Chapter 3
Environmental Analysis

Introduction

This chapter describes the framework within which impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives are evaluated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and defines the terminology used in this document. Sections 3.1 through 3.4 in this chapter discuss the possible environmental effects of the Proposed Project and alternatives for each environmental resource area identified by the Los Angeles Harbor Department (LAHD) as having potentially significant impacts in the Initial Study.

The Notice of Preparation and Initial Study (NOP/IS) (see Final EIR Appendix A) for the Proposed Project was issued in December 2023 and was prepared in accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) further examines the various resource areas and State CEQA Guidelines criteria (per Appendix G) that were identified as "potentially significant" based upon the analyses in the 2023 NOP/IS; State CEQA Guidelines issue areas (or criteria) not considered in this EIR were dismissed from further consideration in the IS because there would be either no impacts or impacts would be less than significant.

Sections 3.1 through 3.4 each present the following information for their specific resource area:

- The environmental setting;
- Applicable regulations;
- Impact assessment methodology;
- CEQA baseline;
- Thresholds of significance (i.e., the criteria against which the significance of impacts is judged);
- Impact determinations;
- Mitigation measures;
- Residual impacts;
- Summary of impact determinations;
- Mitigation monitoring; and
- Significant unavoidable impacts.

Terminology Used in This Environmental Analysis

In evaluating the potential impacts of the Proposed Project and alternatives, the significance of an impact is determined by applying the appropriate threshold of significance (significance criterion). The thresholds of significance used to evaluate impacts are described in each of the four resource sections. The following terms are used to describe impacts:

- **No Impact.** A designation of no impact is given when no adverse changes in the environment are expected.
- **Less-Than-Significant Impact.** A less-than-significant impact would be identified when the Proposed Project or alternatives would cause no substantial adverse change in the environment (i.e., the impact would not reach the threshold of significance).
- **Significant Impact.** A significant impact would create a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the Proposed Project or alternatives. Such an impact would exceed the applicable significance threshold established by CEQA but could be reduced to less than significant by the application of mitigation.
- **Mitigation.** Mitigation refers to measures that would be implemented to avoid or lessen potentially significant impacts. Mitigation includes:
    - Avoiding the impact completely by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;
    - Minimizing the impact by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation;
    - Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
    - Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action; or
    - Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

The mitigation measures would be proposed as conditions of Project approval and would be monitored to ensure compliance and implementation.

- **Residual Impacts.** This is the level of impact after implementation of mitigation measures.
- **Significant Unavoidable Impact**: As required by Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this designation is given when a significant impact would not be reduced to less than significant through any feasible mitigation measure(s).

Requirement to Evaluate Alternatives

State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describes a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, that could feasibly attain most of the basic project objectives but would avoid or substantially lessen any significant environmental impacts. An EIR should compare merits of the alternatives and determine an environmentally superior alternative. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project; rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision making and public participation. An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible.