Resources, and the Environment. The principle encourages planners and developers to “focus new development in existing communities and areas appropriately planned for growth, while protecting air and water quality, conserving wildlife habitat, natural landscapes, floodplains, and water recharge areas.

The California Coastal Act of 1976 identifies a number of policies pertaining to recreation; however, only Section 30220 is the applicable policy for the proposed Project. Section 30220 of the California Coastal Act identifies that coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities shall be protected if such uses cannot be readily provided at inland water areas.

3.12.3.2 Community Plans

Although the proposed Project would be outside the San Pedro and Wilmington Community Plan planning areas, both contain recreational policies that pertain to recreation in the Port.

In the San Pedro Community Plan, Policy 19-1 recognizes the Port as a regional resource and the predominant influence on the economic well-being of the San Pedro Community (City of Los Angeles, 1999a). It further promotes the continued development of the Port so as to meet the needs of the fishing industry, recreational users, and the handling of passengers and cargo, with special emphasis on the accommodation of increasingly larger ships.

The Wilmington Community Plan puts forth policies to facilitate coordination of Port development to provide community access to recreational waterfront areas (City of Los Angeles, 1999b). Recreation and park facilities and open space goals and policies are outlined in the Wilmington Community Plan; however, no goals and policies are pertinent or relate directly to the proposed Project.

3.12.3.3 Controlled Navigation Areas

The Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners has approved adding Controlled Navigation Areas (CNAs) to Tariff No. 4, an amendment that has restricted entry of recreational boats into certain areas of the Port without a permit issued by the Port Police. Creation of CNAs is aimed at ensuring navigational safety of large commercial vessels by reducing nonessential boating traffic while increasing waterside security by limiting access to commercial or permitted vessels (POLA, 2010). The purpose of the CNAs is to exercise a level of control over the thousands of recreational vessels using the Harbor to control waterside access to facilities. The Coast Guard and members of the intelligence community (i.e., defense agencies within the Department of Homeland Security [DHS]) have identified the need to control small vessels due to their potential use as a means to transport waterborne improvised explosive devices. The CNAs are a component of a
larger program involving signs, shoreside and waterside cameras, and an increased
waterborne presence by the Port Police. The goal of the program is to deter pier-side
incursions to commercial facilities, or attacks on large vessels or cruise ships by small
vessels.

The Pier 300 Channel is designated as a CNA; therefore, unpermitted recreational vessels
are restricted from the area (POLA, 2010). The CNA designation would not result in
Project effects to recreational resources, but potential impacts related to the CNA from a
security or risk perspective are addressed in Section 3.8, Hazards and Hazardous
Materials.

3.12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.12.4.1 Methodology

Per the L. A. CEQA Thresholds Guide, potential impacts to recreational resources are
evaluated by determining the net population increase as a result of the proposed project,
and identification of the recreational facilities that would be used by residents in the
project vicinity (City of Los Angeles, 2006). However, development of the proposed
Project would not result in any net population increase and, therefore, would not result in
any direct impact on the demand for recreation and parks. As explained in Chapter 7,
Socioeconomics, the proposed Project would not induce growth or population migration.
Anticipated construction and operational employees, projected by the terminal operator,
would be drawn from the existing local labor pool within the Los Angeles Basin. The
proposed Project would not result in impacts to recreational resources associated with
population increases in adjacent communities such as Wilmington and San Pedro,
because no increase in population would occur. Therefore, the proposed Project would
not use net population or demand for recreational services as part of the methodology to
evaluate the impact to recreational resources.

Impacts on recreational facilities were assessed by determining if the proposed Project or
alternative would result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing
park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities. Potential impacts
to existing recreational opportunities from construction and operation of the proposed
Project are evaluated qualitatively. The potential recreational impacts of the proposed
Project and alternatives were evaluated by comparing the baseline conditions to the
anticipated proposed project (or alternative) effects. Analysis includes adverse impacts
resulting from construction as well as beneficial effects on the quality of the recreational
resources that would be enhanced by the proposed Project.

