

1
2

3 **3.12.1 Introduction**

4 This section addresses the recreational setting in the Project vicinity and potential impacts
5 to recreational facilities from implementing the proposed Project and alternatives.

6 **3.12.2 Environmental Setting**

7 **3.12.2.1 Port of Los Angeles**

8 The Port of Los Angeles offers recreational opportunities to the public in many different areas.
9 The Port provides slips for 6,000 pleasure craft, sport fishing boats, and charter vessels.
10 Sailing, boating, scuba diving, fishing, water skiing, swimming, and sightseeing are common
11 recreational activities inside the breakwater. Continued leisure-time use of Port waters is an
12 important component in the development of the Port of Los Angeles. Community facilities
13 include a waterfront youth center, a boat launch ramp, and a public swimming beach.
14 Educational facilities include the Cabrillo Aquarium and the Maritime Museum.
15 Approximately 0.5-mile of waterfront along the Main Channel is devoted exclusively to
16 commercial tourist-oriented activities, including the Ports O' Call Village, located at
17 Berths 75-83, offering specialty shopping and dining.

18 Much of the Port's recreational activities occur at the Cabrillo Beach recreational
19 complex, located along the southwestern boundary of the Port. The outer beach, which is
20 exposed to the open ocean, is used for swimming, scuba diving, wind surfing, fishing,
21 and surfing. The inner beach, which lies within the breakwater, is used for sunbathing,
22 beachcombing, windsurfing, swimming, and wading. There is a small-boat launch ramp,
23 and the area between the boat launch ramp and the San Pedro breakwater is used for
24 boardsailing and jet skiing. An aquatics camp (operated by the Boy Scouts of America,
25 Los Angeles Area Council) is also located at Cabrillo Beach. It serves nonprofit
26 organizations and provides aquatic activities, overnight camping facilities, and
27 educational programs.

28 **3.12.2.2 Project Vicinity**

29 Adjacent to the Port, the City of Los Angeles supports several parks within the
30 community of San Pedro, all of which are west or south of I-110 and SR-47. Leland Park
31 is an open grassy area on both sides of North Gaffey Street, just west of the I-110 and
32 SR-47 interchange. Leland Park includes a small multipurpose room, baseball field,

1 basketball court, playground, and summer day camp. Peck Park, less than 0.25 mile west
2 of Leland Park and immediately north of Summerland Avenue, offers a community
3 center, tennis courts, ball fields, picnic area, and other field sport opportunities. Other
4 open-space and recreational opportunities within 1 mile of the Project area are two school
5 facilities and two neighborhood parks. A dog run is located along Front Street near the
6 base of Knoll Hill. Two new temporary baseball fields, a T-ball field, and a parking area
7 have been developed at the top of Knoll Hill. The temporary baseball and T-ball fields
8 will be used for up to 3 years (completed in November 2007).

9 The Project area, which includes Berths 97-109, has been developed for Port-related
10 industrial uses and is generally not used for recreational purposes. The nearest pleasure
11 craft slips in the harbor are located approximately 1.5 miles from the Project area. The
12 West Basin, however, does contain a Class II bike lane that runs parallel to John S.
13 Gibson Boulevard and Pacific Avenue just east of the Harbor Belt Line tracks. (Class II
14 bike lanes are narrow lanes set aside in city streets exclusively for bicycle use.) The bike
15 lane then parallels Front Street and, after crossing under the Seaside Freeway, runs south
16 along Harbor Boulevard, east of the railroad tracks.

17 Just to the south of the Project area, Berths 86-95 serve passenger-oriented vessels. In
18 particular, Berth 93A is the Los Angeles World Cruise Center, and Berth 95 serves the
19 Catalina Express excursion boats that travel to and from Catalina Island. Catalina
20 Express offers year-round service to Avalon and Two Harbors on Catalina Island from
21 San Pedro. From San Pedro, Catalina Express offers eight daily trips to Avalon with nine
22 return trips, and five daily trips to Two Harbors with five return trips. Catalina Express
23 vessels have a capacity of 150 to 388 passengers per trip.

24 **3.12.3 Applicable Regulations**

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

30 **3.12.3.1 Port Master Plan and California Coastal Act**

31 Section 5 of the PMP contains the Regulations and Guidelines for Development Projects.
32 Subsection E contains various guidelines and policies for commercial fishing and
33 recreational facilities. Where applicable, sections of the California Coastal Act
34 pertaining to recreation are referenced by section in the PMP. Regarding recreation, the
35 PMP contains the following:

- 36 1. Facilities for the commercial fishing industry shall be protected and, where feasible,
37 upgraded, and shall not be reduced or eliminated unless the demand for the facilities
38 no longer exists or adequate alternative space can be provided.
- 39 2. Marina, marina-related facilities, and recreational boating facility projects, to the
40 extent feasible, shall be designed and located so as not to interfere with Harbor land,
41 water needs of the commercial fishing industry, or the needs of vessels engaged in
42 waterborne commerce, transportation, or services in Harbor waters or on Harbor
43 lands.

- 1 3. In designing and constructing facilities in upland and waterfront areas for public
2 recreation, including boating facilities and marinas, adequate public access shall be
3 provided.
- 4 4. Facilities for public recreation including boating facilities and marinas, when feasible
5 and practicable, shall be distributed and located in available areas of the Harbor
6 District to avoid overcrowding and/or overuse of individual areas.
- 7 5. Coastal areas and waters in the Harbor District suitable for water-oriented
8 recreational activities shall be protected for such uses where the recreational activities
9 do not interfere with commercial or hazardous operations or activities.

