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BACKGROUND

The Port of Los Angeles Master Plan was certified and accepted by the California Coastal Commission at their August 20, 1980 meeting. In certifying the 190-acre landfill area south of Terminal Island, the Commission included the following modification:

"Harbor Deepening and 190-acre Landfill Certified With Fill Area Reserved for Hazardous Cargo, Dry Bulk Cargo, and Commercial Fishing Facilities. The Commission certifies the Harbor Deepening Project, including the 190-acre landfill and shallow water habitat area to the east of the landfill. However, until the completion and certification of the Port Risk Management Plan, Area 9 shall be reserved for the relocation and siting of hazardous bulk liquid cargo facilities and dry bulk cargo facilities, with the exception of a 500-ft. wide area along the western boundary of Area 9, which may be used for Commercial fishing facilities, and areas agreed to in the Board's Least Harm Mitigation Resolution. The location of hazardous liquid cargo facilities and dry bulk facilities in Area 9 shall take place only in accord with the Risk Management Plan as certified by the Commission."

The reference to "Area 9" in the above modification actually refers to the 190-acre landfill portion of Area 9 as indicated in the title.

Since the certification of the Port Master Plan, the port has received numerous requests to use the 190-acre landfill site and possibly some adjacent area in Master Planning Area 9 for port dependent industrial uses. The purpose of this amendment is to allow the addition of another land use for the 190-acre landfill site, i.e., coastal dependent or related industrial. This additional use would not interfere with the long term preferred uses for the area.

COASTAL ACT COMPLIANCE

An amendment to a Port Master Plan must follow the same certification and approval process as a Port Master Plan. In that regard, the California Coastal Act of 1976, Chapter 8, Article 3, Section 30711, paragraph (a), states, "A port master plan that carries out the provisions of this chapter shall be prepared and adopted by each port governing body, and for informational purposes, each city, county, or city and county which has a port within its jurisdiction shall incorporate the certified port master plan in its local coastal program. A port master plan shall include all of the following:

1. The proposed uses of land and water areas, where known.

This amendment would allow the port to place coastal dependent or related industrial uses on the 190-acre landfill site. The landfill is being completed as part of the Los Angeles Harbor Deepening Project and no facilities have been developed on the 190 acres to date."
The primary known use anticipated for the 190-acre landfill site under the industrial category is the assembly and launching of offshore exploratory drilling and production platforms.

Oil and gas development off the California Coast is increasing and moving progressively farther from shore into areas with deeper water. As a result, a number of companies are competing to construct the taller and heavier platforms required to withstand the greater stresses encountered in deep water. To remain competitive within the industry, particularly with foreign fabricators, companies must establish their assembly yards at sites with direct access to the sea and no height restrictions. The 190-acre landfill site satisfies these conditions and provides other advantages such as proximity to a large skilled labor force and a well-developed infrastructure.

Relatively minor dredging to the 190-acre landfill site will be required to provide access for transport barges. The large transport barges generally require a shallow channel extending from the barge dock to the outer harbor.

The 190-acre landfill site is particularly well suited for the type of industrial development proposed. The site offers the following advantages:

- Adequate open land
- Sheltered access to deep water
- No height restrictions
- Located near well-developed infrastructures and skilled labor force
- Located near southern and central California areas where many fabricated structures would be installed or used
- Located in an existing industrialized area, where potential for environmental impact is relatively low
- Excellent weather, which reduces down-time

2. The projected design and location of port land areas, water areas, berthing, and navigation ways and systems intended to serve commercial traffic within the area of jurisdiction of the port governing body.

The location of the 190-acre landfill site is shown in Figure 1. It is bordered approximately by Earle Street and commercial fishing facilities to the west, auto storage and vacant land to the north, and open water of the outer harbor to the east and south. Water access and berthing facilities would be provided along the south face of the landfill.

3. An estimate of the effect of development on habitat areas and the marine environment, a review of existing water quality, habitat areas, and quantitative and qualitative biological inventories, and proposals to minimize and mitigate any substantial adverse impact.
On February 24, 1980, the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners approved the final Environmental Impact Report for the Port of Los Angeles Master Plan which included the 190-acre landfill, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1980, and the State and City of Los Angeles CEQA Guidelines.

4. Proposed projects listed as appealable in Section 30715 in sufficient detail to be able to determine their consistency with the policies of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) of this division.

Proposed industrial projects are nonappealable under Section 30715 of the California Coastal Act.