3.12.4.1.1 CEQA Baseline

Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines requires EIRs to include a description of the
physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of a project that exist at the time of the
NOP. These environmental conditions normally would constitute the baseline physical
conditions by which the CEQA lead agency determines if an impact is significant. For
purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline for determining the significance of
potential Project impacts is the environmental set of conditions that prevailed at the time
the NOP was published for the proposed Project - July 2009. The CEQA baseline takes
into account the throughput for the 12-month period preceding July 2009 (July 2008
through the end of June 2009) in order to provide a representative characterization of
activity levels throughout the year. The CEQA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.6.1. The CEQA baseline for this proposed Project includes approximately 1.13 million TEUs per year, 998,728 annual truck trips, and 247 annual ship calls that occurred on the 291-acre APL Terminal in the year prior to and including June 2009.

The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time and differs from the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1) in that the No Project Alternative addresses what is likely to happen at the proposed Project site over time, starting from the existing conditions. Therefore, the No Project Alternative allows for growth at the proposed Project site that could be expected to occur without additional approvals, whereas the CEQA baseline does not.

**3.12.4.1.2 NEPA Baseline**

For purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. The NEPA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.6.2. Briefly, the NEPA baseline condition for determining significance of impacts includes the full range of construction and operational activities the applicant could implement and is likely to implement absent a federal action, in this case the issuance of a USACE permit. The NEPA baseline includes minor terminal improvements in the upland area (i.e., conversion of a portion of the dry container storage unit area to reefers and utility infrastructure), operation of the 291-acre container terminal, and assumes that by 2027, the terminal (Berths 302 to 305) handles up to approximately 2.15 million TEUs annually and accommodates 286 annual ships calls and 2,336 on-way rail trips, without any federal action. Because the NEPA baseline is dynamic, it includes different levels of terminal operations at each study year (2012, 2015, 2020, 2025, and 2027).

Unlike the CEQA baseline, which is defined by conditions at a point in time, the NEPA baseline is not bound by statute to a “flat” or “no-growth” scenario. Therefore, the USACE could project increases in operations over the life of a project to properly describe the NEPA baseline condition. Normally, any federal permit decision would focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project to the aquatic environment, as well as indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be within the scope of federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed Project or alternative under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or alternative to the NEPA baseline (i.e., the increment).

The NEPA baseline, for purposes of this Draft EIS/EIR, is the same as the No Federal Action Alternative. Under the No Federal Action Alternative, only minor terminal improvements (utility infrastructure, and conversion of dry container storage to refrigerated container storage) would occur, but no new cranes would be added, and the terminal configuration would remain as it was configured in 2008 (291 acres, 12 A-frame cranes, and a 4,000-ft wharf). However, forecasted increases in cargo throughput and annual ship calls would still occur as container growth occurs.

**3.12.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

As discussed above, the determination of significance for recreational impacts in the *L. A. CEQA Thresholds Guide* is typically implemented for projects that would result in a potential net population increase as well as for projects that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have a physical effect on the environment (City of Los Angeles, 2006). The proposed Project (and alternatives)
would not include an increase in net population, nor would it require the construction of new, or expansion of existing recreational facilities. However, because recreational resources are located adjacent to and within the vicinity of the proposed Project site, impacts to recreational resources are analyzed. The threshold below was formulated to determine significant impacts to recreational resources, as a result of the proposed Project or alternative. There are no specific NEPA thresholds associated with recreation. The effects of a Project or alternative on recreation are considered to be significant if:

REC-1: A project or alternative would increase the usage of existing parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated, or include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

3.12.4.3 Impact Determination

3.12.4.3.1 Proposed Project

Impact REC-1: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

The proposed Project is limited to on-site redevelopment and adjacent improvements (i.e., 41-acre backland development), and in-water and over-water construction activities at Berth 306. Construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to result in substantial population growth that could substantially increase demand for recreational services because the proposed Project is intended to accommodate the shipment of goods into and out of the Port, unlike a residential development project that actually increases housing stock. The operation of the proposed Project would result in the employment of up to 2,152 workers by 2027, which is not considered a substantial number in light of an estimated 4.3 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010). In addition, most new terminal employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area and are likely to reside proximate to the Project area. Because the new terminal employees would be filled locally, the new employees would not generate substantial new demand for recreational or park services that would in turn result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities.

The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the proposed Project site (west boundary). Other park and recreational facilities in the Project area are located approximately one mile west along Harbor Boulevard and the Main Channel, and include the San Pedro Plaza Park, John S. Gibson Jr. Park, and the Los Angeles Maritime Institute and Museum. The next nearest water-related recreational opportunities and facilities are located approximately one to two miles southwest of the proposed Project site, and include the West Channel and East Basin marinas (pleasure craft) and the Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex area (swimming, scuba diving, and jet skiing), and the Cabrillo Beach Fishing Pier (angling).