10 The PMP also provides development areas for recreational uses in Area 6 of the Port
11 (near the East Basin).

12 **3.12.3.2 Community Plans**

13 The San Pedro Community Plan contains recreational policies that pertain to recreation in
14 the Port of Los Angeles. Policy 19-1 recognizes the Port as a regional resource and the
15 predominant influence on the economic well-being of the San Pedro Community. The
16 San Pedro Community Plan promotes the continued development of the Port so as to
17 meet the needs of the fishing industry, recreational users, and the handling of passengers
18 and cargo, with special emphasis on the accommodation of increasingly larger ships. The
19 Wilmington Community Plan puts forth policies to facilitate coordination of Port
20 development to provide community access to recreational waterfront areas.

21 **3.12.3.3 Controlled Navigation Areas**

22 The Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners has approved adding Controlled
23 Navigation Areas (CNAs) to Tariff No. 4, an amendment that has restricted entry of
24 recreational boats into certain areas of the Port without a permit issued by the Port Police.
25 Creation of CNAs is aimed at ensuring navigational safety of large commercial vessels
26 by reducing nonessential boating traffic while increasing waterside security by limiting
27 access to commercial or permitted vessels (POLA, 2007). The purpose of the CNAs is to
28 exercise a level of control over the thousands of recreational vessels using the Harbor to
29 control waterside access to facilities. The Coast Guard and other members of the
30 intelligence community have identified the need to control small vessels due to their
31 historical use as a means to transport waterborne improvised explosive devices. The
32 CNAs are a component of a larger program involving signs, shoreside and waterside
33 cameras, and an increased waterborne presence by the Port Police. The goal of the
34 program is to deter pierside incursions to commercial facilities, or attacks on large vessels
35 or cruise ships by small vessels.

36 The West Basin and the entrance to the West Basin has been designated as a CNA;
37 therefore, unpermitted recreational vessels are restricted from the area. The CNA
38 designation would not result in Project effects to recreational resources, but potential
39 impacts related to the CNA from a security or risk perspective are addressed in
40 Section 3.8, Hazards.

3.12.4 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

3.12.4.1 Methodology

Impacts on recreational facilities were assessed by determining if potential population increases resulting from the proposed Project could result in substantial increases in proportional demand on existing recreational services. Impacts also were assessed based on the potential for the proposed Project to limit, alter, or result in the loss of recreational facilities, opportunities, or visitor-oriented activities.

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 Recirculated Draft EIS/EIR, the CEQA baseline for determining the significance of potential Project impacts is the environmental setting prior to March 2001, pursuant to the ASJ described in Chapter 1, Section 1.4.3. The CEQA baseline for this proposed Project includes 45,135 TEUs/year that occurred on the Project site in the year prior to March 2001.

The CEQA baseline represents the setting at a fixed point in time and differs from the No Project Alternative (discussed in Section 2.5) in that the No Project Alternative addresses what is likely to happen at the site over time, starting from the existing conditions. The No Project Alternative allows for growth at the Project site that could be expected to occur without additional approvals.

3.12.4.1.2 NEPA Baseline

For purposes of this Recirculated Draft EIS/EIR, the evaluation of significance under NEPA is defined by comparing the proposed Project or other alternative to the NEPA baseline. To ensure a full analysis of the impacts associated with Phases I through III, the NEPA baseline does not include the dredging required for the Berth 100 wharf, the existing bridge across the Southwest Slip, or the 1.3 acres of fill constructed as part of Phase I (i.e., the Project site conditions are considered without the in-water Phase I activities and structures). 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 permits from the USACE. The NEPA baseline begins in the year prior to 2001 but is not fixed in time. The NEPA baseline includes construction and operation of backlands container operations on up to 117 acres, but does not include wharves, dredging, and improvements that would require federal permits. The NEPA baseline assumes 117 acres of upland development, which is greater than the 2001 baseline conditions. In addition, the NEPA baseline would store or manage up to 632,500 TEUs onsite, but no annual ships calls are included in the NEPA baseline (see Section 2.6.2 for further information).

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 ultimate permit decision would focus on direct impacts of the proposed Project to the aquatic environment, as well as

1 indirect and cumulative impacts in the uplands determined to be within the scope of
2 federal control and responsibility. Significance of the proposed Project or alternative is
3 defined by comparing the proposed Project or alternative to the NEPA baseline (i.e., the
4 increment). The NEPA baseline conditions are described in Section 2.1.

5 The NEPA baseline also differs from the “No Project” Alternative, where the Port would
6 take no further action to construct and develop additional backlands (other than the
7 72 acres that are currently developed). Under the No Project Alternative, no construction
8 would occur, other than the Phase I construction. However, the abandonment of the
9 existing bridge and 1.3 acres of fill, as well as removal of the four A-frame cranes built as
10 part of Phase 1, would occur. Forecasted increases in cargo throughput would still occur
11 as greater operational efficiencies are realized.

12 **3.12.4.2 Thresholds of Significance**

13 The following significance criteria are based on the *City of Los Angeles CEQA*
14 *Thresholds Guide* (City of Los Angeles, 2006) and other criteria applicable to Port
15 projects.

REC-1: The Project would result in a demand for recreation and park services that
exceeds the available resources.

REC-2: The Project would result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of
recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or
resources.

16 **3.12.4.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation**

17 **3.12.4.3.1 Proposed Project**

18 **Proposed Project – Impact REC-1: The proposed Project would not**
19 **result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the**
20 **available resources.**

21 Proposed Project activities would be conducted in designated industrial areas located
22 within Port jurisdiction. Construction and operation of the proposed Project is not
23 expected to result in substantial increases in population that could substantially increase
24 demand for recreational services because the proposed Project is intended to
25 accommodate the shipment of goods into and out of the Port, unlike a residential
26 development project that actually increases housing stock. Although operation of the
27 proposed Project would result in the employment of up to 8,435 direct and indirect
28 workers dispersed throughout the region, only up to 112 workers would be employed at
29 the terminal, which is not considered a substantial number in light of an estimated
30 3.8 million employees in Los Angeles County in 1996 (SCAG, 2001). In addition, the
31 112 terminal workers would be employees represented by the International Longshore
32 and Warehouse Union (ILWU), Local 13. ILWU Local 13 is the Longshore Division of
33 the Southern California Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors area that provides labor
34 for cargo-handling operations on the waterfront in the Port. ILWU Local 13 members,
35 therefore, are considered local employees and are likely to reside proximate to the Project
36 area (see Section 7.2.1.1 of Chapter 7, Socioeconomics). Because the new terminal
37 employees would be filled locally, the new employees would not generate substantial
38 new demand for recreational or park services.