5. Provisions for adequate public hearings and public participation in port planning and development decisions.

The 190-Acre Landfill Amendment was approved for notification of completion and distribution to interested parties by the Board of Harbor Commissions at a public meeting on April 12, 1983. Copies of the amendment were distributed to interested persons, organizations, governmental agencies, the California Coastal Commission and port tenants within 300 feet of the landfill site and written comments were solicited. Also, the Los Angeles Public Library's San Pedro, Wilmington and Public Information Branches each were provided with three copies of the amendment with a request to make them available for public inspection as a library reference. In addition, a public hearing to receive comments and testimony on the draft amendment was held at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, May 12, 1983 in the Los Angeles Harbor Department Board Room.

6. A port master plan shall contain information in sufficient detail to allow the commission to determine its adequacy and conformity with the applicable policies of this division.

This amendment has been prepared in full compliance with the policies of the California Coastal Act of 1976. Coastal Act policies applicable to the proposed amendment are as follows:

Section 30701(b): "The locations of the commercial port districts within the State of California are well established, and for many years such areas have been devoted to transportation and commercial, industrial, and manufacturing uses consistent with federal, state, and local regulations..."

The proposed amendment would allow the 190-acre landfill to be used for industrial uses consistent with federal, state and local regulations.

Section 30705(a)(2): "Water areas may be diked, filled, or dredged when consistent with a certified port master plan for new or expanded facilities or waterfront land for port-related facilities."

Any dredging required to support the proposed industrial use would be limited to port related facilities and would be in accordance with a Corps of Engineers permit.

Section 30255: "Coastal-dependent developments shall have priority over other developments on or near the shoreline..."

The proposed amendment would allow coastal dependent industrial uses to be located on the 190-acre landfill.
In certifying the Main Channel Dredging and Landfill Project, the Commission imposed the following mitigation: "The Port shall not use the 190-acre filled area for any purpose, except least term nesting and commercial fishing facilities, until the Port has undertaken one of the following mitigation actions and the Executive Director has certified that the action has been completed:

a. Construction of a number of artificial reefs, each approximately 2,000 sq. ft. in area and 10 ft. high, outside the San Pedro Breakwater or inside the Port, sufficient to plant the reefs with kelp to provide a total new kelp bed area of approximately 36 acres; or

b. Acquire rights to 72½ acres of former wetland area between the Consolidated Slip and the Cerritos Channel or along the Dominguez Flood Control Channel and permanently restore and maintain such area as either wetland or shallow water submerged bottom lands managed by a wildlife agency; or

c. Convey $362,500, representing a value of $5,000 per acre for the net permanent loss, by filling, of 72½ acres of shallow water soft bottom marine habitat, to a public agency for any one of the following purposes:

(1) For the construction of artificial reefs with covering kelp beds offshore the Southern California coast; or

(2) For acquisition or restoration of degraded wetlands between Beach Boulevard and the Santa Ana River Mouth in the City of Huntington Beach; or

(3) For the acquisition or restoration of other wetlands or shallow water soft bottom marine habitats on the Southern California coast."

Before the 190-acre landfill area is used, one of the above mitigation actions will be completed by the port.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

A public hearing on the draft 190-Acre Landfill Site Amendment was held at 7:30 p.m., May 12, 1983, at the Los Angeles Harbor Department Board Room to receive comments and testimony on the draft amendment.

In addition, written comments were solicited from interested persons, agencies and companies during the planning process. The comments received and the responses to those comments are included in this section of the amendment.

Public Hearing - Comments and Responses

The following comments were made at the public hearing:
A. Mr. M.L. Thorell, Todd Shipyards

Mr. Mandia, Mr. Wise, I thank you for this opportunity. My name is Len Thorell, I am Vice President and General Manager of Todd Shipyards, Los Angeles Division. We are located here in the West Basin of the Los Angeles Harbor.

My concern and my objection are as follows and I will cite them in reverse order:

My objection is that granting of this would allow an additional shipbuilder or offshore construction organization to enter this area and go into business. At the present time, the Los Angeles Division has two proposals in response to a request for offers for various and sundry platforms, drill rigs, and other related offshore work, such as discussed in this proposed amendment. Our situation is very simple, we are in layoff status. We have 5400 people on our roles in our shipyard and because of a virtual total lack of commercial work, not only in our yard, but in this entire nation due to a lack of national maritime policy in this country, our only work, our only possible work results from Navy new constructions repair and overhaul. We currently are finishing off a 17 ship program for building guided missile frigates, nine have been delivered, eight remain to go. We are in layoff mode, we started six weeks ago. In excess of 400 people have been laid off and the layoffs will continue at a virtual regular rate of around 150 a month and we will close our doors in October of 1985, based upon our current work.