The proposed Project is limited to on-site redevelopment and improvements, and in-water and over-water construction activities at Berth 306. Construction activities would require the use of marine-based and upland equipment. See Section 3.9, Marine Transportation, for details of the water-related construction equipment and Section 2.5.2 in Chapter 2,
3.12 Project Description, for a description of the various construction elements and phasing.
Some construction activities would be visible and audible from the Al Larson Marina,
and visible from portions of the Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex and Cabrillo
Fishing Pier. However, as discussed in Section 3.1, Aesthetics and Visual Resources,
construction would result in minimal changes to the visual landscape of the APL
Terminal, and that the proposed improvements would be consistent with the character of
a working port. Construction equipment would not obstruct views of the San Pedro Bay,
or open waters of the Pacific Ocean, and would blend with the existing Port landscape.
Construction activities related to redeveloping the 7-acre backland area behind Berth 301,
and installation of the A-frame cranes at Berths 302-305 (4 of the total 24), and related
operations would be most visible from the Al Larson Marina. Additional upland
improvements are not expected to be visible from the water (i.e., recreational craft at the
Al Larson Marina), given that the proposed Project site is approximately 15-ft above
MLLW.

As discussed in Section 3.10, Marine Transportation, the short-term presence of support
boats at Berths 302-306 would not reduce the existing level of safety for vessel
navigation in the Port or Pier 300 Channel. Unpermitted recreational vessels are
restricted from the Pier 300 Channel, and neither construction nor operations would
impede navigation of the Catalina Express, cruise ships, or pleasure craft in the Main
Channel or other designated transit lanes, and thus would not affect access to the Outer
Harbor, San Pedro Bay, or Pacific Ocean. Therefore, construction and operation of the
proposed Project would not result in a substantial loss of water-related recreational
opportunities.

The noise impact analysis provided in Section 3.11, Noise, identifies sensitive noise
receptor locations in the Port that could potentially be impacted by the proposed Project.
Nighttime dredging of Berth 306 would result in average noise levels that exceed the
ambient levels at the Al Larson Marina, located 1,200 ft from the proposed Project.
However, the increases would be less than 2 dBA, which is below the significance
criteria (refer to Impact NOI-2 of Section 3.11, Noise). Even though construction-related
noise would not violate Section 41.40 of the LAMC Noise Ordinance, it would be
considered an indirect impact to the recreational activities at the Al Larson Marina.

Although construction-related noise impacts to the Al Larson Marina (the nearest
recreational resource) would not be significant, MM NOI-1 (which requires the
contractor to use a pile driving system with a sound insulation system) and MM NOI-2
(which requires the contractor to erect temporary noise attenuation barriers suitable for
pile driving equipment, as necessary), would be implemented. Consequently, it is not
anticipated that construction activities would cause a substantial loss or diminish the
quality of recreational facilities. In addition, operational noise is not anticipated to
increase substantially above the current conditions (refer to Section 3.11, Noise, for the
detailed analysis).

**CEQA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would result in the employment of up to 2,152 workers by 2027,
which represents an increase of 1,111 over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees.
As stated above, this level of employment would not be considered substantial in relation
to the County-wide employment estimate. Consequently, construction and operation of
the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial
physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required. However, noise mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2 requires the contractor to use a pile driving system with a sound insulation system and MM NOI-2 requires the contractor to erect temporary noise attenuation barriers suitable for pile driving equipment, as necessary. These mitigation measures would further reduce the potential for noise impacts to diminish the quality of recreational facilities.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

The proposed Project would result in the employment of up to 2,152 workers by 2027, which represents an increase of 860 over the NEPA baseline level of 1,292 employees. As stated above, this level of employment would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Consequently, construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under NEPA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required. However, the potential for impacts would be further reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

### 3.12.4.3.2 Alternatives

#### 3.12.4.3.2.1 Alternative 1 – No Project

Under Alternative 1, no further Port action or federal action would occur. The Port would not construct and develop additional backlands, wharves, or terminal improvements. No new cranes would be added, no gate or backland improvements would occur, and no infrastructure for AMP at Berth 306 or automation in the backland area adjacent to Berth 306 would be provided. This alternative would not include any dredging, new wharf construction, or new cranes. The No Project Alternative would not include development of any additional backlands because the existing terminal is berth-constrained and additional backlands would not improve its efficiency.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing APL Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 291-acre container terminal. Based on the throughput projections, terminal operations are expected to grow over time as throughput demands increase. Under Alternative 1, the existing APL Terminal would handle approximately 2.15 million TEUs by 2027, which would result in 286 annual ship calls at Berths 302-305. In addition, this alternative would result in up to 7,273 peak daily one-way truck trips (1,922,497 annual), and up to 2,336 annual one-way rail trip movements. Under
Alternative 1, cargo ships that currently berth and load/unload at the Berths 302-305 terminal would continue to do so.