1 **CEQA Impact Determination**

2 As discussed above, the proposed Project would not result in substantial demand for
3 recreation services above 2001 levels because the proposed Project would not result
4 in substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area. Consequently,
5 the proposed Project would not significantly increase the burden or demand for
6 existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities that would exceed available
7 resources.

8 *Mitigation Measures*

9 No mitigation is required.

10 *Residual Impacts*

11 Residual impacts would be less than significant.

12 **NEPA Impact Determination**

13 Although the proposed Project would result in higher levels of construction and
14 operational activities than the NEPA baseline, the proposed Project would not result
15 in substantial demand for recreation services because it would not result in
16 substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA
17 baseline levels. Consequently, the proposed Project would not result in significant
18 impacts related to an increase in demand for existing recreational services, facilities,
19 or opportunities that would exceed available resources.

20 *Mitigation Measures*

21 No mitigation is required.

22 *Residual Impacts*

23 Residual impacts would be less than significant.

24 **Proposed Project – Impact REC-2: The proposed Project would not** 25 **result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational,** 26 **educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

27 The proposed Project would not result in substantial population growth (i.e., new housing)
28 and, therefore, would not diminish the quality of existing recreational services, facilities,
29 or opportunities in the Port and surrounding area because of increased use.

30 The proposed Project would use the existing Catalina Express Terminal site for container
31 backlands and the Berth 100 south extension. The Catalina Express Terminal, which is a
32 visitor-oriented operation, would be temporarily relocated to the south of the Vincent
33 Thomas Bridge as part of the proposed Project. The Catalina Express Terminal will be
34 permanently moved as part of the separate San Pedro Waterfront Project proposed by the
35 Port, and the long-term impact associated with that project will be evaluated in a separate
36 environmental document. Prior to construction of the Phase III backlands, the Catalina
37 Express Terminal would be temporarily relocated to the south of the Vincent Thomas
38 Bridge and would be housed in either temporary tents or trailers, or in the existing
39 Pavilion building. Temporary floating docks would be added to Berth 95 to
40 accommodate loading passengers onto vessels. The temporary relocation of the Catalina
41 Express Terminal would occur prior to construction of the Berth 100 south extension,
42 such that the operations of the Catalina Express Terminal would not be interrupted.

1 The berths surrounding Berth 93, to the south of the Project site and SR-47, offer various
2 visitor-oriented recreational facilities. The Los Angeles World Cruise Center occupies
3 Berths 91, 92, and 93A/B; and the S.S. Lane Victory Memorial Museum operates at
4 Berth 94, adjacent to and south of Berth 95. The museum would not be significantly
5 affected during proposed Project construction or operation because terminal construction
6 and operation would occur entirely onsite, the museum is located on a separate site from
7 the proposed Project, and the temporarily relocated Catalina Express Terminal would not
8 use berths with existing visitor-oriented operations.

9 Marine recreational opportunities in the Harbor would not be adversely affected during
10 proposed construction and/or operation activities. The proposed Project area is generally
11 used for commercial shipping activities; no pleasure craft slips are located in the immediate
12 proposed Project area, including the narrow portion of the Southwest Slip. Because the
13 proposed Project would not block travel lanes in the Main Channel, construction and
14 operational activities would not adversely affect pleasure craft access to the Outer Harbor
15 or the open ocean. In addition, the placement of the bridges across the narrow portion of
16 the Southwest Slip would not result in substantial losses of recreational opportunities due
17 to the lack of pleasure craft slips and the lack of marine recreational opportunities in the
18 Project area.

19 **CEQA Impact Determination**

20 Although the proposed Project would temporarily relocate the Catalina Express
21 Terminal, it would not result in disruptions in service because the relocation would
22 occur prior to construction of Phase III of the proposed Project. In addition, the
23 relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal would not affect berths with current
24 visitor-oriented activities. Because in-water Project construction activities would not
25 interfere with vessel traffic lanes in the Main Channel, the proposed Project would not
26 preclude private watercraft recreational opportunities in the proposed Project vicinity.
27 Consequently, the proposed Project would not result in significant impacts resulting
28 from substantial losses or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-
29 oriented resources.

30 *Mitigation Measures*

31 No mitigation is required.

32 *Residual Impacts*

33 Residual impacts would be less than significant.

34 **NEPA Impact Determination**

35 Although the proposed Project would require the relocation of the Catalina Express
36 Terminal (which would not occur under the NEPA baseline), Catalina Express
37 Terminal operations would not be interrupted because the terminal would be
38 relocated to Berth 95 prior to Phase III construction. In addition, because in-water
39 Project construction activities would not interfere with vessel traffic lanes in the Main
40 Channel, the proposed Project would not preclude private watercraft recreational
41 opportunities in the proposed Project vicinity. Therefore, the proposed Project would
42 not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished
43 quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources.

1 *Mitigation Measures*

2 No mitigation is required.

3 *Residual Impacts*

4 Residual impacts would be less than significant.

5 **3.12.4.3.2 Alternatives**

6 **3.12.4.3.2.1 Alternative 1 – No Project Alternative**

7 Alternative 1 would use the terminal site constructed as part of Phase I for container
8 storage. Because of this, the Phase I construction activities are included under
9 Alternative 1 although the in-water Phase I elements would be abandoned.