There is very little opportunity in the Navy's Five Year Plan for additional work. There is perhaps one or three more ships available that would stem this outflow of trained personnel and we are competing with many other yards for this work, and with our inflated labor rates on the west coast, we have a very slim chance of participating in future work. I feel that some of the facts stated here, although true, there is an ever increasing pool of skilled labor, they will be leaving my shipyard, they will be leaving Long Beach Naval Shipyard, who has announced a reduction in force of some 1700 people by the end of this year, and I think it is far less expensive to the city and the state and the nation to keep people working rather than to allow them to become unemployed and therefore, go on the roles of the unemployed to be picked up as needed by any operation who would economically perform in this new work that's proposed for this facility and I am sure non-union and
therefore, some other difficulties, and I just feel it's not in the best interest of the port, certainly not the local area, which is already depressed and not in the best interest of San Pedro or Los Angeles.

My concern, which is my second point, is that as we all know and we have read particularly in recent months, there is a real problem in this nation for disposal of hazardous waste. I fully recognize that 190 acres is a lot of property, and its current use as described in what you just read is more than adequate, however, I see that it is bound to happened that as other uses are authorized and approved for this 190 acres the area available for disposal of hazardous wastes will continue to shrink and with yet to be defined requirements for the containment and proper handling of hazardous wastes. Who knows if a 190 acres is nearly enough? I offer both of these, both my objection and my concern in the best interest of the Port and I thank you for your time.
Response to Mr. Thorell's Comments:

1. Approval of the proposed amendment would give the Board of Harbor Commissioners coastal development permit authority for port dependent and related industrial uses. The use of port land for these purposes is in full compliance with the policies of the California Coastal Act. Moreover, the Coastal Act gives priority to coastal dependent developments such as proposed in this amendment. The suggestion that the port master planning process be used as a means of restricting competition for new construction contracts is not appropriate. It should be stressed that there is nothing in the proposed amendment that would restrict any business from bidding for new work.

2. The 190-Acre Landfill Site will not be used as a repository for hazardous waste. The term landfill only refers to the fact that the 190 acres were created by filling an area that was once water.
B. Ms. Goldie Otters

I'm Goldie Otters. I live in San Pedro. Two years ago I attended a workshop and a public hearing on the Risk Management Plan. Mine and others' comments are in the plan. I did not receive notice of this meeting and I know of no one who has. The only notice I know of was a report in the News Pilot of a Harbor Commission meeting about a month ago which discussed a variety of subjects. The only copy of this proposed amendment that I've seen was given to me by Mrs. Hunt who went to the Harbor Department and asked about the news article. My understanding of the landfill use was to be for relocation of hazardous storage; now another use is proposed. And another landfill will be requested for storage and another more profitable use will be proposed ad infinitum. Questions arise from the report of the Commission hearing. Why should assembly of off-shore oil rigs not be done at Todd? They need work to retain their employees. Mention is made that using the landfill for platform assembly is only temporary and that it will become a coal terminal. Long Beach already has a coal terminal site without having to create a landfill. Their problem with the trains could be duplicated here. Is it possible that such a drastic change in plans in order to consider the canneries may not be necessary. Mention has been made that Star-Kist is outgrown its headquarters and has been offered locations in Long Beach. The questions of safety regarding terminals near the canneries ignores the safety of such terminals at their present locations; the nine oil tanks for instance. In the Risk Management Plan figure two new facilities would not be permitted if under an existing footprint. If I read the footprints correctly, double Ports O' Call and a new marina has been added in violation of that statement. Parking for these is closer to the GATX Terminal tank trains which are always beside the road. A new marina is being built adjacent to nine oil storage tanks. A public road is being built between those tanks and cliff lined with home and backed up with more homes. An example of irresponsible and dangerous planning by the Port is the treatment of the Fishermen's Co-op building and restaurant. No attention was paid to possible archeological evidence and a hazardous traffic problem has been created. I would like to know the status of cooperation with City planning on the Risk Management Plan. And inasmuch as this hearing is being held in the absence of our Councilwoman and some members of the Harbor Commission, I hope there will be more opportunities for public input. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.
Response to Ms. Otter's Comments.

1. The Port Master Plan condition reserving the 190-Acre Landfill Site for hazardous liquid bulk facilities and drybulk facilities was imposed prior to the development of a Risk Management Plan. Applying the risk management criteria to the 190-acre site indicates that the site is not appropriate for relocating hazardous cargo facilities. This is primarily due to its proximity to the high density working population in Fish Harbor and the planned use of the eastern portion of the landfill for a dry bulk terminal. The Port has applied to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for a permit to construct a remote landfill site for relocating inappropriately located hazardous cargo facilities. That permit, as well as an amendment to the Port Master Plan to allow the construction of the remote site, is currently being processed.