The No Project Alternative would not preclude future improvements to the proposed Project site. However, any future changes in use or new improvements with the potential to significantly impact the environment would need to be analyzed in a separate environmental document.

**Impact REC-1: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.**

Under Alternative 1, no improvements or development would occur to the existing APL Terminal. Under Alternative 1, the existing APL Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 291-acre container terminal. This alternative would not develop additional areas or increase the number of facilities at the existing APL Terminal. Even without improvements, terminal operations are expected to increase slightly with cargo throughput projected to reach approximately 2.15 million TEUs by 2027. The number of employees at the APL Terminal is projected to be approximately 1,202 employees by 2027, which is insignificant in relation to the estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010).

There are no visitor-oriented uses or recreational services located at the Alternative 1 site. The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the Alternative 1 site (west boundary). As with the proposed Project, neither construction activities nor operation of Alternative 1 would significantly affect this recreational facility. Alternative 1 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft, including those in the Al Larson Marina, because it would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel.

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 1 is expected to result in a minor increase of 161 employees over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,202 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Based on the above, Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

The impacts of the No Project Alternative are not required to be analyzed under NEPA. NEPA requires the analysis of a No Federal Action Alternative (Alternative 2 in this document).
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not applicable.

Residual Impacts

An impact determination is not applicable.

3.12.4.3.2.2 Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

The No Federal Action Alternative would be the same as the NEPA baseline and would include only the activities and impacts likely to occur absent further USACE federal approval but could include improvements that require a local action. Under Alternative 2, no federal action would occur; however, minor terminal improvements in the upland area of the existing APL Terminal would be implemented. These minor upland improvements would include conversion of a portion of the dry container storage area to an additional 200 reefers, associated electrical lines, and installation of utility infrastructure at locations in the existing backland areas. Beyond these minor upland improvements, the Port would not construct and develop additional backlands or wharves. No gate or additional backland improvements would occur, and no in-water features such as dredging or a new berth, wharf extension, or over-water features such as new cranes would occur under the No Federal Action Alternative.

Under the No Federal Action Alternative, the existing APL Terminal would continue to operate as an approximately 291-acre container terminal, and up to approximately 2.15 million TEUs could be handled at the terminal by 2027. Based on the throughput projections, the No Federal Action Alternative would result in 286 annual ship calls at Berths 302-305. In addition, this alternative would result in up to 7,273 peak daily truck trips (1,922,497 annual), and up to 2,336 annual one-way rail trip movements. Cargo ships that currently berth and load/unload at the Berths 302-305 terminal would continue to do so.

Impact REC-1: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

Alternative 2 would not expand the existing container terminal; only minor upland improvements, as described above, would be implemented. The number of employees at the APL Terminal is projected to be approximately 1,202 employees by 2027, which is insignificant in relation to the estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010).

There are no visitor-oriented uses or recreational services located at the Alternative 2 site. The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the Alternative 2 site (west boundary). As with the proposed Project, neither construction activities nor operation of Alternative 2 would significantly affect this recreational facility. Alternative 2 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft, including those in the Al Larson Marina, because it would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel.
CEQA Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 2 is expected to result in a minor increase of 161 employees over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,202 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Based on the above, Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

The No Federal Action Alternative would have the same conditions as the NEPA baseline, as explained in Section 2.6.2 in Chapter 2; therefore, there would be no incremental difference between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would result in no impact under NEPA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

There would be no impacts.

3.12.4.3.2.3 Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Four New Cranes

Under Alternative 3, four new cranes would be added to the existing wharf along Berths 302-305 and only minor improvements to the existing APL Terminal would be made (utility infrastructure and conversion of dry container storage to reefers). No other upland terminal improvements would be constructed. The existing terminal is berth-constrained, and adding the additional four cranes would improve the terminal’s efficiency.