10 As described in Chapter 2, under Alternative 1, no additional Port action or federal action
11 would occur. The Port would take no further actions to construct or develop additional
12 backlands (other than the 72 acres that were constructed under Phase I of the proposed
13 Project). Furthermore, the four existing A-frame cranes would be removed, and the
14 existing wharf at Berth 100 would cease to be used for ship berthing or container loading
15 and unloading operations. The 1.3 acres of fill and the bridge over the Southwest Slip
16 constructed during Phase I would be abandoned. This alternative would include the
17 operation of 72 acres of backlands area for storage of containers by Berths 121-131. The
18 Catalina Express Terminal would not be relocated under Alternative 1.

19 **Alt 1 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 1 would not result in a demand for**
20 **recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.**

21 Under Alternative 1, construction of the 72 acres of backlands and in-water elements
22 under Phase I of the proposed Project would be applied to this alternative, and the site
23 would serve as supplemental container storage for the Berth 121-131 Container Terminal.
24 The 1.3 acres of fill added to waters of the U.S. during construction of Phase I of the
25 proposed Project, as allowed under the ASJ and under USACE permit, would remain in
26 place and would be abandoned under Alternative 1. Because this alternative would serve
27 as supplemental backlands and would not generate new TEU throughput (it would
28 reallocate containers from Berths 121-131), no new employees would be required at the
29 terminal.

30 **CEQA Impact Determination**

31 Operation of Alternative 1 would not result in an increase in the number of terminal
32 employees compared to the CEQA baseline (prior to 2001) because it would use
33 existing terminal employees at Berths 121-131. Alternative 1 is not expected to
34 result in substantial demand for recreation services above 2001 levels because this
35 alternative would not result in substantial increases in population or employees in the
36 Project area. Consequently, Alternative 1 would not significantly increase the burden
37 or demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities beyond
38 available resources.

39 *Mitigation Measures*

40 No mitigation is required.

1 *Residual Impacts*

2 No significant impacts are anticipated.

3 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

7 *Mitigation Measures*

8 Mitigation measures are not applicable.

9 *Residual Impacts*

10 A residual impacts determination is not applicable.

11 **Alt 1 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 1 would not result in a substantial
12 loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-
13 oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

14 Alternative 1 would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal.

15 **CEQA Impact Determination**

16 Alternative 1 would use only 72 acres of the Project site for backlands storage,
17 61 acres larger than 2001 conditions. Because no recreational resources or
18 visitor-oriented uses are on the existing site, Alternative 1 would not affect such
19 resources. In addition, although Alternative 1 would remove the four existing cranes
20 (by vessels), marine recreational opportunities in the Harbor would not be adversely
21 affected because no pleasure craft slips are located in the immediate Project area, and
22 the crane removals would not impede travel lanes in the Main Channel. Consequently,
23 Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses
24 or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources.

25 *Mitigation Measures*

26 No mitigation is required.

27 *Residual Impacts*

28 No significant impacts are anticipated.

29 **NEPA Impact Determination**

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

33 *Mitigation Measures*

34 Mitigation measures are not applicable.

35 *Residual Impacts*

36 A residual impact determination is not applicable.

3.12.4.3.2.2 Alternative 2 – No Federal Action

Alternative 2 would utilize the terminal site constructed as part of Phase I for container storage and would increase the backland area to 117 acres. Because of this, the Phase I construction activities are included under Alternative 2 although the in-water Phase I elements would not be used. The Phase I dike, fill, and the wharf would be abandoned.

Under Alternative 2, there would be a Port action to further develop backlands at the Project site (does not require a federal action) on up to 117 acres, but no further federal action. However, the four existing A-frame cranes would be removed, and the existing wharf at Berth 100 would cease to be used for ship berthing and container loading and unloading operations. The bridge constructed during Phase I would be abandoned and the 1.3 acres of fill added to Waters of the U.S. during construction of Phase I of the proposed Project, as allowed under the ASJ and under USACE permit, would remain in place. Alternative 2 would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal.

Alt 2 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 2 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.

CEQA Impact Determination

Alternative 2 would serve as supplemental container storage for the Berth 121-131 Container Terminal, and approximately 632,500 TEUs from the Berth 121-131 Container Terminal would be stored onsite. Because this alternative would serve as supplemental backlands and would not generate new TEU throughput (it would reallocate containers from Berths 121-131), no new employees would be required at the terminal. As a consequence, Alternative 2 would not result in substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not significantly increase the burden or demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities beyond available resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No significant impacts are anticipated.

NEPA Impact Determination

Under this alternative, no further development would occur in the in-water terminal area (i.e., no additional dredging, dike or fill placement, pile installation, or wharf construction). In addition, backland development under Alternative 2 would be the same as under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, potential impacts under NEPA would not occur because there would be no substantial changes in the environmental conditions between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline that could affect demand for recreational and park services.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary under NEPA.

Residual Impacts

No residual impacts would occur.

1 **Alt 2 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial**
2 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-**
3 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

4 Alternative 2 would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal.

5 **CEQA Impact Determination**

6 Alternative 2 would use 117 acres of the Project site for backlands storage, which is
7 106 acres more than 2001 conditions. Because no recreational resources or visitor-
8 oriented uses are on the 117-acre site, Alternative 2 would not affect such resources.
9 In addition, although Alternative 2 would remove the four existing cranes (by vessels)
10 and would abandon the bridge across the Southwest Slip and 1.3 acres of fill, marine
11 recreational opportunities in the Harbor would not be adversely affected because no
12 pleasure craft slips are located in the immediate Project area, and the crane removal
13 would not impede travel lanes in the Main Channel. Consequently, Alternative 2
14 would not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished
15 quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources.