2. See response 1 to Mr. L. M. Thorell's comments in this section of the amendment.

3. The only change proposed is to allow the addition of another land use for the 190-Acre Landfill Site i.e. coastal dependent or related industrial. The addition of the industrial land use is consistent with the policies of the California Coastal Act.

4. The facilities mentioned were certified by the California Coastal Commission and are consistent with the Port Master Plan.
Everything I have is in the form of a question which I needed and answer to. And you're saying that you will not give me any answers tonight at all. Well there is so much about this I don't know and don't understand. However, I will try to put it in the form of a comment rather than a question. It is my understanding that to receive the money to dredge and landfill that this was done by promising that the tank farms would be relocated. You have a lot of your dredging and you have a lot of your landfill and I think you should stand by that. I believe Union Oil Company and GATX Chemical Corporation on 22nd Street in San Pedro was named explicitly for relocation. Star-Kist Tuna Corporation was mentioned to me as a reason why the relocation should not take place. According to an article in the News Pilot, it is, in fact several articles in the News Pilot, the possibility of Star-Kist moving somewhere else is not remote. They talk about an overlapping of the risk if they were to put tank farms on that 190 acres. They show in a picture that the tank farms are quite substantial and perhaps there would be a footprint, but Union Oil Company and GATX together are probably less than 20 acres. What kind of an overlay footprint would that be in regards to Star-Kist as opposed to the overlay footprint on the residence and the recreational facilities? Why should we believe you when you tell us that you will get more landfill? You don't have a permit to get more landfill. You don't have a permit to dredge more. Until you do that, and even if you don't do that, it is necessary that you do relocate and stand by the original promises made to the government. One of the Commissioners was quoted in the News Pilot that the Port of Los Angeles has the highest net income in the United States. With an attitude like that, how can we possibly be assured that the Harbor Department has any intention whatsoever of relocating anything and we know there is no profit in it. I presume that the Harbor Department knows there are three earthquake faults under the Port of Los Angeles: the Palos Verdes fault, the Cabrillo fault, and I think the San Andreas fault. Now how would the residents of San Pedro and the visitors to all the recreational areas on the west bank be the safest with the tanks, Union or GATX, Union and GATX, where they are now or relocated to the landfill? And speaking of that new landfill on area 9 there that you would like to have and that you show on your map, isn't it true that the Fish and Game Department is totally additional landfill in the area? If you can't get it, what then? Thank you.
Response to Ms. Hunt's Comments.

1) See Response 3 to Miss Goldie Otter's comments in this section of the amendment. In addition, the Port's proposed relocation site was south of the 190-Acre landfill on a new landfill to be served by a 65 foot deepwater channel.

2) The Port does not plan to relocate hazardous cargo facilities to benefit one area of the harbor at the expense of another. The intent of the Port Master Plan is to develop a remote site specifically designed for hazardous cargo facilities and to relocate and consolidate, where feasible, inappropriately located hazardous cargo facilities at that site.
As long as you have limited this to just a discussion of the leasing of the land for the use of assembly and construction of portable oil rigs to go and be used off the California coast, I won't be able to comment on some of the things I wanted to. However, I will concur with the gentlemen from Todd Shipyard. I happen to be a stock holder in Todd Shipyard and I like to see a little dividend coming in. They've had pretty rough times up until now and I think another facility going in here is certainly going to make it pretty tough for those who are already here. I think that the Harbor Department should consider that Todd Shipyard is one of the backbones of the community of San Pedro from its tax structure and also from its employment. Now Bea Atwood just talked about the Union Oil Company and GATX and I represent the South Bay chapter of the American and Civil Liberties Union and we are very concerned about the safety of the residents. In other words, under the Constitution of the United States you are presumed to have be safe and secure in your home. Now you're talking about, according the newspaper articles, about the cannery workers and yet the tanks of the Union Oil farm are very very close to one of our grammar schools. I believe its included in the footprint. Now I also think that where your hazard situations talked about there you don't consider anything but the flammability and probably the explosion part; you don't consider the toxicity that can come from an operation like GATX and I think that with the recent earthquake we had up in Coalinga, if we ever get a 6.5 in San Pedro its going to be a sad sad story because many of these tanks are way over 20 years of age, the pipelines are older than that, as one hodge podge mess as even members of the Harbor Department will admit. I thank you for letting me give my few comments on this.
Response to Mr. Miller's Comments.