The total acreage of backlands under Alternative 3 would remain at approximately 291 acres, which would be less than the proposed Project. This alternative would not include the extension of the existing wharf, construction of a new berth, dredging, or the relocation and improvement of various gates and entrance lanes.

Based on the throughput projections, TEU throughput under Alternative 3 would be less than the proposed Project, with an expected throughput of approximately 2.58 million TEUs by 2027. This would translate into 338 annual ship calls at Berths 302-305. In addition, this alternative would result in up to 8,725 peak daily truck trips (2,306,460 annual), and up to 2,544 annual one-way rail trip movements. Configuration of all other landside terminal components would be identical to the existing terminal.
Impact REC-1: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

Alternative 3 would not expand the existing APL Terminal or include wharf expansion, but would include four new A-Frames cranes, conversion of dry container storage to a 200-unit refrigerated area, and utility infrastructure. The number of employees at the APL Terminal is projected to be approximately 1,599 employees by year 2027, which is insignificant in relation to the estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010).

There are no visitor-oriented uses or recreational services located at the Alternative 3 site. The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the Alternative 3 site (west boundary). As with the proposed Project, neither construction activities nor operation of Alternative 3 would significantly affect this recreational facility. Alternative 3 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft, including those in the Al Larson Marina, because it would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel.

CEQA Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 3 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 307 employees over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,599 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Based on the above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

NEPA Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 3 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 307 employees over the NEPA baseline level of 1,292 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,599 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. As discussed above, Alternative 3 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under NEPA. Therefore, under NEPA, Alternative 3 would not significantly affect parks or other recreational resources.
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

3.12.4.3.2.4 Alternative 4 – Reduced Project: No New Wharf

Under Alternative 4, six cranes would be added to the existing terminal wharf at Berths 302-305, and the 41-acre fill area adjacent to the APL Terminal would be developed as container yard backlands. EMS would relinquish the 30 acres of backlands under space assignment. EMS would not add the nine acres of land behind Berth 301 or the two acres at the main gate to its permit. Because no new wharf would be constructed at Berth 306, the 41-acre backland would be operated using traditional methods and would not be expected to transition to use of automated equipment. As the existing wharf would not be extended to create Berth 306, no dredging would occur.

Under Alternative 4, the total terminal acreage would be 302 acres, which is less than the proposed Project. Based on the throughput projections, TEU throughput would be less than the proposed Project, with an expected throughput of approximately 2.78 million TEUs by 2027. This would translate into 338 annual ship calls at Berths 302-305. In addition, Alternative 4 would result in up to 9,401 peak daily truck trips (2,485,050 annual), and up to 2,563 annual one-way rail trip movements. Configuration of all other landside terminal components (i.e., Main Gate improvements) would be identical to the proposed Project.

Impact REC-1: Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 4 would be similar to, but less than, those discussed for the proposed Project. Alternative 4 would only include six new cranes, and would not expand the wharf to create Berth 306. The number of employees at the APL Terminal is projected to be approximately 1,867 employees by year 2027, which is insignificant in relation to the estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010).

There are no visitor-oriented uses or recreational services located at the Alternative 4 site. The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the Alternative 4 site (west boundary). As with the proposed Project, neither construction activities nor operation of Alternative 4 would significantly affect this recreational facility.

Alternative 4 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft, including those in the Al Larson Marina, because it would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel.

CEQA Impact Determination

Implementation of Alternative 4 is expected to result in the increase of terminal employees by approximately 826 over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,867 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Alternative 4
would not result in substantial demand for recreation services above baseline levels because it would not result in a substantial increase in population or employees in the proposed Project area. Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Residual Impacts*

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 4 is expected to result in the increase of terminal employees by approximately 575 over the NEPA baseline level of 1,292 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (1,867 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. Although Alternative 4 would result in higher levels of construction and operational activities than the NEPA baseline, this alternative would not result in substantial demand for recreation services because it would operate at a lower throughput level than the proposed Project, and because the proposed Project would not result in substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA baseline levels. Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under NEPA.

*Mitigation Measures*

No mitigation is required.

*Residual Impacts*

Impacts would be less than significant.