16 *Mitigation Measures*

17 No mitigation is required.

18 *Residual Impacts*

19 No significant impacts are anticipated.

20 **NEPA Impact Determination**

21 Under this alternative, no further development would occur in the in-water terminal
22 area (i.e., no additional dredging, dike or fill placement, pile installation, or wharf
23 construction). In addition, backland development under Alternative 2 would be the
24 same as under the NEPA baseline. Therefore, potential impacts under NEPA would
25 not occur because there would be no substantial changes in the environmental
26 conditions between Alternative 2 and the NEPA baseline that could diminish the
27 quality of recreational opportunities.

28 *Mitigation Measures*

29 No mitigation measures are necessary under NEPA.

30 *Residual Impacts*

31 No residual impacts would occur.

32 **3.12.4.3.2.3 Alternative 3 – Reduced Fill: No New Wharf Construction at Berth 102**

33 Alternative 3 does not include construction of 925 linear feet of wharf at Berth 102, but
34 the additional 375 feet of wharf at the south end of Berth 100, the relocation of the
35 Catalina Express Terminal, and other elements of the proposed Project would be
36 constructed.

1 **Alt 3 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 3 would not result in a demand for**
2 **recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.**

3 **CEQA Impact Determination**

4 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would not result in substantial demand
5 for recreation services above 2001 levels because it would not result in substantial
6 increases in population or employees in the Project area. Consequently, Alternative 3
7 would not significantly increase the burden or demand for recreational services,
8 facilities, or opportunities beyond available resources. Alternative 3 would result in
9 the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither
10 would result in significant increases in demand for recreational resources.

11 *Mitigation Measures*

12 No mitigation is required.

13 *Residual Impacts*

14 No significant impacts are anticipated.

15 **NEPA Impact Determination**

16 Although Alternative 3 would result in higher levels of construction and operational
17 activities than the NEPA baseline, this alternative would not result in substantial
18 demand for recreation services because it would operate at lower throughput levels
19 than the proposed Project and because the proposed Project would not result in
20 substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA
21 baseline levels. Consequently, Alternative 3 would not result in significant impacts
22 related to an increase in demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or
23 opportunities that would exceed available resources. Alternative 3 would result in
24 the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither
25 would result in significant increases in demand for recreational resources.

26 *Mitigation Measures*

27 No mitigation is required.

28 *Residual Impacts*

29 No significant impacts are anticipated.

30 **Alt 3 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial**
31 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-**
32 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

33 Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 3 would be similar to those
34 discussed for the proposed Project because this alternative includes wharf and backlands
35 development. This alternative would also involve the relocation of the Catalina Express
36 Terminal.

37 **CEQA Impact Determination**

38 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 3 would temporarily relocate the Catalina
39 Express Terminal, but it would not result in disruptions in service because the
40 relocation would occur prior to Phase III of proposed Project construction. No other

1 visitor-oriented uses are located on the site of this alternative. In addition,
2 Alternative 3 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft because it
3 would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main
4 Channel or Southwest Slip. Consequently, Alternative 3 would not result in
5 significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished quality of
6 recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Alternative 3 would result in
7 the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because both
8 would result in the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal and neither would
9 otherwise significantly affect recreational or park resources.

10 *Mitigation Measures*

11 No mitigation is required.

12 *Residual Impacts*

13 No significant impacts are anticipated.

14 **NEPA Impact Determination**

15 Although Alternative 3 would require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal
16 (which would not occur under the NEPA baseline), Catalina Express Terminal
17 operations would not be interrupted by the relocation because it would be relocated
18 prior to Phase III construction. In addition, Alternative 3 would not affect
19 recreational activities of private watercraft because it would not impede vessel travel
20 lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel or Southwest Slip. Therefore,
21 Alternative 3 would not result in significant impacts related to substantial losses or
22 diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resource.
23 Alternative 3 would result in the same level of less than significant impacts as the
24 proposed Project because both would result in the relocation of the Catalina Express
25 Terminal, and neither would otherwise significantly affect recreational or park
26 resources.

27 *Mitigation Measures*

28 No mitigation is required.

29 *Residual Impacts*

30 No significant impacts are anticipated.

31 **3.12.4.3.2.4 Alternative 4 – Reduced Fill: No South Wharf Extension at Berth 100**

32 Under this alternative, the 375 feet of wharf at the south end of Berth 100 that is an
33 element of the proposed Project would not be constructed, but the wharf at Berth 102
34 would be constructed. The reduced terminal acreage (130 acres) would not require the
35 relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal.

36 **Alt 4 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 4 would not result in a demand for**
37 **recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.**

38 **CEQA Impact Determination**

39 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 4 would not result in substantial demand
40 for recreation services above 2001 levels because it would not result in a substantial
41 increase in population or employees in the Project area. Consequently, Alternative 4

1 would not significantly increase the burden or demand for existing recreational
2 services, facilities, or opportunities that would exceed available resources.
3 Alternative 4 would result in the same level of less than significant impacts as the
4 proposed Project because neither would result in significant increases in demand for
5 recreational resources.

6 *Mitigation Measures*

7 No mitigation is required.

8 *Residual Impacts*

9 No significant impacts are anticipated.

10 **NEPA Impact Determination**

11 Although Alternative 4 would result in higher levels of construction and operational
12 activities than the NEPA baseline, this alternative would not result in substantial
13 demand for recreation services because it would operate at a lower throughput level
14 than the proposed Project, and because the proposed Project would not result in
15 substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA
16 baseline levels. Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in significant impacts
17 related to an increase in demand for recreational services, facilities, or opportunities
18 that would exceed available resources. Alternative 3 would result in the same level
19 of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither would result
20 in significant increases in demand for recreational resources.