1. See response 1 to Mr. K. M. Thorell's comments in this section of the amendment.

2. See response 2 to Ms. Hunt's comments in this section of the amendment.
E. Mr. Alfred Sattler

My name's Al Sattler. I live at 835, do you want addresses, you've got it there already.

Okay, good enough. I wonder whether you wanted it on the recording. I'm unfamiliar with your protocol here. I don't have an awful lot to say, I'm a rather recent resident of San Pedro. But just glancing through this and keeping in mind things we're being essentially bombarded with in the news almost every day it seems like, new findings about wastes, dumps that hadn't been suspected by local residents. The latest news being the high levels of DDT found in Harbor water which of course Harbor Scientists by surprise to at least allegedly. I just happen to have an awful lot of doubts about any expanded use of the Harbor without better control in it. In particular the hazardous waste materials really ought to be moved away as far away from residences as possible and this is not necessarily in that direction. You might also want to consider for economic viability project just what rate there is going to be an expansion of offshore oil drilling off California. This given concern about the environmental, projected environmental impacts of rapid expanded oil drilling, it might well be problematic or there would be a large increase in offshore oil drilling. Thank you.
Response to Mr. Sattler's Comments.

1. See response 2 to Mr. L. M. Thorell's comments in this section of the amendment.
My name is Lilio Edward Gattoni, better known as Leo. I've been a resident of this town well 20 years which is relatively recent, that is relative to some of the people I know in the 30 year club and so on are very concerned about this town. Like myself I want to know more about its history and so on like Art Almeida, people who would have liked to have been here tonight, but have other commitments. I told them I would be here tonight in their stead, as it were. I first of all, I am here also representing the White Lung Association which is an association dedicated to the asbestos problem, particularly, and which is a hazardous material as we know from much of the publicity as finally received after a long cover-up of some three or four decades, but we are also concerned about occupational safety and health and the health of the public at large. And I have heard so much negative stuff regarding this proposed landfill of 190 acres, that I mean I have tried to understand as much of it as possible, I've had copies of this previously prior to coming here and read it, and I read portions of the Master Plan, you know that rather large volume, and tried to absorb it and tried to question it within myself and try to understand it more and more. The more I try to understand it, the more I realize that maybe we don't want this. I've been hearing various people get up here like; Goldie Otters, Bill Miller, Bea Atwood Hunt, people that I know very well, people that I respect as being conscientious and sincere, and really mean well for this town, I mean they have they have no ulterior motive of any kind. I mean nothing, even the industries represented here, the man from the man from the Los Angeles Division of Todd Shipyards, he really impressed me; I don't know his name, but as I walked in a little late when he was speaking I got here. Even he is opposed to it and so it seems to me that it's a damn good indication that we should at least pause and wait for more public input, before we go ahead on this thing, this landfill thing and more public input and what else? and give people like myself more of a chance to know what's really going on, cause I really don't know, all I know is it doesn't look good, because of what I've been hearing from people that have a better vision than I of what is good and what is not good for this town.

Thank you.
Response to Mr. Gattoni’s Comments.

1 See response 2 to Mr. L. M. Thorell’s comments in this section of the amendment.
May 12, 1983

The attached photocopies, and the transparencies that will be shown at the hearing before the Board of Harbor Commissioners, demonstrate the concern of this organization: reducing the hazard to residential neighborhoods in San Pedro should have first priority for use of the 190-acre landfill, as specified in the Port Master Plan; the footprints of potential exposure to radiant heat, as provided in the risk management studies, from which the photocopies were derived, indicate that population at risk would be far greater if the Union Oil tanks on Crescent were left in place, rather than moved to the eastern portion of the 190-acre landfill.

We oppose any amendment to the Port Master Plan that further delays moving the Union Oil storage tanks or other hazardous installations.

Gregory Smith
Board Member

15 Carolina St
San Pedro, CA 9073
Figure 3.7-5. Port of Los Angeles
Population Density: Weekend/Nighttime
Personnel hazard zones resulting from petroleum and petroleum products storage facilities fire radiant heat.
Figure 4.3.1-3. Storage tank farm area and hazard footprint for use of landfill area as constrained by hazard footprint not overlapping high density population areas. Tank farm areas assumed as 250,000 bbl capacity with six-foot high dikes. Hazard footprint for hazard to personnel, and for light crude or petroleum products fire.
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Response to Mr. Smith's Comments.