**3.12.4.3.2.5 Alternative 5 – Reduced Project: No Space Assignment**

Alternative 5 would improve the existing terminal, construct a new wharf (1,250 ft) creating Berth 306, add 12 new cranes to Berths 302-306, add 56 acres for backlands, wharfs, and gates improvements, construct electrification infrastructure in the backlands behind Berths 305-306, and relinquish the 30 acres currently on space assignment. This alternative would be the same as the proposed Project, except that EMS would relinquish the 30 acres of backlands under space assignment. As with the proposed Project, the 41-acre backlands and Berth 306 under Alternative 5 could utilize traditional container operations, electric automated operations, or a combination of the two over time. Dredging of the Pier 300 Channel along the new wharf at Berth 306 (approximately 20,000 cy) would occur, with the dredged material beneficially reused, and/or disposed of at an approved disposal site (such as the CDF at Berths 243-245 and/or Cabrillo shallow water habitat) or, if needed, disposed of at an ocean disposal site (i.e., LA-2).

Under Alternative 5, the total gross terminal acreage would be 317 acres, which is less than the proposed Project. TEU throughput would be the same as the proposed Project, with an expected throughput of approximately 3.2 million TEUs by 2027. This would
translate into 390 annual ship calls at Berths 302-306. In addition, this alternative would result in up to 11,361 peak daily truck trips (3,003,157 annual) including drayage, and up to 2,953 annual one-way rail trip movements. Configuration of all other landside terminal components would be identical to the existing terminal.

Impact REC-1: Alternative 5 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 5 would be very similar to those discussed under the proposed Project. The only substantive difference is that Alternative 5 would relinquish the 30-acre space assignment, resulting in 317 acres rather than 347 acres. The number of employees at the APL Terminal is expected to increase to approximately 2,196 employees by 2027, which is not considered a substantial number in comparison with the estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010). The new terminal employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area and are likely to reside proximate to the Project area. Because the new terminal employees would be filled locally, the new employees would not generate substantial new demand for recreational or park services that would in turn result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities.

The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 900 ft west of the Alternative 5 site (west boundary). Other park and recreational facilities in the area are identified above under the proposed Project.

Alternative 5 would be limited to on-site redevelopment and improvements, and in-water and over-water construction activities at Berth 306. Construction activities would require the use of marine-based and upland equipment. Some construction activities would be visible and audible from the Al Larson Marina, and visible from portions of the Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex and Cabrillo Fishing Pier. However, construction would result in minimal changes to the visual landscape of the APL Terminal and that the proposed improvements would be consistent with the character of a working port. Construction equipment would not obstruct views of the San Pedro Bay, or open waters of the Pacific Ocean, and would blend with the existing Port landscape.

Construction activities related to redeveloping the 7-acre backland area behind Berth 301, and installation of the A-frame cranes at Berths 302-305 (4 of the total 24) would be most visible from the Al Larson Marina. Additional upland improvements are not expected to be visible from the water (i.e., recreational craft at the Al Larson Marina) given that the Alternative 5 site is approximately 15-ft above MLLW.

As discussed in Section 3.10, Marine Transportation, the short-term presence of support boats at Berths 302-306 would not reduce the existing level of safety for vessel navigation in the Port or Pier 300 Channel. Unpermitted recreational vessels are restricted from the Pier 300 Channel and construction activities would not impede navigation of the Catalina Express, cruise ships, or pleasure craft in the Main Channel or other designated transit lanes, and thus would not affect access to the Outer Harbor, San Pedro Bay, or Pacific Ocean. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial loss of water-related recreational opportunities.
The noise impact analysis provided in Section 3.11, Noise, identifies sensitive noise receptor locations in the Port that could potentially be impacted by the proposed Project. Nighttime dredging of Berth 306 would result in average noise levels that exceed the ambient levels at the Al Larson Marina, located 1,200 ft from the proposed Project. However, the increases would be less than 2 dBA, which is below the significance criteria (refer to Impact NOI-2 of Section 3.11, Noise). Even though construction-related noise would not violate Section 41.40 of the LAMC Noise Ordinance, it would be considered an indirect impact to the recreational activities at the Al Larson Marina.

Although construction-related noise impacts to the Al Larson Marina (the nearest recreational resource) would not be significant, MM NOI-1 (which requires the contractor to use a pile driving system with a sound insulation system) and MM NOI-2 (which requires the contractor to erect temporary noise attenuation barriers suitable for pile driving equipment, as necessary), would be implemented. Consequently, it is not anticipated that construction activities would cause a substantial loss or diminish the quality of recreational facilities. In addition, operational noise is not anticipated to increase substantially above the current conditions (refer to Section 3.11, Noise, for the detailed analysis).