21 *Mitigation Measures*

22 No mitigation is required.

23 *Residual Impacts*

24 No significant impacts are anticipated.

25 **Alt 4 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial** 26 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-** 27 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

28 Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 4 would be similar to, but less
29 than, those discussed for the proposed Project due to the lower throughput.

30 **CEQA Impact Determination**

31 Alternative 4 would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal. In
32 addition, Alternative 4 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft
33 because it would not impede vessel travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the
34 Main Channel or Southwest Slip. Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in
35 significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished quality of
36 recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Although Alternative 4 and
37 the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to recreational
38 resources, Alternative 4 would result in slightly less recreational resource impacts
39 than the proposed Project because it would not require the relocation of the Catalina
40 Express Terminal (as would the proposed Project).

1 *Mitigation Measures*

2 No mitigation is required.

3 *Residual Impacts*

4 No significant impacts are anticipated.

5 **NEPA Impact Determination**

6 Alternative 4, like the NEPA baseline, would not require the relocation of the
7 Catalina Express Terminal. Although Alternative 4 would include wharf
8 construction and operations, it would not impede vessel travel lanes or substantially
9 reduce recreational opportunities in the Main Channel or Southwest Slip.
10 Consequently, Alternative 4 would not result in significant impacts resulting from
11 substantial losses or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-
12 oriented resources. Although both Alternative 4 and the proposed Project would
13 result in less than significant impacts to recreational resources, Alternative 4 would
14 result in slightly less recreational resource impacts than the proposed Project because
15 it would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal (as would the
16 proposed Project).

17 *Mitigation Measures*

18 No mitigation is required.

19 *Residual Impacts*

20 No significant impacts are anticipated.

21 **3.12.4.3.2.5 Alternative 5 – Reduced Construction and Operation: Phase I**
22 **Construction Only**

23 Under Alternative 5, the Phase I container terminal that was completed in 2003 (as
24 allowed by the ASJ) and that is currently operational would continue to operate at levels
25 similar to today (2007). The total acreage of backlands under this alternative would be
26 72 acres. This alternative would not include the relocation of the Catalina Express
27 Terminal.

28 **Alt 5 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 5 would not result in a demand for**
29 **recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.**

30 **CEQA Impact Determination**

31 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 5 would not result in substantial demand
32 for recreation services above 2001 levels because it would not result in a substantial
33 increase in population or employees in the Project area. Consequently, Alternative 5
34 would not significantly increase the burden or demand for recreational services,
35 facilities, or opportunities beyond available resources. Alternative 5 would result in
36 the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither
37 would result in significant increases in demand for recreational resources.

38 *Mitigation Measures*

39 No mitigation is required.

1 *Residual Impacts*

2 No significant impacts are anticipated.

3 **NEPA Impact Determination**

4 Although Alternative 5 would include wharf operations, it would result in lower
5 levels of backland construction, and its operation would not result in substantial
6 increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA baseline levels.
7 Alternative 5 would require fewer employees than the proposed Project due to lower
8 TEU throughout. Although operation of Alternative 5 would result in more terminal
9 employees than would occur under the NEPA baseline (no new employees), the
10 employees would be primarily local (see Chapter 7) and the increase is not
11 considered substantial. Consequently, Alternative 5 would not result in significant
12 impacts related to an increase in demand for recreational services, facilities, or
13 opportunities. Alternative 5 would result in the same level of less than significant
14 impacts as the proposed Project because neither would result in significant increases
15 in demand for recreational resources.

16 *Mitigation Measures*

17 No mitigation is required.

18 *Residual Impacts*

19 No significant impacts are anticipated.

20 **Alt 5 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 5 would not result in a substantial**
21 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-**
22 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

23 Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 5 would be the same as Phase I of
24 the proposed Project.

25 **CEQA Impact Determination**

26 Alternative 5 would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal. No
27 other visitor-oriented uses are located on the Phase I site. In addition, Alternative 5
28 would not affect recreational activities of private watercraft because it would not
29 impede vessel travel lanes in the Main Channel. Consequently, Alternative 5 would
30 not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished
31 quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Although both
32 Alternative 5 and the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to
33 recreational resources, Alternative 5 would result in slightly less recreational resource
34 impacts than the proposed Project because it would not require the relocation of the
35 Catalina Express Terminal (as would the proposed Project).

36 *Mitigation Measures*

37 No mitigation is required.

38 *Residual Impacts*

39 No significant impacts are anticipated.

NEPA Impact Determination

Alternative 5, like the NEPA baseline, would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal. No other visitor-oriented uses are located on the Phase I site. Although Alternative 5 would include wharf construction and operations, it would not operate at a substantially higher throughput level than the NEPA baseline. Alternative 5 would not affect recreational marine activities because vessel travel lanes in the Main Channel would remain open for use by recreational vessels. Consequently, Alternative 5 would not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Although both Alternative 5 and the proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts to recreational resources, Alternative 5 would result in slightly less recreational resource impacts than the proposed Project because it would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal (as would the proposed Project).

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No significant impacts are anticipated.

3.12.4.3.2.6 Alternative 6 – Omni Cargo Terminal

This alternative would construct an omni cargo terminal at the Project site, which would entail physical land improvements and wharf construction as required for the proposed Project. Under this alternative, the 142 acres of backlands would be developed, but the backlands would be constructed to match the needs of an omni terminal. Like the proposed Project, construction of this alternative would involve construction of 2,500 linear feet of wharf and 2.5 acres of fill into waters of the United States. The Catalina Express Terminal would be relocated under this alternative.

Alt 6 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 6 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.