(1) See response (2) to Ms. Bea Atwood Hunt's comments in this section of the amendment. In addition, it should be pointed out that the eastern portion of the landfill site has been designated for a dry bulk terminal in the certified Port Master Plan and would not be available for relocating hazardous cargo facilities. This points out the need for maintaining a broad rather than narrow perspective in implementing the Port Master Plan. Planning decisions made only on a narrow project-by-project basis do not take into consideration the complete port entity, the interaction of various port activities and the future growth of the Port and invariably result in uncoordinated development. The intent of the Port Master Plan is to consolidate and isolate hazardous cargo facilities, where feasible and practical, and not redistributed them on a terminal-by-terminal basis without considering the complete port entity.

(2) The proposed amendment will not delay the Port's plan to relocate inappropriately located hazardous cargo facilities.
Yes I will make a comment Mr. Mandia. Since you are not the spokesman, I will not turn my back upon some interest parties here who have come to what has been announced as a hearing. Well it's a kind of a shabby hearing when you only hear one side of it. I would hope that the others present here that we would hear from the advocates of the amendment. Instead of that we are going to hear from the protesters and the detractors. I think some of them are too soon with their protests, with too much, and I am just sorry that the Commissioners, not even one Commissioner, or the officials I mentioned are not here to answer some questions, because in the media this was announced as being a hearing and those other people are not visible or not audible. Since 1913, I have been a mariner and my concept of this amendment and what goes on around here will be the concept of a seaman. I have spent some years here concerned with operations of the harbor with the safety of operations, the prudent operations of ships. Now, when it gets down to the nitty gritty of this thing you have got to remember, we have a wonderful harbor here, it's the wonderful forethought starting back with 75 years ago that has made this harbor. In the beginning it was set-up for navigation, commerce, and fishing. When we received the land grant from the state, there was no exclusion there, it did not exclude the operators of the port and the Commissioners or the ruling body, it did not exclude them from the mineral rights of this place. One primary thing that people seem to bitch about around here is that they will get in some exploratory holes in the ground out there to see what petroleum is down there. Well I assert that they should do that without delay, they ought to get with it, get in there, in this new tract and other places and see what's down there before they start to building, don't delay that at all, it should commence without delay.

Now as to schools, cannery workers, if you want to say hospitals or any other activities, this port here, particularly Terminal Island is an industrial and a port activity, you would expect to have the things that are here, and if schools have been or other things have been located through here and in hazardous proximity, that has been through lack of forethought and planning. Just like airports, they build an airport and then people protest because they can't move up close to it or the airplanes make too much noise. This is a port and the activities that are going on here are necessary to it and it's to be expected, and we should exclude things that are not necessary to port operations. It's no place for dwelling, no place for schools, no place for
the things that will be hazardous. Sitting near me some of those present asked me to say something about an offshore petroleum working facility such as a mono-buoy. We do need that, the Harbor Department of Long Beach has not wanted one and the Harbor Department of Los Angeles has not wanted to get into that, because anything else outside of the breakwater doesn't ring their cash register. Well it could and we could evade some of the probable hazards that occur in handling petroleum by having a facility off there. You could get it off there quite a distance, and right here in Los Angeles uptown there is one of the manufacturers of that equipment has been most successful all over the wide world using such things. I would hope that we would get that off of there and it could decrease the amount of petroleum handling of crude inside the breakwater, but with this shabby kind of a hearing where you only have just people here and we can't get any comment or any back-up from the Commissioners or the Executives of the port, so I can't see where it's any good to go on any further. I thank you for listening to me and that's the way it is as I see it.
Response to Admiral Higbee's Comments.

Admiral Higbee made a number of comments concerning the harbor in general but offered no specific comments on the amendment.
Written Comments and Responses

Written comments were received from: The City of Los Angeles Planning Department, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Fish and Wildfish Service and Star Kist Foods, Inc. The four letters of comment along with responses follow.
Date: May 6, 1983

To: Sid Robinson, Director of Planning and Research Harbor Department

From: Arch D. Crouch, Principal City Planner

SUBJECT: COMMENTS - DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE PORT MASTER PLAN - 190-ACRE LANDFILL SITE

The addition of another land use for the 190-acre landfill site - coastal dependent or related industrial uses - in itself does not conflict with any element of the City's General Plan.

In regard to the primary known use anticipated in connection with the addition of the industrial category, i.e., the assembly and launching of offshore exploratory drilling and production platforms, the Conservation Plan (an element of the General Plan adopted by the City Council on December 20, 1973) sets forth the following policies which should be considered in light of the draft amendment and future projects related to it:

- "The City shall require full disclosure of all planned petroleum exploratory and production activities before approval of any such activity."