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 5 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 1,155 employees over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (2,196 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. As discussed above, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to interfere with water-related recreational activities, vessel traffic, or private watercraft in the Project vicinity. Consequently, Alternative 5 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required. However, the potential for impacts would be further reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 5 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 904 employees over the NEPA baseline level of 1,292 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (2,196 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. As discussed above, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to interfere with water-related recreational activities, vessel traffic, or private watercraft in the Project vicinity. Consequently, construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under NEPA.
Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required. However, the potential for impacts would be further reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2.

Residual Impacts

Impacts would be less than significant.

3.12.4.3.2.6 Alternative 6 – Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard

Alternative 6 would be the same as the proposed Project; however, the existing on-dock railyard on the terminal would be redeveloped and expanded. Under this alternative, approximately 10 acres of backlands would be removed from container storage for the railyard expansion. Alternative 6 would improve the existing terminal, develop the existing 41-acre fill area as backlands, add 1,250 ft of new wharf creating Berth 306, and dredge the Pier 300 Channel along Berth 306. Under this alternative, 12 new cranes would be added to the wharves along Berths 302-306, for a total of 24 cranes. As with the proposed Project, the 41-acre backlands and Berth 306 under Alternative 6 could utilize traditional container operations, electric automated operations, or a combination of the two over time. Dredging of the Pier 300 Channel along Berth 306 would occur (removal of approximately 20,000 cy of material), with the dredged material beneficially reused and/or disposed of at an approved disposal site (such as the CDF at Berths 243-245 and/or Cabrillo shallow water habitat) or, if needed, disposed of at an ocean disposal site (i.e., LA-2). Total terminal acreage (347) would be the same as the proposed Project.

Based on the throughput projections, TEU throughput would be the same as the proposed Project, with an expected throughput of approximately 3.2 million TEUs by 2027. This would translate into 390 annual ship calls at Berths 302-306. In addition, Alternative 6 would result in up to 10,830 peak daily truck trips (2,862,760 annual), and up to 2,953 annual rail trip movements. Configuration of all other landside terminal components would be identical to the existing terminal.

Impact REC-1: Alternative 6 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.

Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 6 would be very similar to those discussed for the proposed Project because it would involve much of the same features as the proposed Project. The number of employees at the terminal is expected to increase to approximately 2,152 by 2027, which is not considered a substantial number in light of an estimated 7.7 million employees in Los Angeles County in 2009 (CEDD, 2010). The new terminal employees would come from local sources in the Los Angeles area and are likely to reside proximate to the Project area. Because the new terminal employees would be filled locally, the new employees would not generate substantial new demand for recreational or park services that would in turn result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities.

The nearest pleasure craft slips are located in the Al Larson Marina, which is located along the west side of Fish Harbor and approximately 300-900 ft west of the Alternative 6 site (west boundary). Other park and recreational facilities in the area are identified above under the proposed Project.
Alternative 6 would be limited to on-site redevelopment and improvements, and in-water and over-water construction activities at Berth 306. Construction activities would require the use of marine-based and upland equipment. Some construction activities would be visible and audible from the Al Larson Marina, and visible from portions of the Cabrillo Beach Recreational Complex and Cabrillo Fishing Pier. However, construction would result in minimal changes to the visual landscape of the APL Terminal and that the proposed improvements would be consistent with the character of a working port. Construction equipment would not obstruct views of the San Pedro Bay, or open waters of the Pacific Ocean, and would blend with the existing Port landscape.

Construction activities related to redeveloping the 7-acre backland area behind Berth 301, and installation of the A-frame cranes at Berths 302-305 (4 of the total 24) would be most visible from the Al Larson Marina. Additional upland improvements are not expected to be visible from the water (i.e., recreational craft at the Al Larson Marina) given that the Alternative 6 site is approximately 15-ft above MLLW.

As discussed in Section 3.10, Marine Transportation, the short-term presence of support boats at Berths 302-306 would not reduce the existing level of safety for vessel navigation in the Port or Pier 300 Channel. Unpermitted recreational vessels are restricted from the Pier 300 Channel and construction activities would not impede navigation of the Catalina Express, cruise ships, or pleasure craft in the Main Channel or other designated transit lanes, and thus would not affect access to the Outer Harbor, San Pedro Bay, or Pacific Ocean. Therefore, construction of the proposed Project would not result in a substantial loss of water-related recreational opportunities.