CEQA Impact Determination

As with the proposed Project, Alternative 6 would not result in substantial demand for recreation services above 2001 levels because it would not result in substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area. Consequently, Alternative 6 would not significantly increase the burden or demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities beyond available resources. Alternative 6 would result in the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither would result in significant increases in demand for recreational resources.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is required.

Residual Impacts

No significant impacts are anticipated.

1 **NEPA Impact Determination**

2 Although Alternative 6 would result in higher levels of construction and operational
3 activities than the NEPA baseline, this alternative would not result in substantial
4 demand for recreation services because, like the proposed Project, it would not result
5 in substantial increases in population or employees in the Project area above NEPA
6 baseline levels. Consequently, Alternative 6 would not result in significant impacts
7 related to an increase in demand for recreational services, facilities, or opportunities
8 beyond available resources. Alternative 6 would result in the same level of less than
9 significant impacts as the proposed Project because neither would result in significant
10 increases in demand for recreational resources.

11 *Mitigation Measures*

12 No mitigation is required.

13 *Residual Impacts*

14 No significant impacts are anticipated.

15 **Alt 6 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 6 would not result in a substantial** 16 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-** 17 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

18 Construction and operational impacts from Alternative 6 would be similar to those
19 discussed for the proposed Project because it would involve much of the same features as
20 the proposed Project.

21 **CEQA Impact Determination**

22 As with the proposed Project, Alternative 6 would relocate the Catalina Express
23 Terminal, but the relocation would not result in disruptions in service because it
24 would occur prior to Phase III Project construction. No other visitor-oriented uses
25 are located on the site of this alternative. In addition, Alternative 6 is not expected to
26 affect recreational activities of private watercraft because it would not impede vessel
27 travel lanes or recreational opportunities in the Main Channel or Southwest Slip.
28 Consequently, Alternative 6 would not result in significant impacts resulting from
29 substantial losses or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-
30 oriented resources. Alternative 6 would result in the same level of less than
31 significant impacts as the proposed Project because both would result in the
32 relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal, and neither would otherwise
33 significantly affect recreational or park resources.

34 *Mitigation Measures*

35 No mitigation is required.

36 *Residual Impacts*

37 No significant impacts are anticipated.

38 **NEPA Impact Determination**

39 Although Alternative 6 would require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal
40 (which would not occur under the NEPA baseline), Catalina Express Terminal
41 operations would not be interrupted by the relocation because it would be relocated to

1 the vicinity of Berth 95 prior to Phase III construction. In addition, because this
2 alternative would not interfere with vessel traffic lanes or recreational opportunities in
3 the Main Channel or Southwest Slip, Alternative 6 would not substantially affect private
4 watercraft recreational opportunities in the vicinity. Therefore, Alternative 6 would not
5 result in significant impacts related to substantial losses or diminished quality of
6 recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Alternative 6 would result in
7 the same level of less than significant impacts as the proposed Project because both
8 would result in the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal, and neither would
9 otherwise significantly affect recreational or park resources.

10 *Mitigation Measures*

11 No mitigation is required.

12 *Residual Impacts*

13 No significant impacts are anticipated.

14 **3.12.4.3.2.7 Alternative 7 – Nonshipping Use**

15 Alternative 7 would utilize the terminal site constructed as part of Phase I for commercial
16 and industrial uses and would increase the backland area to 117 acres. Because of this,
17 the Phase I construction activities are included under Alternative 7 although the in-water
18 Phase I elements would not be used. The Phase I dike, fill, and the wharf would be
19 abandoned.

20 Alternative 7 would convert the site from shipping and containerized storage to retail,
21 office park, and light industrial uses on 117 acres. A public dock would be constructed
22 but would be developed only to support small watercraft. Additional wharves would not
23 be constructed. The Catalina Express Terminal would not be relocated under this
24 alternative.

25 **Alt 7 – Impact REC-1: Alternative 7 would not result in a demand for 26 recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.**

27 Alternative 7 would develop the site as a “Regional Center,” which would increase
28 employment opportunities on the Project site. Alternative 7 would result in
29 approximately 4,650 workers at the site, which is greater than the workers at the site for
30 the proposed Project. Total workers under Alternative 7 (approximately 8,360) would be
31 similar to the proposed Project employees (see Section 7.3.1.11). The direct employees
32 at the terminal site are expected to come from across the region consistent with
33 employment in the SCAG area. The new employees could use recreational resources in
34 the Port and surrounding areas prior to or after their work shifts; however, potential
35 recreational activity is not expected to be concentrated at any particular recreational
36 facility due to the varied and numerous recreational opportunities that exist in
37 surrounding areas (see Sections 3.12.2.1 and 3.12.2.2 above). Because of this,
38 Alternative 7 is not expected to result in or induce substantial or significant demands for
39 recreational resources.

40 **CEQA Impact Determination**

41 Alternative 7 would result in approximately 4,650 employees at the site but would
42 not result in significant demand for recreational resources. Varied and numerous
43 recreational opportunities exist in surrounding areas and nothing in Alternative 7

1 would cause recreational demand to be concentrated at any particular recreational
2 resource. Consequently, Alternative 7 would not significantly increase the burden or
3 demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities beyond available
4 resources. Alternative 7 would result in a greater level, albeit it less than significant
5 impacts, of impact to recreational resources than the proposed Project due to the
6 greater number of direct employees at the Project site.