- "Future oil extraction activities shall be banned at surface locations on beach and offshore waters within the City's jurisdiction."

ADC: LF: mv
Response to City of Los Angeles Planning Department correspondence of May 6, 1983.

1) No drilling or production activities are proposed on the 190-Acre Landfill Site.
MAY 6 - 1983

Port of Los Angeles
P.O. Box 151
San Pedro, CA 90733

ATTN: Director of Planning and Research

RE: Draft Amendment - 190-acre Landfill Site

Gentlemen:

We have reviewed the draft amendment to the certified Port Master Plan which proposes to allow the addition of another land use for the 190-acre landfill site, namely, coastal dependent or related industrial facilities.

We foresee no water quality problems or impairment of harbor beneficial uses arising from the proposed type of development on the landfill site, provided any necessary dredging is accomplished in conformance with appropriate waste discharge requirements issued by this Board, and any discharges to harbor waters are in compliance with the State's Bays and Estuaries Policy and such permits as may be adopted by the Board.

In this connection, we previously commented on the Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR for Kaiser Steel Corporation's Offshore Platform Fabricating/Launching Project on the landfill site, and on a proposed expansion of the project site. Attached are copies of our letters dated December 28, 1982, and May 5, 1983.

If you have any further questions on this matter, please call Dr. Lewis A. Schirnazi of my staff at the above number.

Very truly yours,

RAYMOND M. HERTEL
Executive Officer

Enclosures
Any necessary dredging will be in conformance with the appropriate waste discharge requirements.
Mr. Sid Robinson  
Director of Planning and Research  
Port of Los Angeles  
P.O. Box 151  
San Pedro, CA 90733  

Re: Draft Port Master Plan Amendment,  
Master Planning Area 9, 190-Acre Landfill Site  

Dear Mr. Robinson:

The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has reviewed the referenced Draft Port Master Plan Amendment (MPA) and offers the following comments. We find that two important public fish and wildlife issues need some further discussion. They are: the protection of California least tern nesting and foraging areas and the implementation of a listed "mitigation action". The California least tern is a State and Federal Endangered Species which nests on Terminal Island in the Port of Los Angeles. The "mitigation action" is required by a previous California Coastal Commission Master Plan certification, to partially offset the biological harm to public fish and wildlife resources caused by the 190-acre landfill.

The draft MPA indicates neither how the necessary California least tern (CLT) nesting area would be accommodated nor how tern feeding area loss or degradation would be avoided. The Port has offered the opinion, by letter to the Corps of Engineers (CE) dated 13 January 1983, and at a meeting with the Corps of Engineers on 22 March 1983, that establishment of the landfill nest site for the 1983 nesting season of the CLT was not possible, citing a variety of reasons. Among the unresolved issues cited by the Port are:

a) The configuration and location of the nesting area suggested by FWS and CE could restrict development.

b) The Port is not obligated to fence a designated nesting area, prior to constructing permanent facilities on the adjacent area.

c) Grading and leveling of the landfill and Reeves Field
must yet be accomplished.

e) It should be possible for the CLT nesting area to be relocated, as needed, to accommodate Port development planning.

f) The Port finds objectionable some CLT nesting area management techniques, such as the use of CLT decoys on a designated nesting area.

f) An interagency agreement, finalized in advance of the 1984 CLT nesting season, could be appropriate for resolving the above items.

It would seem that developments on the 190-acre landfill should not proceed until the CLT issues are resolved. We suggest that such issues be resolved expeditiously through formulation of an interagency agreement. Once such an agreement is completed, it would be incorporated into the draft MPA.

Also, necessary dredging for the proposed platform fabrication facility, though relatively small in extent, would be within a harbor region utilized by breeding least terns for feeding themselves and their young. Such an impact should be addressed and mitigated in the draft MPA.

It is unclear in the draft MPA what action the Port is contemplating regarding the satisfaction of the "mitigation actions" already required by the previous Master Plan certification. Completion of one of the "mitigation actions" (artificial reef construction, coastal wetland restoration/acquisition, commitment of funds, etc.) could take planning and, with some options, construction time. To avoid the possibility of delay of proposed landfill uses, fulfillment of this requirement should be expedited.