The noise impact analysis provided in Section 3.11, Noise, identifies sensitive noise receptor locations in the Port that could potentially be impacted by the proposed Project. Nighttime dredging of Berth 306 would result in average noise levels that exceed the ambient levels at the Al Larson Marina, located 1,200 ft from the proposed Project. However, the increases would be less than 2 dBA, which is below the significance criteria (refer to Impact NOI-2 of Section 3.11, Noise). Even though construction-related noise would not violate Section 41.40 of the LAMC Noise Ordinance, it would be considered an indirect impact to the recreational activities at the Al Larson Marina.

Although construction-related noise impacts to the Al Larson Marina (the nearest recreational resource) would not be significant, MM NOI-1 (which requires the contractor to use a pile driving system with a sound insulation system) and MM NOI-2 (which requires the contractor to erect temporary noise attenuation barriers suitable for pile driving equipment, as necessary), would be implemented. Consequently, it is not anticipated that construction activities would cause a substantial loss or diminish the quality of recreational facilities. In addition, operational noise is not anticipated to increase substantially above the current conditions (refer to Section 3.11, Noise, for the detailed analysis).

**CEQA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 6 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 1,111 employees over the CEQA baseline level of 1,041 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (2,152 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. As discussed above, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to interfere with
water-related recreational activities, vessel traffic, or private watercraft in the Project vicinity. Consequently, Alternative 6 would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under CEQA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required. However, the potential for impacts would be further reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**NEPA Impact Determination**

Implementation of Alternative 6 is expected to result in the increase of approximately 860 employees over the NEPA baseline level of 1,292 employees. As stated above, this level of employment growth (2,152 employees by 2027) would not be considered substantial in relation to the County-wide employment estimate. As discussed above, construction and operation of the proposed Project is not expected to interfere with water-related recreational activities, vessel traffic, or private watercraft in the Project vicinity. Consequently, construction and operation of the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts resulting from a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities under NEPA.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required. However, the potential for impacts would be further reduced with implementation of mitigation measures MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2.

**Residual Impacts**

Impacts would be less than significant.

**3.12.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

Table 3.12-1 presents a summary of the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations for the proposed Project and its alternatives related to Recreation as described in the detailed discussions above. This table is meant to allow easy comparison between the potential impacts of the proposed Project and alternatives with respect to this resource. The potential impacts identified below may be based on federal, state, or City of Los Angeles significance criteria, Port criteria, and the scientific judgment of the report preparers.

For each impact threshold, the table describes the impact, notes the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations, describes any applicable mitigation measures, and notes the residual impacts (i.e., the impact remaining after mitigation). All impacts, whether significant or not, are included in this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>REC-1: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required; however, MM NOI-1: Noise Reduction during Pile Driving and MM NOI-2: Erect Temporary Noise Attenuation Barriers Adjacent to Pile Driving Equipment, Where Necessary and Feasible would further reduce impacts.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 – No Project</td>
<td>REC-1: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 – No Federal Action</td>
<td>REC-1: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not applicable</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3 – Reduced Project: Four New Cranes</td>
<td>REC-1: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4 – Reduced Project: No New Wharf</td>
<td>REC-1: Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5 – Reduced Project: No Space Assignment</td>
<td>REC-1: Alternative 5 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities, or include construction of new facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required; however, MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2 would further reduce impacts.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.12-1: Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Recreation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Impact Determination</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Impacts after Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6 – Proposed Project with Expanded On-Dock Railyard</td>
<td><strong>REC-1</strong>: Alternative 6 would not result in a substantial physical deterioration or expansion of existing park or recreational facilities.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
<td>Mitigation not required; however, MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2 would further reduce impacts.</td>
<td>CEQA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
<td></td>
<td>NEPA: Less than significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.12.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring

No significant impacts would occur to Recreation as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project or alternatives. In the absence of significant impacts, mitigation measures are not required. However, mitigation measures for noise (MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2) are applicable to the proposed Project and Alternatives 5 and 6. The monitoring program for mitigation measure MM NOI-1 and MM NOI-2 can be found in Section 3.11.4.5 (in Section 3.11, Noise).

3.12.5 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant unavoidable impacts related to recreational resources would occur as a result of construction or operation of the proposed Project or alternatives.