7 *Mitigation Measures*

8 No mitigation is required.

9 *Residual Impacts*

10 No significant impacts are anticipated.

11 **NEPA Impact Determination**

12 Alternative 7 would result in higher levels of construction and operational activities
13 than the NEPA baseline because it would fully develop 117 acres of the Project site
14 with residential, office, and industrial uses; whereas, the NEPA baseline would
15 develop and use the 117 acres for only backlands activities. This alternative would
16 result in approximately 4,650 employees at the site. Although Alternative 7 would
17 result in more potential for increases in population or employees in the Project area
18 compared to NEPA baseline levels, it is not expected to result in substantial demand
19 for recreation services due to the varied and numerous recreational opportunities that
20 exist in surrounding areas and because nothing in Alternative 7 would cause
21 recreational demand to be concentrated at any particular recreational resource.
22 Consequently, Alternative 7 would not result in significant impacts related to an
23 increase in demand for existing recreational services, facilities, or opportunities.
24 Alternative 7 would result in a greater level, albeit it less than significant impacts, of
25 impact to recreational resources than the proposed Project due to the greater number
26 of direct employees at the Project site.

27 *Mitigation Measures*

28 No mitigation is required.

29 *Residual Impacts*

30 No significant impacts are anticipated.

31 **Alt 7 – Impact REC-2: Alternative 7 would not result in a substantial** 32 **loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-** 33 **oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.**

34 Alternative 7 would not include the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal.

35 **CEQA Impact Determination**

36 Alternative 7 could indirectly add to recreational opportunities through the provision
37 of docking locations that support small private watercraft, and through the provision
38 of and visitor-oriented facilities (shopping and restaurants), which would be a
39 beneficial recreational/visitor-oriented impact. Such benefits resulting from this
40 alternative would be expected to provide additional marine recreational opportunities
41 through increased consumer-related Port activities, increased pleasure craft access,
42 and improved access of pleasure craft to the Outer Harbor and open ocean.

1 Consequently, Alternative 7 would not result in significant impacts resulting from
2 substantial losses or diminished quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-
3 oriented resources. Alternative 7 would result in fewer impacts to recreational
4 resources than the proposed Project because it would not require the relocation of the
5 Catalina Express Terminal and because it would actually provide additional
6 recreational opportunities by serving as a potential destination of recreational
7 watercraft users.

8 ***Mitigation Measures***

9 No mitigation is required.

10 ***Residual Impacts***

11 No significant impacts are anticipated.

12 **NEPA Impact Determination**

13 Alternative 7 could provide new recreational resources (compared to the NEPA
14 baseline), such as docks supporting small private watercraft and visitor-oriented
15 facilities (shopping and restaurants), which would be a beneficial recreational/visitor-
16 oriented impact. Such benefits resulting from this alternative would be expected to
17 provide additional marine recreational opportunities through increased consumer-
18 related Port activities, increased pleasure craft access, and improved access of
19 pleasure craft to the Outer Harbor and open ocean. Consequently, Alternative 7
20 would not result in significant impacts resulting from substantial losses or diminished
21 quality of recreational, educational, or visitor-oriented resources. Alternative 7
22 would result in fewer impacts to recreational resources than the proposed Project
23 because it would not require the relocation of the Catalina Express Terminal and
24 because it would actually provide additional recreational opportunities by serving as
25 a potential destination of recreational watercraft users.

26 ***Mitigation Measures***

27 No mitigation is required.

28 ***Residual Impacts***

29 No significant impacts are anticipated.

30 **3.12.4.4 Summary of Impact Determinations**

31 Table 3.12-1 presents a summary of the CEQA and NEPA impact determinations for the
32 proposed Project and its alternatives related to Recreational Resources as described in the
33 detailed discussions in Sections 3.12.4.3.

1

Table 3.12-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Recreation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives

Alternative	Environmental Impacts*	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts after Mitigation
3.12 Recreation				
Proposed Project	REC-1: The proposed Project would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
	REC-2: The proposed Project would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
Alternative 1 (No Project)	REC-1: The No Project Alternative would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not required Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Not applicable
	REC-2: The No Project Alternative would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Not applicable	Mitigation not required Mitigation not applicable	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Not applicable
Alternative 2 (No Federal Action)	REC-1: The No Federal Action Alternative would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: No impact
	REC-2: Alternative 2 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: No impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: No impact
Alternative 3 (Reduced Fill: No New Wharf Construction at Berth 102)	REC-1: Alternative 3 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact

2

Table 3.12-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Recreation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)

Alternative	Environmental Impacts*	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts after Mitigation
3.12 Recreation (continued)				
Alternative 3 (Reduced Fill: No New Wharf Construction at Berth 102) (continued)	REC-2: Alternative 3 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
Alternative 4 (Reduced Fill: No South Wharf Extension at Berth 100)	REC-1: Alternative 4 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
	REC-2: Alternative 4 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
Alternative 5 Reduced Construction and Operation: Phase I Construction Only	REC-1: Alternative 5 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
	REC-2: Alternative 5 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact

Table 3.12-1. Summary Matrix of Potential Impacts and Mitigation Measures for Recreation Associated with the Proposed Project and Alternatives (continued)

Alternative	Environmental Impacts*	Impact Determination	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts after Mitigation
3.12 Recreation (continued)				
Alternative 6 Omni Cargo Terminal	REC-1: Alternative 6 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
	REC-2: Alternative 6 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
Alternative 7 Nonshipping Use	REC-1: Alternative 7 would not result in a demand for recreation and park services that exceeds the available resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
	REC-2: Alternative 7 would not result in a substantial loss or diminished quality of recreational, educational, visitor-oriented opportunities, facilities, or resources.	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact	Mitigation not required Mitigation not required	CEQA: Less than significant impact NEPA: Less than significant impact
Note: *Unless otherwise noted, all impact descriptions for each of the Alternatives are the same as those described for the proposed Project.				

1

1 **3.12.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring**

2 No significant impacts would occur as a result of construction or operation of the
3 proposed Project. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

4 **3.12.4.6 Significant Unavoidable Impacts**

5 No significant unavoidable impacts to Recreational Resources would occur as a result of
6 construction or operation for the proposed Project or Alternatives.