The Fish and Wildlife Service continues to be concerned with and interested in the avoidance of potential conflicts between necessary port developments and public fish and wildlife resources by advance planning. We stand ready to assist the Port with such planning. Should there be any questions, please contact Mr. Jack Pancher or me at (714) 831-4270.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Halpis Pisapia
Field Supervisor

cc: CCC, San Francisco
CDFG, MRR, Long Beach
Approval of the amendment to allow port-dependent or related industrial uses on the 190-Acre Landfill Site will have no impact on California least tern nesting or foraging areas. Approval will only transfer coastal development permit authority for port-dependent or related industrial uses to the local governing body which is the intent of the California Coastal Act. However, at the time when specific developments are proposed for the 190-acre landfill site, the impact of those developments on the California least tern, as well as other environmental impacts, will be evaluated to determine what action, if any, would be necessary.

The question of how the least tern nesting area would be accommodated is a separate issue. The Port has already agreed by resolution and permit to establish a 15-acre site on the landfill. Negotiations are currently underway between the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Fish and Game and the Port to determine an appropriate nesting site on the landfill.

See response ① above.

This comment should be addressed to a project specific EIR when it is submitted for public review.

The mitigation action contemplated by the Port is conveyance of $362,500 to a public agency.
April 21, 1983

Mr. Sid Robinson
Director of Planning and Research
Port of Los Angeles
425 S. Palos Verdes St.
P. O. Box 151
San Pedro, CA 90733

Re: Draft Amendment 190 Acre Landfill Site

Dear Mr. Robinson:

We have reviewed the draft amendment to the Port Master Plan sent under cover of your letter of April 12th and whilst we have no objections to the proposal, we are concerned about the following factors:

1) We would be concerned about any adverse impact on air or water quality that might affect our food processing operations on Terminal Island. We are not aware of any significant adverse impact that would affect us but we would be concerned about any significant change in air quality or harbor water quality since we use harbor water for non-process cooling water in our plants.

2) However, we do have serious concern about the impact of this proposal and the potential further developments in the fill area on traffic access to this part of Terminal Island. We believe the additional employee traffic plus road and rail goods traffic will cause significant problems in the following areas which need to be addressed:

A) The additional traffic flow up Earle Street might cause considerable congestion, particularly when the Fish Harbor Development Plan is implemented. This might be relieved by scheduling work hours at the Platform Fabrication facility so that they do not coincide exactly with the cannery work hours.
Mr. Sid Robinson  
April 21, 1983

b) Additional railroad traffic crossing Terminal Way will cause additional congestion and will effectively block off half of the Island for emergency vehicle access when Terminal Way is obstructed by railroad traffic. In order to reduce this problem, railroad movement should be scheduled to take place outside the periods of peak vehicular traffic flow.

c) We believe that the greatest problem will be caused by the extra vehicular traffic movement in the afternoon heading in the direction of Long Beach and endeavoring to cross, by means of a single lane, the Vincent Thomas Bridge access road. This part of the road access system is already the cause of considerable congestion which we believe will be aggravated to an unacceptable degree by Platform Fabrication Plants and any further developments in the Terminal Island area.

We believe that the last traffic pattern study was carried out some 2 or 3 years ago since which time the volume of truck and container traffic into the area of Terminal Island west of the Vincent Thomas Bridge has increased significantly. We feel that in order to cope with this increased volume of traffic and the increased volume that will result from the proposed platform construction plants and further developments in the area that the traffic pattern study should be updated. A specific task of the study should be to address the means of traffic management to be adopted at the Vincent Thomas Bridge access road so that the crossing south bound traffic and the approaching bridge traffic can be handled more speedily in rush hour periods. We believe this will have to be resolved by changes to the road system at this point.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these proposals and we look forward to learning of your plans for relieving the traffic problems.

Yours truly,

STAR-KIST FOODS, INC.

Jane Ballands
D. Ballands
General Manager
Engineering Services

DB/ah

cc: Brian Leamy
    Ed Ryan
    Jeff Naumann
    John Murray
    Bob Batterson
Response to the Star-Kist Foods, Inc. letter dated April 21, 1983.

1. Potential air, water, traffic and other project level environmental impacts will be addressed in a project specific EIR which will be submitted for public review when a specific project is proposed for the 190-Acre Landfill Site.

2. See Response 1 above. The traffic problems identified are valid concerns. The solutions suggested to alleviate those problems, as well as other potential solutions, will be considered before a decision is made on any specific development. In addition, the Federal Government has funded the construction of a new east bound street (heading in the direction of Long Beach) that will begin at Ferry Street. The new street will extend eastward south of the bridge toll plaza and will merge with Seaside Avenue, east of the toll plaza. Also, Seaside Avenue will be improved and expanded to six lanes (three in each direction).

The Seaside Avenue improvement program and the construction of the new street are intended to relieve traffic congestion caused by traffic moving in the Long Beach direction from the southwestern portion of Terminal Island.